Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Special Meeting (12/5/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
5.a.	Adrienne W Griffin	Favor	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/2/2021	n/a
5.a.	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Bob Blumenfield	Other	While I appreciate that every option has competing interests and advantages, I want you to know how important it is for the entire San Fernando Valley to be united in one supervisorial district. Please see my letter submitted 12-4-2021 for further detail.	12/4/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Deborah Pasachoff	Favor	La Crescenta needs to be included with Glendale, not Palmdale/Lancaster. We are located Glendale adjacent and are one community that should not be separated.	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Ebani Abram	Other	Greetings Commissioners, Thank you again for all of your hard work and for taking all of our public comments and recommendations. I've uploaded a pdf document that lists the People's Bloc (whom I also represent) modifications that we'd like to see on Map F-1. Thank you again!	12/2/2021	View attachment

5.a.	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with these options. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Emily Dow	Other	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/2/2021	n/a
5.a.	Fridah I Sanchez	Favor	Keep Pomona in the first district.	12/5/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Gabriela Mohaupt	Other	I support Map B-2 and oppose Map F	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Ivan S Sanchez	Favor	-	12/5/2021	View attachment
5.a.	J B	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Jennifer Ryan	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Katy Medina	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Kimberly Berry	Other	The guiding principles of redistributing should be to protect our most vulnerable communities by keeping resources in the most under resourced communities and voting blocs of historically underrepresented groups together. Keep USC in district 8. Keep Pasadena and Altadena together, keep Altadena in the San Gabriel Valley.	12/4/2021	n/a
5.a.	Kimberly Kaplan	Oppose	Why aren't we linked with Glendale/Burbank/Pasadena? We have nothing to do with Palmdale/Lancaster districts for voting. Nothing at all. Please don't make these kind of bad decisions. Do the sensible thing.	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Leticia C Sanchez	Favor	-	12/5/2021	View attachment

5.a.	Lezlie Campeggi	Other	MAP B-2 Otherwise, MAKE NO CHANGES until it can be put on a regular election ballot!	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lidia A Manzanares	Favor	Thank you Commissioners for your service and commitment to our communities. I am writing to express my opposition to maps 84 and 83 as they disenfranchise our many working class communities of color. I support map 82 as it keeps my community --Pomona --- with other working class communities that already have ties to Pomona. However, more affluent communities like Bel Air should not be part of D1 as that would lead to less affluent communities becoming an afterthought. I also support map 81 as it also keeps Pomona is D1. Thank you again for listening to our concerns and helping ensure that Pomona stays a part of D1.	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Lisa G Hite	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/2/2021	n/a
5.a.	Matthew S Bennett	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	MICHAEL J TARBET	Other	-	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	MICHAEL J TARBET	Other	-	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Nora Garcia	Favor	-	12/2/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Nourbese N Flint	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	View attachment
5.a.	Q Q	Other	-	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation,	12/4/2021	n/a

			discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990 On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition Brief For The United States In Opposition TABLE OF CONTENTS Questions Presented Opinions below		

Jurisdiction
Statement
Argument
Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors.

3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the

			Core. 4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan. 5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority. 6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted. STATEMENT 1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid. In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal		

			Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid. 2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the		

			apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
5.a.	Stuart Waldman	Other	I think that the commission should take a look at maps 078. This map modifies 74 to make sd2 it more like G, still using of maps G & 60 to create a map with: SD2 has LAX, UCLA, Beach communities, the Palos Verde area etc and still almost 25% Black CVAP and keeping historic black NCs SD3 Unites the San Fernando Valley COG communities SD4 is 53% Latino CVAP SD1 Unites the Eastside Communities of LA & Hollywood with working-class communities in the San Gabriel Valley SD5 becomes a 25% Asian district combining the Foothill communities of SGV & the North"	12/4/2021	n/a
5.a.	Susan Rinehart	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
5.a.	Terri Dinubilo	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
5.a.	Terri Tippit	Other	The Westside Neighborhood Council (WNC) requests two basic concerns: 1. That all eight (8) neighborhood HOA/communities be kept whole, along with the WNC, within a single district.	12/2/2021	View attachment

			2. That WNC-affiliated communities be grouped with our historically connected neighbors to the north and west that share businesses and major arterials. Traditionally, the WNC has been placed in District # 3 due to longstanding commonality of interests with other residential and business communities on the Westside of LA County. But, among the three current options, Map G would require the most minimal tweaks while B-2 and F-1 split us essentially in half between two districts. To that end – and recognizing the Commission's Ad Hoc Working Groups' planned review of current map options B-2, F-1 and G – I have detailed below tweaks to these maps with regard to WNC boundaries that would ensure inclusion in District 3. • Map Option B-2 In order to keep the WNC and its affiliated HOAs whole, the border between District 3 and District 4 (rather than a combination of Pico Blvd and Santa Monica Blvd) should be shifted slightly south to the I-405 Freeway and National Blvd, east to Overland. From Overland eastward, use the I-10 Freeway. • Map Option F-1 Beginning from the I-10 Freeway @ Overland, please continue westward using National Blvd to the I-405 Freeway as the northern edge of District 2. • Map Option G Between the I-405 Freeway and Overland Avenue, the southern boundary of the WNC area is National Blvd., -- NOT the I-10 Freeway. (Starting at Overland Avenue and continuing east, the southern boundary is, indeed, the I-10 freeway.) As always, we are available to clarify these requests, and can provide a map of the WNC territory as a refresher-guide. Thank you for your continued consideration and service.		

OP 082	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 082	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 082	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Fridah I Sanchez	Favor	Support 81 & 82.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Gabriela Mohaupt	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 082	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 082	Ivan S Sanchez	Favor	support for 81 & 82	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Lester C Kau	Favor	Much better than the original. I like that it keeps the Foothill cities together in one district.	12/4/2021	n/a
OP 082	Leticia C Sanchez	Favor	support for 81 & 82	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Lidia A Manzanares	Favor	I am in support of map 82 as it keeps Pomona in D1. It is imperative that working class communities that share common identities, resources and have a long standing history of working together.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Mayor Bill Brand	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a

OP 082	Michael Martin	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Ranald R MacKinnon	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 082	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422	12/4/2021	n/a

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term, 1990

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition

Brief For The United States In Opposition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented
Opinions below
Jurisdiction
Statement
Argument
Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

			1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims. 2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors. 3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core. 4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan. 5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority. 6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted. STATEMENT		

			1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid. In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid. 2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting		

			process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OP 082	Stuart Waldman	Favor	While I would prefer a map with a district that has more San Fernando Valley voters, this map is an improvement from others with a district made up of	12/4/2021	n/a

			64.65% SFV voters. It is still a step backwards from what we have currently. However, we do not love a Sylmar to Redondo Beach district.		
OP 083	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 083	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 083	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Fridah I Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Gabriela Mohaupt	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 083	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 083	Ivan S Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Lester C Kau	Other	It is better than the original, but it is strange that part of the Northern part of Arcadia was pulled out of the Foothill cities.	12/4/2021	n/a
OP 083	Leticia C Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Lidia A Manzanares	Oppose	I am opposed to map 83 as it removes Pomona from D1 and looks to disenfranchise our community by lumping it with communities with n historical ties or common identities.	12/5/2021	n/a

OP 083	Pamela Combar	Other	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Pamela Combar	Other	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 083	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990	12/4/2021	n/a

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition

Brief For The United States In Opposition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented
Opinions below
Jurisdiction
Statement
Argument
Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors.

3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core.

4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan.

5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority.

6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted.

STATEMENT

1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles

			County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid. In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid. 2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75.		

			Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OP 083	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Map B2 took a significant step backwards and we now oppose. It went from a district with 71% San Fernando Valley voters to a district with 53.5%.	12/4/2021	n/a
OP 084	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	I opposed to redistricting of Lacrescenta to Lancaster/Palmdale	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 084	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment:	12/3/2021	n/a

			Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM		
OP 084	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Fridah I Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Gabriela Mohaupt	Other	I support Map B-2 and oppose Map F	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 084	George Avakyan	Oppose	I oppose the redistributing of Lacrescenta to Lancaster/ Palmdale	12/3/2021	n/a
OP 084	Ivan S Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Lester C Kau	Favor	Much better. Thank you for keeping the Foothill cities together in one district.	12/4/2021	n/a
OP 084	Leticia C Sanchez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Lidia A Manzanares	Oppose	I am opposed to map 83 as it removes Pomona from D1 and looks to disenfranchise our community by lumping it with communities with n historical ties or common identities.	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Michael Martin	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OP 084	Sofia G Quinones	Favor	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have	12/4/2021	n/a

			sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990 On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition Brief For The United States In Opposition		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented
Opinions below
Jurisdiction
Statement
Argument
Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute

			the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors. 3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core. 4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan. 5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority. 6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted. STATEMENT 1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid.		

