

Written Public Comments Submitted for CRC Regular Meeting (12/8/2021)

Agenda Item	Name	Position	Comments	Comments Received	Attachment
4	Allison Gingold	Other	<p>Thank you for all your hard work to ensure an equitable and inclusive map for LA County. We know this is not an easy process and understand there are several different versions of maps under consideration with the Commission.</p> <p>We urge the Commission to consider the Jewish community as a community of interest among other communities of interest. We are a diverse and unique community, with many cultural and social institutions serving a wide population. While the Jewish population resides in many parts of the County, the bulk of the Jewish community has historically been nested in the existing 3rd district, from Los Feliz to Hancock Park to West Hollywood, Westwood to various parts of the San Fernando Valley such as Studio City, Encino and Tarzana. As the maps continue to evolve, we urge the Commission to support a map that will keep much of our community together in the 3rd district.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Bruce Rowe	Favor	I would like for you to keep the San Fernando Valley Whole. It should be represented by one commissioner who lives in the Valley. Please see the uploaded file.	12/8/2021	View attachment
4	Catherine Tessier	Other	Please keep the city of Pomona in District 1. We have an excellent working relationship with the District 1 staff and want to keep building on that relationship and knowledge of our city	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Debi Graboff	Favor	Please adopt the recommendations of the City Council to keep the Jewish community or Los Angeles together as one district. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Henry Fung	Other	The Powerpoint from December 7 has not been posted. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a

4	Ilana Grinblat	Other	<p>Thank you for all your hard work to ensure an equitable and inclusive map for LA County. We know this is not an easy process and understand there are several different versions of maps under consideration with the Commission.</p> <p>We urge the Commission to consider the Jewish community as a community of interest among other communities of interest. We are a diverse and unique community, with many cultural and social institutions serving a wide population. While the Jewish population resides in many parts of the County, the bulk of the Jewish community has historically been nested in the existing 3rd district, from Los Feliz to Hancock Park to West Hollywood, Westwood to various parts of the San Fernando Valley such as Studio City, Encino and Tarzana. As the maps continue to evolve, we urge the Commission to support a map that will keep much of our community together in the 3rd district.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
4	John Mendoza	Other	-	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Margaret Aichele	Other	-	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Mark J Sarni	Oppose	As a resident of Redondo Beach, I oppose any change to the status quo on the pending issue.	12/8/2021	n/a
4	Sergio Diaz	Favor	Commissioners I thank you for your work on creating these redistricting maps. I hope that any map chosen will keep Pomona in Supervisor District 1. I have spent most time of my time outside of Pomona in El Monte, La Puente, West Covina, and Los Angeles. I feel these communities are just like home to me. They are most familiar to me and I know many of my neighbors and friends in my community feel the same. An LA County where Pomona is separated from District 1 is not an LA County I can feel is home. I hope that whatever is decided, a map where Pomona is kept within this Supervisor District 1 is chosen. Thank you for your work and your time - it's the work that's going to keep our communities together.	12/7/2021	n/a

6.a.	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	Map option G cuts out a significant portion of the NE equestrian/agrarian community placing it under the representation of a Supervisor that, while good at their job serving more suburban communities, would not be able to understand nor properly serve the needs of equestrian/agrarian communities currently under the representation of a single Supervisor. To split out significant portions of the equestrian/agrarian community into different Districts would mute the unified voice and action of the NE agrarian community and disrupt the current well-organized disaster plan in place in the event of the need to evacuate equestrian/agrarian animals	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	Jack Cheng	Favor	Map Option F. Keep Chinatown in District 1	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	John L Satterfield	Favor	Map D is the only choice which truly makes sense. Adopt map D.	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	John Mendoza	Other	-	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	Karen Diaz	Other	-	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	Lee Coller	Other	With the maps presented this evening, please consider not splitting the South Bay Beach cities into two districts, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach better fit with Torrance, the Peninsula than with the areas of South LA and Downtown. Either of the Maps could be altered to accommodate this.	12/8/2021	n/a
6.a.	Lezlie Campeggi	Other	Approve Map B-3 or drop the entire redistricting until VOTERS have a real say in their own representation. This daily onslaught of re-mapping seems to show nothing more than an inability for this commission to propose a solution that makes sense from a logistical standpoint! Count Supervisors need to be in the field often, meeting in person with constituents and agencies regarding programs they help to implement and oversee, as well as seeing, firsthand, the issues and challenges of many of the complexities to properly govern. It makes ZERO sense to have ANY Supervisor spend hours a day on the L.A. County freeways to adequately cover their District geographies. We cannot redistrict in ANY fashion that	12/8/2021	n/a

			contributes to ANY area being underserved due to nightmare commutes.		
6.a.	Margaret Aichele	Other	<p>I urge you to please keep Pomona with our communities of interest, and do not make modifications at our expense, as Map 78 does.</p> <p>The families that we serve here in Pomona have different needs than the Northern San Gabriel Valley foothill cities. I feel that map F2 would best serve our community.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Alison Chavez	Favor	<p>As a resident of Manhattan Beach, I strongly urge you to allow Janice Hahn to continue to represent us. She has proven to be a great ally to us and understands our issues. It is important to us that the Beach and Coastal cities stay together. We are small towns who have many common issues and loose boundaries. It doesn't make sense to split us up.</p> <p>I support Map B/ OP64.</p> <p>The Supervisorial districts are too big -- but until we add seats to the Board of Supervisors, we need to make the districts as compact as possible so that each Supervisor can represent their constituents as effectively as possible.</p> <p>Map B does that. According to your own scorecard, Map B has the highest Polsby-Popper Compactness Score and makes the districts as compact as possible.</p> <p>We need a map that allows Supervisors to be in their communities when they need to be. We need Map B.</p> <p>We have unique issues related to the coast, tourism, and our environment. Janice Hahn understands our concerns about offshore drilling, marine habitats, water processing, etc. We must also deal with population density, tourism, and social divisions. Ms.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a