			In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid. 2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one		

			district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OP 084	Stuart Waldman	Favor	While I would prefer a map with a district that has more San Fernando Valley voters, this map is an improvement from others with a district made up of 64.54% SFV voters. It is still a step backwards from what we have currently.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Abby Watkins	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Adrienne W Griffin	Favor	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Amy Agius	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Andrew Klein	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	Anita Reviczky Stoddard	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ann Wolfson	Favor	I am in favor of opt. B-2 for the South Bay and Beach Cities.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ariel Watkins	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Babette Wald	Favor	Please keep Janice Hahn as our rep.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Becky Anderson	Favor	Map B2 is the best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area which are reflected in map B2.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Bob Blumenfield	Other	Map B-2 splits the Valley into two districts with just over half the population from the San Fernando Valley in one district. Other options are better to unite the entire San Fernando Valley.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Brian Greenfield	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Brian Schlichter	Favor	The San Fernando Valley should have a supervisor that lives in out community and shares our lifestyles. Map B2 Keeps most of the SFV together along with Las Virgenes COI.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Cecily A Lee	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Charisse Bremond Weaver	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	View attachment

OPTION B-2	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Connie Tan	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Courtney Adolph	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Craig Klein	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Deborah Wolf	Oppose	Comments for redistricting proposals, specifically B-2, F-1 and G. As a member of the Shadows Hills community for the past 35 years, I would respectfully ask that the semi-rural horsekeeping areas be kept together as in proposal F-1. All areas face the same issues, are in fire zones, zoned for agriculture and farm animals, are subject to flooding from the hillsides during El Nino seasons, and are one of the very few remaining areas left in Los Angeles that supports horsekeeping. These areas all help each other in times of need and need the same types of services from the city. Breaking these up will create a hardship for all 3 of the areas. We need representation on the County Board from 1 person who truly is understands the needs of this area. The only proposal that meets this goal is F-1 as currently proposed. B-2, and G do not support our community, but rather divide it. Thank you for your attention in this matter. Deborah Wolf	12/4/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	Delice Moya	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Donald Martin	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Donna Evans	Favor	The South Bay has nothing in common with the valley and the two areas should not become one	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ebani Abram	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ed MacLaughlin	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ed Smith	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Elaine C Ti	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	Cuts out significant sections of horsekeeping/agrarian areas currently within District 5 so that these sections will lose representation by a Supervisor that understands and can serve an agrarian constituency	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Emily Dow	Other	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Frencis Barbic	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Gabriela Mohaupt	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Gaylord P Suddeth	Favor	This option provides for maintaining the most accurate representation of the interests and concerns of the citizens of the coastal areas of Los Angeles County.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Gemma Steib	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Gordon Nash	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	grace A yasa	Favor	Do NOT divide San Pedro.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Graham Edwards	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Hannah McCallum	Favor	Very in favor of Map B-2. Keeps Janice Hahn supervisor over the southbay and the southbay beaches.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Heather Schlichter	Favor	Supervisor should live in our community and share our lifestyles. Map B2 is the one that keeps most of the San Fernando Valley whole with the adjacent Los Virgenes COI.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Hugo Fernandes	Favor	South Bay has very diverse interests that don't include San Fernando Valley interests.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ireh Yoon	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	J B	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	James Horrell	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Jason Mayerle	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Jeffrey Rieth	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Jennifer Ryan	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Jill Stranger	Favor	Keep Janice Hahn in our district.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Jinhee Lee	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Joanna Edwards	Favor	I am in favor of Map B-2	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	John Mendoza	Favor	None	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	John Mendoza	Oppose	Original B was eliminated by political bargaining to appease Mayor of Pomona and allies who have used Fairplex as a political tool while other voces in N Pomona. The more maps are modified the more sneaky status quo elivates in working groups. Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights, Roland Hights don't fit with packed LatinX Supervisor District 1 modified behind closed doors.Working groups undermine Original Maps. Adding	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Judith D St John	Favor	The portion of Pomona in Map B needs to be represented together with La Verne, San Dimas, and the other cities that are part of Map B, because of common interests. We do not belong with San Gabriel Valley. We need a different Supervisor for L. A. County Fairgrounds known as FAIRPLEX. The current County Supervisor has been too closely aligned with the operators of the County Fairgrounds putting the financial interests of the Fairplex corporation executives ahead of the interests of the surrounding residents. La Verne shares the concerns of North Pomona residents who live near the fairgrounds and we need to be included in the same Map B supervisorial district with La Verne.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Justin Nash	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Justina L Tuck	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Justine Catanese	Favor	The best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area which are reflected in map B2.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Karen Klink	Favor	In favor of B2!! We want to keep Janice Hahn in the South Bay. This map makes so much more sense than redistricting the South Bay with the San Fernando Valley, we have nothing in common with them.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Kathryn Have	Favor	I am in favor of Map B-2	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Laura Chapin	Oppose	Anything above Glenoaks from Wentworth down to La Tuna Canyon should be kept in the same zone. There are too many horse properties in that area that are currently disappearing from ADU units and other conversions being built.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Lauren Bergloff	Favor	I support Map B-2	12/5/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	Lee L Coller	Favor	This is the best map. It keeps the south bay in District 4 where Janice Hahn has represented us well. It makes no sense to lump the south bay with San Fernando Valley, there are few interests in common. It makes a log more sense to have the harbor areas all in the same district.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Lester C Kau	Favor	This is the only map that keeps the Foothill cities together. We have many issues in common, and separating us makes complicated issues even more complicated to deal with. Please keep the Foothill cities together in one district.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Lezlie Campeggi	Favor	This is the only option that makes sense! Who in their right mind lumps the South Bay area in with the Valley? Or carves out coastal only as a District? Both are logistical nightmares for a Supervisor to navigate for in-person coverage. That, and Supervisor Hahn is a South Bay native ... deep roots, knowledge and relationships that would be GONE, and with a short-term representative NOT SANCTIONED BY VOTERS! Further, how dare anyone making this decision do so based on a "stick count" of people who call into the meeting. That is NOT representative of the constituents, is a miniscule amount of people, and NOT any well-thought out reasoning for decision making.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Lisa Youngworth	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Manjusha Kulkarni	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Marc King	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Marcie Guillermo	Favor	Because the Beach cities have worked together, is very diverse, and our current representative knows the district very well, and more importantly is working well for all communities in consideration. Many thanks!	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	MarkAnthony Wilson	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Marlene Montanez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Matthew S Bennett	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	Mayor Bill Brand	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Melanie Moss	Favor	Map B-2 allows the part of Pomona around Fairplex to be connected to the Supervisor who represents La Verne, where we have a common interest in the impact of Fairplex activities. The Supervisor who represents La Verne has been responsive to the concerns of her constituents, and we want that same leadership and consideration	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Mia Herman	Favor	Map B2 is the best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area which are reflected in map B2.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Michael Hope	Favor	I support B-2	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Michael Martin	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Michelle Lane	Favor	Best option for beach cities	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Miriam Kaufman	Favor	Please do not clump us with the San Fernando Valley.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Monica Reagan	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Neil Najjar	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Nicole Brozost	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Norchelle Brown	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Nourbese N Flint	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Pamela Combar	Favor	B2 map is the best choice for the cities and interests in this area.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Pamela Combar	Favor	Los Angeles County Redistricting Update The December 3, 2021 Redistricting Commission meeting was astounding.	12/5/2021	n/a

			Based on the comments from the commissioners, they are literally making the decision on how to carve up LA County based on the number of people calling in via Zoom. At least one commissioner stated this made no sense as the 100 people calling in could determine the representation of nearly 10 million people -Zoom calls from only 0.00001% of the residents. Most of the Zoom callers at the meeting were not from the South Bay, so the commissioners are not being heard by you! Map F-1, which is what they are leaning towards will combine Redondo Beach with the San Fernando Valley. San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. Check out the proposed map above which appears to fit the textbook definition of Gerrymandering as seen below. A significant criterion of the redistricting process is to keep communities of interest together. Lumping the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay makes absolutely no sense at all. There is another meeting today, Sunday, December 5th,, and starts at 3 pm. Be sure to write and call in to the Zoom meeting before it is too late. To send a written Public Comment before the meeting please follow these steps. Use this link publiccomment.redistricting.lacounty.gov/ ?fbclid=IwAR2GiyCLw3xmZXSZfvKGu1-M_hhtWCELr1o9vcWA839D0 _7-Gg_ZzL-2PP0 Favor Map B-2. Map B2 is the best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area which are reflected in.		

OPTION B-2	Patrick P Mellier	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ranald R MacKinnon	Favor	The Beach Communities and the major users of those beaches need to be together to protect the ocean from pollution.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ray Gilman	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Robert Gaddis	Favor	B2 is the best choice for the county and coastal communities. This map reflects specific issues of the South Bay.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ron Blackie	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	roque armenta	Oppose	Map B-2 is 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.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Roy Humphreys	Favor	stat balance	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ryan Tucker	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Samantha Goldberg	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Scott Froschauer	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Sharon Watkins	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Shianne Winston	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles	12/4/2021	n/a

			County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990 On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition Brief For The United States In Opposition TABLE OF CONTENTS		

Questions Presented
Opinions below
Jurisdiction
Statement
Argument
Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors.

3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core.

4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan.

5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority.

6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted.

STATEMENT

1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid.

In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the

			purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid. 2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79.		

			The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OPTION B-2	Stephen Wertheimer	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Steve Goldberg	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Stuart Waldman	Favor	Map B-2 is good as is. it has a district that includes 71% San Fernando Valley voters.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Susan Rinehart	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Susan Wong	Oppose	Map B-2 cut out Hansen Dam, the Big T wash, most of Lake View Terrace, and La Tuna Canyon Road out of District 5 and put them into District 3, leaving Shadow Hills and most of Stonehurst in District 5. This separates the horse-keeping, agrarian, and severe-fire-risk communities from one another. The three (3) foothill communities (abutting the Verdugo Mountains, the Angeles National	12/2/2021	n/a

			Forest and the Big Tujunga Wash) of Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon must remain in one district, as they currently are in LA City Council District 7 and the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council . All three rural communities have an equestrian heritage and agrarian lifestyles. All 3 communities are located in Mountain Fire districts and high fire zones. Over the years, these three communities have developed fire protection and evacuation plans which have helped save human and animal lives and properties during our various wildfires (ie. La Tuna Canyon and Creek fires). During major floods of the Big Tujunga Wash Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills have worked together to provide shelter to flood victims and protect neighborhoods from flooding. They also work together to protect and clean up the Big Tujunga Wash. There is a historical cooperation between these three communities due to their common interests and goals. If they were to be separated into different communities, their unified voice and actions would be muted. Map B-2 also inexplicably cuts out a strangely shaped segment of Stonehurst along Wealtha Ave.and put those relatively few homes into District 3, These folks live, play, and ride their horses in the Shadow Hills parks and trails, and would be better served not being cut out of their neighborhood. These few blocks should be in L.A. County Supervisor District 5.		
OPTION B-2	Tashia Hinchliffe	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Ted J Smith	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Terri Dinubilo	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Terri Tippit	Other	The Westside Neighborhood Council could support Map Option B-2 if the following tweak were to be made: In order to keep the WNC and its affiliated HOAs whole, the border between District 3 and District 4 (rather than a combination of Pico Blvd and Santa Monica Blvd) should be shifted slightly south to the I-405 Freeway and National Blvd, east to Overland. From Overland eastward, use the I-10 Freeway. Thank you for your continued consideration and service.	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION B-2	Valerie Fernandes	Favor	Stop the rush to shove together 2 completely disparate communities for political manipulation.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	WAYNE CRAIG	Favor	Map B2 is the best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. Combining it with other areas as with map F1 makes no logical sense at all. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area which are reflected in map B2.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Wesley Nash	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION B-2	Zabrina Nash	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Abby Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Adrienne W Griffin	Favor	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Amy Agius	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Andrew Klein	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Anita Reviczky Stoddard	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ann Masterson	Favor	To Whom it May Concern, I am a 21 year resident of Shadow Hills and am passionately dedicated keeping our unique community together, in the same district. The maps you have drawn do NOT reflect the best interests of our equestrian area which includes high fire risk, challenging terrain, and equine-centric paths, trails and road-ways as a small sampling. There is NO benefit for the stakeholders of the shared-interest communities of Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon & Lake View Terrace, represented in the oft-revised maps you have proposed, except F-1. After extensive and passionate engagement from our community, including an exhaustive letter-writing campaign, a map was finally drawn that appropriately	12/4/2021	n/a

			reflected the commonsense choice that we have been attempting to convey, one that is critical for the health and wellbeing of our community, and now that's been changed once again in these last minute revisions, with F-1 being the only logical option. Any other choice, in my opinion, would demonstrate that the civil servants who are supposed to be serving the interests of the people- who have clearly and emphatically conveyed their thoughts, feelings and wishes- in fact, are not interested in doing so. I ask that you please do the RIGHT thing by keeping our communities together and take the considerations below into account when making your final decisions. I favor Map F-1 because it keeps the three (3) Foothill communities (abutting the Verdugo Mountains, the Angeles National Forest and the Big Tujunga Wash) of Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon TOGETHER. They must remain in one district, as they currently are in LA City Council District 7 and the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council. All three rural communities have an equestrian heritage and agrarian lifestyles. All three communities are located in Mountain Fire districts and high fire zones. Over the years, these three communities have developed fire protection and evacuation plans which have helped save human and animal lives and properties during our various wildfires (ie. La Tuna Canyon and Creek fires). During major floods of the Big Tujunga Wash Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills have worked together to provide shelter to flood victims and protect neighborhoods from flooding. They also work together to protect and clean up the Big Tujunga Wash. There is a historical cooperation between these three communities due to their common interests and goals. If they were to be separated into different communities, their unified voice and actions would be muted. 1. I am against MAP B-2 because it has inexplicably cut out a strangely shaped segment of Stonehurst out of Shadow Hills along Wealtha Ave. and put those relatively few homes into District 3, AND Map B-2 has also has cut out Hansen		

			Dam, the Big T wash, most of Lake View Terrace, and La Tuna Canyon Road out of District 5 and put them into District 3, leaving only Shadow Hills and most of Stonehurst in District 5. This separates the horse-keeping, agrarian, and severe-fire-risk communities from one another. 2. I am against MAP G because it inexplicably cuts out a strangely shaped segment of Stonehurst along Wealtha and put those relatively few homes into District 3, but has left most of Stonehurst and all of Shadow Hills in District 5 along with Lake View Terrace, Hansen Dam, and the Big T wash. However, it has taken La Tuna Canyon Road out of District 5 and put that area into District 3. This separates La Tuna Canyon from the other horse-keeping, agrarian, and severe-fire-risk communities still in District 5. Thank you in advance. Regards, Ann Masterson		
OPTION F-1	Ann Wolfson	Oppose	I oppose option F-1.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ariel Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Becky Anderson	Oppose	combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay makes no sense. Different lands where South Bay has farbor, beach very different issues then inland!	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Bob Blumenfield	Other	Map F-1 would combine the West San Fernando Valley LA City Council CD3's neighborhoods with the Westside coastal communities of Santa Monica,	12/4/2021	n/a

			Redondo Beach and Palos Verdes which is 43 miles away and has a significantly different climate than the third district.		
OPTION F-1	Bonnie Rogers	Favor	In favor because this is the only map that keeps horsekeeping properties togther. Our communities of Shadow Hills, Stonehurst, Lake View Terrace, and La Tuna Canyon must stay together. Our issues are the same and our neighborhood Councils are one joint group. We have no business in any other district area and nothing in common with other areas. We all use Hansen Dam and are a family of horse owners and riders and bring invaluable economic income to the City. Please keep our current Council District 7 together. The other maps propose cutting out a teeny tiny piece of Shadow Hills/Stonehurst where I live in the City Stonehurst Historic Preservation Overlay Zone. We favor this mp.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Brian Greenfield	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Charisse Bremond Weaver	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Connie Chung Joe	Favor	• SUPPORT MAP F-1 (here) WITH AMENDMENTS: Extend the border of SD2 to keep Ktown whole. Move Arcadia and Temple City to SD 1, to keep WSGV together. Move Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, and Hacienda Heights into SD4, to keep ESGV together. Shift the border between SD1 and SD3 to make Thai Town whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Connie Tan	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Courtney Adolph	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Craig Klein	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Deborah Wolf	Favor	Comments for redistricting proposals, specifically B-2, F-1 and G.	12/4/2021	n/a

			As a member of the Shadows Hills community for the past 35 years, I would respectfully ask that the semi-rural horsekeeping areas be kept together as in proposal F-1. All areas face the same issues, are in fire zones, zoned for agriculture and farm animals, are subject to flooding from the hillsides during El Nino seasons, and are one of the very few remaining areas left in Los Angeles that supports horsekeeping. These areas all help each other in times of need and need the same types of services from the city. Breaking these up will create a hardship for all 3 of the areas. We need representation on the County Board from 1 person who truly is understands the needs of this area. The only proposal that meets this goal is F-1 as currently proposed. B-2, and G do not support our community, but rather divide it. Thank you for your attention in this matter. Deborah Wolf		
OPTION F-1	Delice Moya	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Donald Martin	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Donna Evans	Oppose	The South Bay has nothing in common with the valley and the two areas should not become one	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ebani Abram	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ed MacLaughlin	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ed Smith	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a

OPTION F-1	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Elektra Kruger	Favor	Keeps a primarily horsekeeping/agrarian area under the representation of a single Supervisor such that that Supervisor can understand and support the needs of all the NE agrarian communities of Shadow Hills, Stonehurst, LVT, La Tuna Canyon, Big Tujunga Canyon and Hansen Dam.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Emily Dow	Other	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Frances E Jemmott	Favor	I strongly favor maintaining the voting power and integrity of the Black Community Voice at this critical time when issues of equity, gentrification, voter push out due to housing inequity and increased need for community voices in public safety, housing and preventing homelessness is essential.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Frances E Jemmott	Favor	This option best preserves the integrity and voting power of historic Black communities that have been so instrumental in positive changes for our communities. In light of the increased need for equity and community engagement on issues like economic development, housing and homelessness it is the wrong time to dilute the voting power of my community.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Frencis Barbic	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Gabriela Mohaupt	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Gaylord P Suddeth	Oppose	This option might be well-meaning, but would lead to confused and conflicted representation of both Coastal area and S.F. Valley areas. Bad Idea.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Gordon Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Graham Edwards	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION F-1	Hannah McCallum	Oppose	Do not want this to take place, thanks.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Harrison Ryoo	Favor	I support MAP F-1. Oppose Map G that splits up Ktown and oppose Map B-2 that separates Ktown from other API COIs like ThaiTown, HiFi, Little Tokyo & Chinatown.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Hugo Fernandes	Oppose	Stop trying to redistrict based on the opinion of less than 1% of the population.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ireh Yoon	Favor	-	12/2/2021	View attachment
OPTION F-1	Ireh Yoon	Favor	We are in support of Map F-1 with suggested amendments below and oppose all other maps (B-2 and G). However, we ask the Commission to amend Map F-1 by: Moving Arcadia and Temple City to SD 1, to keep WSGV together. Moving Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, and Hacienda Heights into SD4, to keep ESGV together. Shifting the border between SD1 and SD3 to make Thai Town whole. Extending the border of SD2 to keep Ktown whole as submitted in the attached map. The COI of Koreatown needs to be kept whole. There are nearly 5000 petition signatures on change.org and written petitions in support of unifying Koreatown. Please honor the Census data, as well are our testimonies and protect our community of interest by keeping Koreatown whole.	12/2/2021	View attachment
OPTION F-1	J B	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	James Horrell	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Jason Mayerle	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Jeffrey Rieth	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION F-1	Jennifer Ryan	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Jinhee Lee	Favor	I am a stakeholder who does business in Koreatown, Los Angeles. I am in support of Map F-1 with suggested amendments below and oppose all other maps (B-2 and G). However, we ask the Commission to amend Map F-1 by: Moving Arcadia and Temple City to SD 1, to keep WSGV together. Moving Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, and Hacienda Heights into SD4, to keep ESGV together. Shifting the border between SD1 and SD3 to make Thai Town whole. Extending the border of SD2 to keep Ktown whole as submitted in the attached map. The COI of Koreatown needs to be kept whole. There are nearly 5000 petition signatures on change.org and written petitions in support of unifying Koreatown. Please honor the Census data, as well are our testimonies and protect our community of interest by keeping Koreatown whole. Please do not split Koreatown apart.	12/2/2021	View attachment
OPTION F-1	Joanna Edwards	Oppose	I oppose Map F	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Justin Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Kelly K Herold	Favor	Map F-1 keeps all of Shadow Hills, Stonehurst, Lake View Terrace, La Tuna Canyon, and the Big T-wash and Hansen Dam in District 5. It is imperative this community stays together. Do not carve up history and this community. That would be a tragedy and the loss of keeping a bit of country, culture and nature within the city, not just the county of Los Angeles. You start carving us apart, so will the profiteers. The city is considered a concrete jungle, our area and our common interest neighborhoods staying together shows some soul.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	KEVIN OCONNOR	Oppose	I am a resident of the South Bay and I strongly oppose Map F-1, which would combine Redondo Beach with the San Fernando Valley. San Fernando Valley has	12/5/2021	n/a

			no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. I believe that a significant criterion of the redistricting process that is used, is to keep communities of interest together. Combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay has significant differences and absolutely does not make sense at all, therefore, I strongly urge you to vote for Option F-1.		
OPTION F-1	Laura A Kiely	Oppose	I've been a Manhattan Beach resident since 1994. My husband and I have raised our 2 teenagers in Manhattan Beach, where they currently attend High School. I feel very strongly about keeping Supervisor Hahn as my representative. Please do not approve a plan that would change her district to exclude Manhattan Beach. She knows our needs and has always been a responsive and engaged leader for Manhattan Beach. Thank you.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Laura Chapin	Favor	Anything above Glenoaks from Wentworth down to La Tuna Canyon should be kept in the same zone. There are too many horse properties in that area that are currently disappearing from ADU units and other conversions being built.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Lauren Bergloff	Oppose	I oppose Map F	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Lee L Coller	Oppose	It makes no sense to have the south bay and san fernando valley in the same district.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Leslie Sutphin	Oppose	I am a resident of the South Bay and I strongly oppose Map F-1, which would combine Redondo Beach with the San Fernando Valley. San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. I believe that a significant criterion of the redistricting process that is used, is to keep communities of interest together. Combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay has significant differences and absolutely does not make sense at all, therefore, I strongly urge you to vote for Option F-1.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Lester C Kau	Oppose	Why pull Azusa out of the other Foothill Cities? This causes problems in dealing with issues that we have in common with neighboring cities.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Lisa Youngworth	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Manjusha Kulkarni	Favor	Please see attached pdf.	12/4/2021	View attachment

OPTION F-1	Marc King	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Marcie Guillermo	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	MarkAnthony Wilson	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Marlene Montanez	Favor	Commissioners, 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, keeps the historic eastside communities together and does not break apart the API communities who we stand in solidarity with. Long Beach Forward stands in solidarity with the People's Bloc and with those who are fighting to keep their communities together. We understand the necessity of elevating the voices of the communities who continue to be disenfranchised by these processes. We urge the commission to select modified Map F-1 (OP Map 81) so that you act on the values that this independent commission was created to uphold. 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 occured as a result of the community being driven out through racist policies, economic disinvestments, and gentrification. This trend will not improve in the	12/5/2021	View attachment

			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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to the residents of 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 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 our 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.		

			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. The modified Map F-1, keeps the Metro API communities whole and unites the API communities in the East San Gabriel Valley such as Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights. It also brings Temple City and Arcadia into SD1 and keeps them together with other API Communities of Alhambra, Monterey Park, and Rosemead. This is something no other map accomplishes. I urge the commission to NOT be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise the communities that we stand in solidarity with and that will take a decade to fix. Please move forward with the modified Map F-1 (Option Map 81) submitted by the People's Bloc. Respectfully, Long Beach Forward We envision a Long Beach where race and income do not determine one's future—a community where everyone is safe, connected, and healthy. lbforward.org		

OPTION F-1	Matthew S Bennett	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Mayor Bill Brand	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Mia Herman	Oppose	We are not the Valley.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Michael Martin	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Michelle Lane	Oppose	Obvious Gerrymandering	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Miriam Kaufman	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Neil Najjar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Nicole Brozost	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Norchelle Brown	Favor	Protect Black Voices Commissioners, 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 our Black community. As a Black millennial from the Watts-Willowbrook, my goal is to continue to active the members of my community. The proposed changes that I oppose will make this much more difficult. 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 our Black residents being overlooked at the expense of more affluent areas. South LA has historically been a place of residence for our Black community and it is the last place in the county where the majority reside. In the	12/3/2021	n/a

			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 occured as a result of our 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to our 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 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 our 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 our community needs. 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. I urge the commission to not be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise our 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. Respectfully, Norchelle M. Brown, MSW		
OPTION F-1	Nourbese N Flint	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Patrick P Mellier	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ranald R MacKinnon	Oppose	Divides the Beach Communities and their users!	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Robert Gaddis	Oppose	Combining the San Fernando valley with the South Bay makes no sense, as the issues are very different.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ron Blackie	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	roque armenta	Favor	The modified Map F-1, keeps the Metro API communities whole and unites the API communities in the East San Gabriel Valley such as Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights. It also brings Temple City and Arcadia	12/3/2021	n/a

			into SD1 and keeps them together with other API Communities of Alhambra, Monterey Park, and Rosemead. This is something no other map accomplishes.		
OPTION F-1	Roy Humphreys	Oppose	foothills to foothills	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Ryan Tucker	Oppose	You're joking with this map right? Hell no.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Samantha Goldberg	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Scott Froschauer	Favor	Please keep the horsekeeping neighborhoods of Shadow Hills, Lake View Terrace and La Tuna Canyon in one block. Thank you.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Sharon Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Shianne Winston	Favor	Commissioners, 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 our Black community. As a third generation Angelino, whose great-grandparents migrated here in the early 1900s, I have witnessed the continued gouging of resources in my community. I grew up in South Central, on Western Avenue, I now live in the Crenshaw District and have attended schools throughout West Los Angeles. Just driving to and from these areas, you can see the shift in economic investments. Our community is our culture and as the Vice President of the Black Los Angeles Young Democrats, I work countless hours to ensure equity in our voices, in policies and in infrastructure development. Now more than ever, as our communities are fighting to survive a pandemic, it is imperative that we listen and invest. The Black Los Angeles Young Democrats base fully supports this map, as it represents our needs and our values all the while ensuring a full recovery post pandemic by keeping the thriving assets and economic engines in our district. 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 our Black residents being overlooked at the expense of more	12/3/2021	n/a

			affluent areas. South LA has historically been a place of residence for our 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 occured as a result of our 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to our 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 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 our 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 our community needs. 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. I urge the commission to not be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise our 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. Respectfully, Shianne Winston VP, Black Los Angeles Young Democrats		
OPTION F-1	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we	12/4/2021	n/a

			inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation. justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990 On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition Brief For The United States In Opposition TABLE OF CONTENTS Questions Presented Opinions below Jurisdiction Statement Argument		

Conclusion

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors.

3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core.

4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the

			Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan. 5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority. 6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted. STATEMENT 1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid. In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid.		

			2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions. The court first examined the historical background. After a thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at		

			A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OPTION F-1	Stephen Wertheimer	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Steve Goldberg	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Bad	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Susan Rinehart	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Susan Wong	Favor	Map F-1 keeps the three (3) foothill communities (abutting the Verdugo Mountains, the Angeles National Forest and the Big Tujunga Wash) of Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon in one district, as they currently are in LA City Council District 7 and the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council . All three rural communities have an equestrian heritage and agrarian lifestyles. All 3 communities are located in Mountain Fire districts and high fire zones. Over the years, these three communities have developed fire protection and evacuation plans which have helped save human and animal lives and properties during our various wildfires (ie. La Tuna Canyon and Creek fires). During major floods of the Big Tujunga Wash Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills have worked	12/2/2021	n/a

			together to provide shelter to flood victims and protect neighborhoods from flooding. They also work together to protect and clean up the Big Tujunga Wash. There is a historical cooperation between these three communities due to their common interests and goals. If they were to be separated into different communities, their unified voice and actions would be muted. Please vote for Map F-1.		
OPTION F-1	Tashia Hinchliffe	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Terri Dinubilo	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Terri Tippit	Other	The Westside Neighborhood Council could support Map Option F-1 if the following tweak were to be made: Beginning from the I-10 Freeway @ Overland, please continue westward using National Blvd to the I-405 Freeway as the northern edge of District 2. Thank you for your continued consideration and service.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Valerie Fernandes	Oppose	I am a resident of the South Bay and I strongly oppose Map F-1, which would combine Redondo Beach with the San Fernando Valley. San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. I believe that a significant criterion of the redistricting process that is used, is to keep communities of interest together. Combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay has significant differences and absolutely does not make sense at all.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	WAYNE CRAIG	Oppose	Map F1 is a textbook definition of Gerrymandering as seen in the analysis provided by the experts. How can combining the South Bay and Beach Cities with the San Fernando Valley make any sense to any rational redistricting effort? The San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. Please reject this ill-conceived map.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Wesley Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION F-1	Yanel Saenz	Other	Hello, my name is Yanel Saenz I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I oppose map F-1 in its current form and would support map F-1 with the modification that unincorporated Florence-Firestone be moved back to SD2. Same for map G. Florence-Firestone is a neighborhood that is historically a part of South Central LA and not SELA (Southeast LA). Alameda St was the racial boundary that existed prior to desegregation and influenced the	12/3/2021	n/a

			development of Florence-Firestone and the other SELA cities into distinct communities with different histories. Although both Florence-Firestone and SELA share similar demographics with regards to the Latinx population, Florence-Firestone has more in common demographically (both Latinx and Black) with its surrounding neighborhoods of South Central, such as Central-Alameda, Watts, and Green Meadows and they have shared histories being part of South Central. As an unincorporated community we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as a 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. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD 2!! I attached an article from Manuel Pastor that shows a map of South Central LA and demonstrates that Florence-Firestone falls within the South Central boundaries.		
OPTION F-1	Zabrina Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Abby Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Adrienne W Griffin	Favor	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Albert Hernandez	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Alex Ugrik	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Amos Kardos	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Andrew Klein	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Anita Reviczky Stoddard	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Ariel Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Armine Ketsoyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Barbara Nowicki	Oppose	I chose opposed & copied and pasted my comment (see next sentence) in each comment section. Here is my comment: Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Bob Blumenfield	Other	This map is more compact for the West San Fernando Valley and does not include far southern beach cities.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Carey Wendler	Favor	We need to keep all of our equestrian trails	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Cary B Gold	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	CARYN WALTER	Favor	Kagel Canyon should remain in District 5, due to its makeup and location. It does not belong in any other district than District 5. Thank you.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Charisse Bremond Weaver	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Charlotte M Brodie	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Christa Chilton	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Cindy Bloom	Favor	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Colvin colvin	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Craig Klein	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Deborah Wolf	Oppose	Comments for redistricting proposals, specifically B-2, F-1 and G. As a member of the Shadows Hills community for the past 35 years, I would respectfully ask that the semi-rural horsekeeping areas be kept together as in proposal F-1.	12/4/2021	n/a

			All areas face the same issues, are in fire zones, zoned for agriculture and farm animals, are subject to flooding from the hillsides during El Nino seasons, and are one of the very few remaining areas left in Los Angeles that supports horsekeeping. These areas all help each other in times of need and need the same types of services from the city. Breaking these up will create a hardship for all 3 of the areas. We need representation on the County Board from 1 person who truly is understands the needs of this area. The only proposal that meets this goal is F-1 as currently proposed. B-2, and G do not support our community, but rather divide it. Thank you for your attention in this matter. Deborah Wolf		
OPTION G	Delice Moya	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Ebani Abram	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Edward Dergharapetian	Oppose	I completely oppose / disagree with this option. It makes no practical sense to bundle the Glendale/Montrose/La Crescenta/La Canada-Flintridge area with the Palmdale/Lancaster area. The communities are different in every way and have completely different needs. They aforementioned areas should be more aligned with the San Fernando Valley community. I urge you to reconsider Option E.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	Cuts out significant sections of horsekeeping/agrarian areas currently in District 5 so that these sections will lose representation by a Supervisor that understands and can serve an agrarian constituency.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Emily Dow	Other	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Eva Andrews	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Farrah Khan	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Gabriela Mohaupt	Other	I support Map B-2 and oppose Map F	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	George Avakyan	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Gordon Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Harrison Ryoo	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Henry Fung	Favor	With regards to People's Bloc revised F-1 (Map 81), I find that the San Gabriel Valley is divided into three districts. This is unacceptable as it dilutes the SGV's influence. I appreciate that they are trying to keep SD 1 similar to today and make the math work out, by keeping Hacienda and Rowland Heights communities in SD 4, but the Citizen's Redistricting Commission was not created to ratify the status quo.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Ireh Yoon	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Issam Najm	Favor	Option G provides the appropriate representation to the Porter Ranch as it aligns us with with other communities with shared interests.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	James L Rhodes	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Jan Kelly	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Jason Mayerle	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Jeff Leeson	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Jennifer Ryan	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster. TYVM	12/3/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Jinhee Lee	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	John Mendoza	Oppose	El Monte on west end does not share community Interest with Diamond Bar. Diamond Bar share pubic education with Walnut and water located in Walnut Valley.El Monte and Pomona have Disadvantage community members Diamond Bar none. Diamond Bar not a fitMap cuts too far inland diluting the community voice to address issues of quality of life such as bike trails, water sheds, poluution	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Justin Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Karen Klink	Oppose	Against G!!! Why are we trying to gerrymander these districts? For special interests? We, in the South Bay do not want a different District nor a different Supervisor.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Karin Marin	Favor	Please keep our district as it is. We share common interest, concerns and values with our neighbors to the north of us.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kathleen Pierson	Favor	Already submitted, but accidentally checked oppose	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kathleen Pierson	Oppose	No Water, Geologically unsound, on major earthquake fault, no transportation in or out, extreme fire zone, historic buildings, equestrian area, trails to small for parking hence fire department cannot reach homes for emergencies or fires…	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kattharine Paull	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kelly A Kardos	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kelly Decker	Favor	We would like to keep Kagel Canyon in Supervisorial District 5, along with the Foothills communities and the unincorporated communities within the Angeles National Forest.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Kip Drabeck	Favor	December 3, 2021 Re: Los Angeles County Redistricting 2021 Public Comment As President of the Chatsworth Lake Manor Rural Town Council, sponsored and recognized by the 5th District County of Los Angeles, I can say without hesitation that our community is in favor of staying within the 5th District. I and our	12/3/2021	n/a

			community request that this map be adjusted to keep Chatsworth Lake Manor and the greater Chatsworth area together within the 5th District. In addition we have a long standing productive relationship with our representatives in the 5th District which has developed over the last 6 years to greatly benefit our community. We have been able to transform an under-represented and largely ignored community into one that has a true symbiotic working relationship with their county government. We have a working relationship with our government that is almost unheard of in these times, that is a product of years of patient and dedicated hard work by the Lake Manor Community, Town Council and the 5th District, County of Los Angeles. Through this partnership with the 5th District we have been achieve things that our small community has unable to do in the past. Following are a few of our more notable achievements: 1) The 5th District has been instrumental in assisting us in stopping illegal dumping and force the removal of tens of thousands of cubic yards of illegal materials, toxic to our community, our fragile hillside environment and actually blocking our local stream beds. This involved coordinated community involvement with California Highway Patrol, California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, Offices of LA County Council & District Attorney and LA County and LA City Departments of Transportation. 2) The 5th District acting on our communities outcries, forced the closure and removal of two illegal marijuana dispensaries with gang affiliations that suddenly appeared, operating in a small rental house and then a closed local restaurant both on the main road through our community. This involved coordinated community involvement LA County Sherriff's Department and Offices of LA County Council & District Attorney. 3) The 5th District Assisted us in our liaison with Ventura County in removing squatters from an abandoned house thereby stopping a local crime wave that originated from that house which persisted for months including mail theft, car theft, discharge of firearms and general disruption throughout our small		

			community. 4) The 5th District Established a direct relationship with L.A. County Fire Operations and our Town Council during wildfire events such as the 2005 Topanga Fire that surrounded our community on all sides and later the 2018 Woolsey Fire including numerous smaller fires that gravely threatened our community. We were able to warn residents when immediate evacuation was needed even before the news media was notified through this contact. We have been lucky to be spared significant damage from wildfire in recent years in this extremely high risk fire zone which suffered wild fires on a regular basis historically. But is is not just luck, it is preparation, activism, and enhanced communication with L.A. County Fire enabled though our relationship with the 5th District. 5) The 5th District has partnered with Lake Manor in our ongoing community relationship with Southern California Edison (SCE) in order to make SCE more responsive in mitigating Power Outages and utility caused fires in our area, including sponsoring town hall meetings, online meetings and hearings to allow direct communication with SCE and California Public Utility Commission Officials . We have the most power outages of any circuit that SCE operates in Southern California. This is due to old , poorly maintained, non- fire resistant transmission line infrastructure. In large part due to our community activism, vigorously supported by the 5th District, SCE is now proactively installing new insulated transmission lines, quick acting fuses, more sub circuits to help mitigate power line sparking and equipment failures that were responsible for past fires, most notably the Woolsey and Thomas Fires. We are now touted by SCE as the first example of a SCE circuit that will have a fully hardened power grid in the near future. We have also demanded from SCE, with full support of the 5th District , more mitigation measures during the numerous Public Safety Power Shutdowns (PSPS) power outages our community suffers due to High Wind Events and planned power outages to install Power Grid upgrades. SCE has reluctantly increased some assistance to the community during these power blackouts due to our collective efforts but we have much more to accomplish.		

			If we are no longer represented by the 5th District, it would require starting over again developing effective new relationships with our new County District representatives. It would take years to re-establish the trust and working relationships which we now enjoy with our current 5th District Representatives. This in turn would dilute our effectiveness as a very proactive and cohesive neighborhood in addressing and acting on community issues and affecting safety and quality of life in our community that we have fought hard to improve. I am unaware of any argument by anyone within or without our community that would justify or demonstrate any benefit to Chatsworth Lake Manor by the removing it from the 5th District and inserting it into another County District. It would in fact be quite the opposite. It would be a huge setback to the effectiveness and progress that we have made in the last 6 years to truly make our government more representative, responsive and effective and improving our community. If we in Chatsworth Lake Manor were removed from the 5th District, it would not only be a setback in effective government and community progress, we would be at more at risk for degradation of Public Safety and Quality of Life issues such as Wildfires, Local Crime, Illegal Dumping, Power Outages and Illegal Drug Operations. I, my neighbors and community urge you emphatically to include the unincorporated community of Chatsworth Lake Manor in the newly formed 5th District Map G. Sincerely, J. Kip Drabeck President Chatsworth Lake Manor Citizens Committee Rural Town Council County of Los Angeles		

OPTION G	Kristin C Sabo	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Laura Chapin	Oppose	Anything above Glenoaks from Wentworth down to La Tuna Canyon should be kept in the same zone. There are too many horse properties in that area that are currently disappearing from ADU units and other conversions being built.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Lee L Coller	Oppose	Please keep the south bay in District 4, along with the LA Harbor and Long Beach harbor areas.	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Lester C Kau	Oppose	Why pull Azusa out of the other Foothill Cities? This causes problems in dealing with issues that we have in common with neighboring cities.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Linnea Hunt-Stewart	Favor	The districts in this map seem more compact (except district 5, of course, a commuting nightmare for the supervisor). Consequently, they're more alike in terms of ethnicity, income, housing, etc., and the supervisor can make more clear-cut decisions and administer targeted services.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Lyles Perkins	Favor	best option there is	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Maddy Press	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Manjusha Kulkarni	Oppose	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Marc King	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Marcie Guillermo	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	maria fisk	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	MarkAnthony Wilson	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Marlene Montanez	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Matthew S Bennett	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Mayor Bill Brand	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Melinda Boyajyan	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Michael Anderson	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Michael Martin	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Michelle Flashberg	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Mira Harges	Favor	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Miriam Kaufman	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Nancy Jones	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Norchelle Brown	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Nourbese N Flint	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Patricia Anderson	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Peggy A Price	Favor	I want to stay in the same Supervisor District to the North of us as we share the same concerns for fire and horse property etc.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Ranald R MacKinnon	Oppose	Divides the Beach Communities and their users!	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Robert Gibson	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Robert W Dager	Favor	This map option will keep our community aligned with the most similar neighboring communities.	12/2/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Ron Blackie	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	roque armenta	Oppose	Map G has very harmful effects to the residents of 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 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 our 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.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Roy Humphreys	Oppose	foothills to foothills	12/5/2021	n/a

OPTION G	Samantha Goldberg	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sarah Olson	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sarkis Simonian	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Scott Froschauer	Oppose	-	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sharon Shingai	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sharon Watkins	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Shianne Winston	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sofia G Quinones	Oppose	The Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors, and the Independent Redistricting Commission, State of California, and Federal Government of the U.S. have sanctioned segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. Mexican Americans make up the largest ethnic voting block in Los Ángeles County and are the largest growing population in the Republic. Mexican American women are the most significantly, impacted by the segregation, discrimination, and voter suppression. These proposed redistricting maps once again, have failed to add another seat within Los Ángeles County, that would correct the bigotry and inequality we inherited from the past and continue to exist under. These premeditated renderings demonstrate the blatant bigotry and systemic racism that today plagues Los Ángeles and our country. We demand that another seat be added to the renderings that reflects the inclusion of our representation on the Los Ángeles County Board of Supervisors. We reject these renderings and denounce these fascist renderings. The historical background of this generational trauma is documented in the following link that describes the Supreme Court Case Docket # 90849 and A-422, Yolanda Garza vs Los Angeles County. We have also added the text of this case below the link in order for the public to grasp the severity of the situation.	12/4/2021	n/a

			justice.gov/sites/default/files/osg/briefs/1990/01/01/sg900576.txt COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL., PETITIONERS V. YOLANDA GARZA, ET AL., AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Nos. 90-849 and A-422 In The Supreme Court Of The United States October Term, 1990 On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit And On Application For Stay Pending Consideration Of The Petition Brief For The United States In Opposition TABLE OF CONTENTS Questions Presented Opinions below Jurisdiction Statement Argument Conclusion OPINIONS BELOW The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. A1-A48) is not yet reported. The decisions and orders of the district court (Pet. App. A50-A151, A152-A163) are not yet reported. JURISDICTION		

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on November 2, 1990. The petition for rehearing was denied on November 27, 1990. The application for a stay of the court of appeals' judgment and the petition for a writ of certiorari were filed on November 30, 1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court-ordered remedy for vote dilution caused by intentional race discrimination providing for legislative districts with equal numbers of persons violates the Equal Protection Clause principles established in Reynolds v. Sims.

2. Whether the lower courts properly found that petitioners' decision to fragment a population core of Hispanic persons was motivated by impermissible discriminatory intent, when the districting plan by which fragmentation was achieved was intended both to dilute the Hispanic vote and to protect incumbent supervisors.

3. Whether the district court's remedial plan, which unites the Hispanic Core, is an appropriate remedy for the fragmentation of the Core.

4. Given the findings that petitioners' fragmentation of the Hispanic Core was motivated by discriminatory intent, whether a finding that this has significantly diminished the opportunity of Hispanics to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice establishes a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause, even absent proof that Hispanics could have constituted a majority of the eligible voters in a district at the time petitioners adopted their redistricting plan.

5. Whether the district court exceeded its remedial authority when

it provided for a district with a Hispanic voting majority.

6. Whether the question of a plaintiff's ability to challenge a redistricting plan that is valid when adopted is properly presented, when the court of appeals' decision is premised entirely on a finding that petitioners' redistricting plan was invalid when adopted.

STATEMENT

1. Hispanics in Los Angeles County are geographically concentrated to a significant extent in an area known as the Hispanic Core. Pet. App. A62-A63. /1/ The 1981 redistricting plan for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors divided the Hispanic Core among three of the five Supervisor districts. Id. at A86. Almost half of the Core was assigned to District 1; almost half was assigned to District 3; and a smaller section was assigned to District 2. Ibid.

In August 1988, the Garza plaintiffs -- Hispanic voters in Los Angeles County -- filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan had the purpose and result of diluting Hispanic voting strength, in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A58. In September 1988, the United States filed suit alleging that the 1981 plan violated Section 2. Ibid.

2. After a three-month trial beginning in January 1990, the district court ruled for plaintiffs. Pet. App. A50-A151. The court's ultimate finding was that the County's plan was adopted with the intent of diluting Hispanic voting strength and that it had resulted in denying Hispanic citizens an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. The court entered detailed findings in support of these conclusions.

The court first examined the historical background. After a

			thorough review of the four redistrictings between 1959 and 1971, the court found that the County repeatedly added predominantly white areas to District 3, while avoiding the addition of predominantly Hispanic ones, and that this pattern was "persuasive evidence that the lines were drawn and maintained with a racially discrimantory design." Pet. App. A64-A73. The court then turned to the 1981 redistricting. It found that there had been explosive growth in the Hispanic population between 1970 and 1980, and that all participants in the redistricting process were aware of this. Id. at A61, A74. The participants were also aware that most of this growth had taken place in Districts 1 and 3. Id. at A75. Against this backdrop, the question of how to apportion the Hispanic Core became a key issue. A coalition of Hispanic groups -- the Californios for Fair Representation (CFR) -- sought to eliminate the fragmentation of the Core. Recognizing that it would be futile to propose a plan with a substantial Hispanic majority in any one district, CFR proposed a plan increasing the Hispanic population in District 3 to 50%, and in District 1 to 42%. Pet. App. A78-A79. The court found that, despite the County's awareness that the apportionment of the Hispanic Core was a critical issue to Hispanics, it did not appoint a single Hispanic to the Boundary Committee. Pet. App. A77. Only after CFR objected did the County relent. Id. at A77-A78. Even then, none of these appointees had previous redistricting experience, and they were therefore relegated to a minor role. Id. at A78. Eventually, the Board addressed the redistricting issue in a series of unusual meetings, avoiding the State's public meeting requirement by meeting privately, in a back room, two at a time. Pet. App. A82. After ten such meetings, the court found, an agreement was reached. The Board then adopted the plan without ever having presented it to the public. Ibid. The plan continued "to split the Hispanic Core		

			almost in half." Id. at A83. The Board understood that this would "impair the ability of Hispanics to gain representation on the Board." Ibid. Based on its findings, the court reached three conclusions		
OPTION G	Sonja Williams	Favor	We need more time to look at the maps and and get further public input.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Sophie Ramillon	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Steve Goldberg	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Stuart Waldman	Oppose	Not good for the San Fernando Valley.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Susan Rinehart	Oppose	Why is NN Glendale/Montrose, La Crescenta & La Canada-Flintridge not grouped with the rest of Glendale-Pasadena & Burbank? These are the communities & school districts associated, not Palmdale/Lancaster.	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Susan Wong	Oppose	Map G has taken La Tuna Canyon Road out of District 5 and put that area into District 3. This separates La Tuna Canyon from the other horse-keeping, agrarian, and severe-fire-risk communities still in District 5. Shadow Hills, including all of Stonehurst, Lake View Terrace, and La Tuna Canyon must remain in one district, as they currently are in LA City Council District 7 and the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council . All three rural communities have an equestrian heritage and agrarian lifestyles. All 3 communities are located in Mountain Fire districts and high fire zones. Over the years, these three communities have developed fire protection and evacuation plans which have helped save human and animal lives and properties during our various wildfires (ie. La Tuna Canyon and Creek fires). During major floods of the Big Tujunga Wash Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills have worked together to provide shelter to flood victims and protect neighborhoods from flooding. They also work together to protect and clean up the Big Tujunga Wash. There is a historical cooperation between these three communities due to their common interests and goals. If they were to be separated into different communities, their unified voice and actions would be muted.	12/2/2021	n/a

			Map G also inexplicably cuts out a strangely shaped segment of Stonehurst along Wealtha and put those relatively few homes into District 3, but has left most of Stonehurst and all of Shadow Hills in District 5 with Lake View Terrace, Hansen Dam, and the Big T wash. However, it has taken La Tuna Canyon Road out of District 5 and put that area into District 3. This separates La Tuna Canyon from the other horse-keeping, agrarian, and severe-fire-risk communities still in District 5. Please either do not vote for this map, or make the changes to keep the foothill neighborhoods together.		
OPTION G	Terri Tippit	Other	The Westside Neighborhood Council could support Map Option G if the following tweak were to be made: Between the I-405 Freeway and Overland Avenue, the southern boundary of the WNC area is National Blvd., -- NOT the I-10 Freeway. (Starting at Overland Avenue and continuing east, the southern boundary is, indeed, the I-10 freeway.) Thank you for your continued consideration and service.	12/2/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Timothy W Burgess	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Valerie Thornton	Oppose	-	12/3/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Wendi C Gladstone	Favor	Communities of mutual interest and/or with commonalities should remain together. This is especially critical for disaster preparedness and emergency and disaster response issues. Horse properties, small unincorporated towns surrounded by city and wildfire prone communities are three examples.	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Wesley Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	William R Slocum	Favor	-	12/4/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Yanel Saenz	Other	Hello, my name is Yanel Saenz I am a resident of unincorporated Florence-Firestone in SD2. I oppose map G in its current form and would support map G with the modification that unincorporated Florence-Firestone be moved back to SD2. Same for map F-1. Florence-Firestone is a neighborhood that is historically a part of South Central LA and not SELA (Southeast LA). Alameda St was the racial boundary that existed prior to desegregation and influenced the development of Florence-Firestone and the other SELA cities into distinct communities with different histories. Although both Florence-Firestone and SELA share similar	12/3/2021	n/a

			demographics with regards to the Latinx population, Florence-Firestone has more in common demographically (both Latinx and Black) with its surrounding neighborhoods of South Central, such as Central-Alameda, Watts, and Green Meadows and they have shared histories being part of South Central. As an unincorporated community we lack proper political representation and heavily rely on the Supervisor as a 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. Please keep Florence-Firestone in SD 2!! I attached an article from Manuel Pastor that shows a map of South Central LA and demonstrates that Florence-Firestone falls within the South Central boundaries.		
OPTION G	Zabrina Nash	Oppose	-	12/5/2021	n/a
OPTION G	Zvart Vartanyan	Favor	-	12/3/2021	n/a
-	Jeff Boynton	-	-	12/4/2021	View attachment
-	Margaret Finlay	-	-	12/4/2021	View attachment
-	Kathy Ku	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Kathy Ku and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the	12/3/2021	n/a

			pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Sincerely yours Kathy Ku		
-	Pastor Eddie Anderson	-	Commissioners, 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 our Black community. Over the decades it has been pivotal for the voices of Black communities and communities of color to be adequately and equitably represented on the Board of Supervisors. Our historic congregation has existed for over 90 years and has worked tirelessly to ensure that Black community voices are heard and have an opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. In this moment of racial reckoning and reconciliation, I implore the commission to act in a way that ensures that SD2 remains with at least 30% African-American CVAP. Personally, as a former Redistricting Commissioner, I know how hard you work and admonish you to ensure protected classes in Section 2 of the VRA are truly protected. Map F-1 does this given your current alternatives. The commission is making history as being the first independent commission to draw new district lines for the county. This is monumental and having served on the Los Angeles City commission, I know how important it is to value your independence and the unique opportunity it presents for each of you to be beckons of light and advocacy for our communities. However, it is very disappointing to see the voices of our Black residents being overlooked at the expense of more affluent areas. South LA has historically been a place of	12/3/2021	n/a

			residence for our 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 occured as a result of our 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to our 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 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 our 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 our community needs. 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. I urge the commission to not be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise our 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. Respectfully, Rev.Edward L. Anderson		
-	Ronald Collins	-	Commissioners, 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 our Black community. I work for the Los Angeles Black Worker Center, and we strive to ensure that our communities have access to quality jobs and support fighting discrimination both in and out of the workplace. Building people power and unity around employment issues in our community are the most powerful tools that we have to affect change for our people. By drawing the map in a way that puts wealthy	12/3/2021	n/a

			coastal communities and working class Black communities together, you are taking away our ability to create that unity. Black Angelenos are suffering multiple crises of COVID, homelessness, joblessness, and gentrification and one way this commission can help to combat those crises is by maintaining the integrity of and strengthening Black communities. 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 our Black residents being overlooked at the expense of more affluent areas. South LA has historically been a place of residence for our 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 occured as a result of our 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to our 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 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 our 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 our community needs. 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. I urge the commission to not be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise our 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. Respectfully, Ron Collins		
-	Black Los Angeles Young Democrats	-	-	12/3/2021	View attachment

-	Charisse Bremond Weaver	-	-	12/3/2021	View attachment
-	Jose Ugarte / Councilmember Curren Price	-	Hello Commission, Attached is a letter from Los Angeles City Councilmember Curren Price regarding County Redistricting.	12/3/2021	View attachment
-	Chris Rowe	-	You can tell this to the Commissioners. I have not received anything directly from EmpowerLA aka: DONE. I was on their FACEBOOK page which it turns out that I had "Liked" maybe a decade ago. But their post there did not get sent to my notifications of groups that I look at when I log in. Last night, Thursday, December 4th, 2021, since I am allowed only 1 minute of Public Comment per agenda item, when the representative from EmpowerLA was at the West Hills Neighborhood Council, I raised my hand when she was speaking. I asked if during her time on their agenda, if she could speak about the email that came out from Anne-Marie Holman of EmpowerLA. During her time to speak, she said that she did not know anything about any communications from EmpowerLA regarding Redistricting Los Angeles County. I referenced an email on that call with Director Beltran and Ms. Holman, and she was unaware of the email exchange that we had regarding outreach to the NCs for LA County Redistricting purposes. Since this is a public record, I will say that for future Redistricting purposes in the next decade, the LA County Redistricting Commission should find another way to communicate to the Neighborhood Councils. Both of the Neighborhood Council Presidents that spoke on Wednesday night were on my BCC'd email blast on how to weigh in at your meetings. Both of those members are also members of the LANCC - Los Angeles Alliance of Neighborhood Councils: http://www.lancc.org/ I have also blind copied some members of the VANC: https://empowerla.org/vanc-2/ Respectfully submitted, Chris Rowe	12/3/2021	n/a

-	Amy Wong	-	Dear Commissioners, 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, keeps the historic eastside communities together and does not break apart the API communities who we stand in solidarity with. My name is Amy Wong, I work at Active San Gabriel Valley. We are a community-based nonprofit in El Monte working to creating a more sustainable, equitable, and livable San Gabriel Valley region. ActiveSGV is committed to the communities we serve, low-income communities of color in the San Gabriel Valley disproportionately impacted by environmental injustices and health disparities. We live and breathe the issues we're fighting for, and want to make sure the County maps reflect the needs of our most vulnerable, particularly our Black and Brown communities. 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 occured 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to the residents of 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	12/3/2021	n/a

			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 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 our 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. 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 districts 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.		

			The modified Map F-1, keeps the Metro API communities whole and unites the API communities in the East San Gabriel Valley such as Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights. It also brings Temple City and Arcadia into SD1 and keeps them together with other API Communities of Alhambra, Monterey Park, and Rosemead. This is something no other map accomplishes. I urge the commission to NOT be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise the communities that we stand in solidarity with and that will take a decade to fix. Please move forward with the modified Map F-1 (Option Map 81) submitted by the People's Bloc.		
-	Polly Li	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Polly Li and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region	12/2/2021	n/a

			• The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. POlly		
-	Steven Si-ching Lee	-	• My name is Steven Si-ching Lee and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/3/2021	n/a
-	David Hsu	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is David Hsuand I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve	12/3/2021	n/a

			the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Thank you David Hsu		
-	Jungtai Joseph Pan	-	My name is Jungtai Joseph Pan and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor.	12/2/2021	n/a

			• The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region		

			• The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Regards, JungTai Joseph Pan		
-	Fanny C Han	-	Dear Commissioners: My name is Fanny Han and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region. The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Fanny Han	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Sonny Shang	-	My name is Sonny Shang and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley.	12/4/2021	n/a

			• The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Regards! Sonny Shang		
-	Tenfar Chen	-	Dear Commissioners, My name is Tenfar Chen and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor.	12/2/2021	n/a

			The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Best, Tenfar Chen		
-	Victoria Chien	-	Dear Commissioners: My name is Victoria Chien and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this.	12/4/2021	n/a

			The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Best regards, Victoria		
-	Pan Li	-	Dear Commissioners, My name is Pan Li and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Best,	12/2/2021	n/a

			Pan Li		
-	Kally Hsiao	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is ____kally_____ and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Jan Chen	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Jan Chen and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has	12/3/2021	n/a

			become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Joy Hsu	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Joy Hsu and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this.	12/2/2021	n/a

			• The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Joy Hsu		
-	Wenko Chen	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Wenko Chen and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a

			Thank you~ Wenko Chen		
-	Enming Kuan	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Enming Kuan and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Thanks. Enming Kuan	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Pei Jen Pan	-	Dear Commissioners: My name is Pei Jen Pan and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley.	12/2/2021	n/a

			The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Pei Jen Pan		
-	Chris Sun	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Chris and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor.	12/2/2021	n/a

			• The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Sincerely, Chris Sun		
-	Danny Hao	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is _____Danny__ and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Chuck Sun	-	Dear Commissioner Williams,	12/1/2021	n/a

			· My name is Chuck Sun and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. · The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. · The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. · The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the API community in this region · The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Thank you Chuck		
-	Arsi Chan	-	Hello Commissioners First off sorry for the many iterations of maps, I was making changes as I was getting feedback and hearing out the public comments. Map 78 is Map G modified to increase latino CVAP in districts 4 and 1, also keeping a Black CVaP district in SD2, and making sd5 a asian district and sd3 is a sfv district.	12/1/2021	n/a

			Please take a second to look at it, if you want to see any changes to it please email me and I am happy to modify it.		
-	Lucy Yang	-	• My name is Lucy Yang and I'm a resident of Walnut, CA 91789. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Las Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Thank you. Respectfully, Lucy Yang	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Gloria Liu	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is __Gloria Liu_____ and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has	12/4/2021	n/a

			become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Lucy Yang	-	My name is Lucy Yang and I'm a resident of Walnut, CA 91789. • The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Las Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share	12/2/2021	n/a

			policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole. Thank you. Respectfully, Lucy Yang		
-	Kitty Twu	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Kitty Twu and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but	12/1/2021	n/a

			one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Ngee Kon	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Ngee Kon and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/1/2021	n/a
-	Arlene Chang	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Arlene Chang and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four	12/1/2021	n/a

			decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Danny Hou	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Danny Hou and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Penny Pan	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Penny Pan and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region •	12/2/2021	n/a

			The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Connie Ko	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Connie Ko and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	William Hung	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is William Hung and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a

-	Cindy Wong	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Cindy Wong and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Philip Chen	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Philip Chen and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.	12/2/2021	n/a
-	Amy Guan	-	Dear Commissioners: • My name is Amy Guan and I'm a resident of San Gabriel Valley. The West and East SGV should not be separated from each other in the	12/2/2021	n/a

			wake of the San Gabriel Valley's burgeoning population of Asian Americans which has become a dominant cultural force. Several business districts developed to serve the community's needs creating a collection of Southern California Chinatowns loosely connected along the Valley Boulevard Corridor, Main Street/Last Tunas Drive Corridor and Colima Road Corridor. • The AAPI community in the SGV has a strong and distinct cultural association. Residents go to the same churches, temples, the same shopping centers, the same restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community throughout the region share policy concerns – the anti-Asian hate that emerged during the pandemic is but one example of this. • The split of the SGV would create an uphill battle to elect a representative concerned about this community of interest and reverse four decades of progress that has been made for the AAPI community in this region • The Commission must keep the Asian American community of interest in the SGV whole.		
-	Joanna Diaz	-	Commissioners, 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, keeps the historic eastside communities together and does not break apart the API communities who we stand in solidarity with. Long Beach Forward stands in solidarity with the People's Bloc and with those who are fighting to keep their communities together. We understand the necessity of elevating the voices of the communities who continue to be disenfranchised by these processes. We urge the commission to select modified Map F-1 (OP Map 81) so that you act on the values that this independent commission was created to uphold.	12/5/2021	n/a

			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 occured 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. Map G, which is being put forward, has very harmful effects to the residents of 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 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 our 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. 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. The modified Map F-1, keeps the Metro API communities whole and unites the API communities in the East San Gabriel Valley such as Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights. It also brings Temple City and Arcadia into SD1 and keeps them together with other API Communities of Alhambra, Monterey Park, and Rosemead. This is something no other map accomplishes. I urge the commission to NOT be on the wrong side of history by creating lines that will disenfranchise the communities that we stand in solidarity with and that will take a decade to fix. Please move forward with the modified Map F-1 (Option Map 81) submitted by the People's Bloc.		