			Hahn has proven that she is responsive to our needs and is fair. These issues must be a priority to our Supervisor and keeping the cities together ensures that. With the climate crisis no longer deniable, we need to protect our resources. We need a smaller, cohesive district with Janice Hahn representing us on the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors.		
OPTION B-3	Andrew Lippa	Favor	Please use this map and not any others.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Ann Wolfson	Favor	Map B3 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 B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Anneke Blair	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Arisbeth Rossi	Favor	-	12/7/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Babette Wald	Favor	Plez put the South Bay in this best option. Thank u.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Barbara J Epstein	Favor	Makes the most sense for the residents.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Brian Applegate	Favor	Best reflects the neighborhood of the 3 options given.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Carrie Kessler	Favor	Map B3 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 B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Cheryl DeMucci	Favor	Need to keep South Bay together, including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, and Palos Verdes pensinula together.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Claire Stevens	Favor	Map B3 is the best choice for the county and communities of interest in the Southbay and beach cities. The South Bay has a harbor, beach, and other coastal issues that impact the area reflected in map B3.	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION B-3	Cliff Numark	Favor	I am strongly in favor of Map B as it aligns with the current community of interest, keeping Torrance with the South Bay cities, maintaining the coastal connection from Long Beach North. The overall South Bay is an integrated economic and community unit - and this map best enables this integration to continue.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Dan Elder	Favor	While the redistricting process has been far too rushed with very little time for public feedback, the proposed map for B-3 is the least disruptive. These types of changes will impact us for many years and taking the time to understand their significant is critical.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	David Hattrup	Favor	This plan best represents the overall affinity of beach cities and is best served by a single supervisor who can holistically address their needs.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Dina Mills	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Dolores Acosta	Favor	Map B3 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 B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Edward Mannes	Favor	This makes the most sense because it includes the coastal cities and nearby south bay cities that have much in common when it comes to issues/concerns.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Elektra Kruger	Favor	Keeps all NE equestrian/agrarian communities together within one District under the representation of a single Supervisor. These communities share a common Equestrian/agrarian heritage and lifestyle. Were any portion of these communities to be separated from one another, the unified voice/action of the equestrian/agrarian community will be muted and the portions severed and placed into a District other than District 5 will be represented by a Supervisor who does not understand the needs of this equestrian community and will fail to serve or concentrate on its agrarian needs properly	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Jack L Epstein	Favor	This option works for the voters who elected Supervisor Hahn to represent them.	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION B-3	James A McPherson	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	James Crawford	Favor	Please adopt this map.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Janis Burke	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Jerome Chang	Favor	I favor B-3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Karen Diaz	Oppose	We oppose B-3 because it will divide the San Fernando Valley into two different districts. These communities of interest have stated in different testimonies that they want to be kept together. The east side of San Fernando will be with the northern part of the county, of which it shares no common interest or issues. The west side of San Fernando will be with coastal cities, and they do not share the same issues or social economic backgrounds. San Fernando has been in a district with the coastal communities for the past 10 years, and they have not had a chance to elect a candidate of choice. Instead they've had a candidate that has not served the low income communities that reside in San Fernando.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Karim Sahli	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Kip Dtabeck	Favor	December 7, 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 community request that all three remaining map options G-1, F-2 and B-3 be adjusted to leave Chatsworth Lake Manor and the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas together within the 5th District as they are in the current 2020 County Map and have been historically. 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	12/7/2021	n/a

		<p>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.</p> <p>Through this partnership with the 5th District we have been able to achieve things that our small community has been unable to do in the past. Following are a few of our more notable achievements:</p> <p>1) The 5th District has been instrumental in assisting us in stopping illegal dumping and forcing 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.</p> <p>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 with LA County Sheriff's Department and Offices of LA County Council & District Attorney.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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 arbitrarily 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I, my neighbors and community urge you emphatically to include the unincorporated community of Chatsworth Lake Manor as well as the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas and keep them in the newly formed 5th District per Maps per any of the three currently remaining map options per Maps F-2 , G-1 or B-3.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Kip Drabeck President Chatsworth Lake Manor Citizens Committee Rural Town Council County of Los Angeles</p>		
OPTION B-3	Leah J Pressman	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION B-3	Leah J Pressman	Oppose	This option will take Holly Mitchell away from her voters.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Lee Coller	Favor	I strongly support Map B-3. By keeping the South Bay aligned with similar communities in PV Peninsula San Pedro, and Long Beach it allows the area to be better represented. F-2, putting the South Bay in the same district as San Fernando Valley makes no sense, and screams of gerrymandering. G1, while better, merges the South Bay with South LA, and the interests are clearly different.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Lezlie Campeggi	Favor	This proposed map area most closely matches what Supervisor Hahn currently covers. It's important to note that Supervisor Hahn scaled back on the political arena, leaving the Assembly District 36 to serve in her native South Bay, and wins elections by an overwhelming margin. No one understands the South Bay issues as well as Hahn. To strip this area from her, without an election, is truly egregious to her, the relationships she has formed, the multitude of the programs she champions that have unique complexities that the other Supervisors have no experience handling, and disenfranchises voters. At present, B3 is the map that most closely aligns with Supervisor Hahn's expertise and the overwhelming support of her constituents.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Linda Maertzweiler	Favor	The best choice for the county as it addresses the needs of a community that is very different from many other areas of LA.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Lisa Youngworth	Favor	This is the best choice as it retains communities of interest in one District.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Marcie Guillermo	Favor	Because it is the BEST choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and the Beach Cities. The South Bay coastal cities share coastal issues that impact the geographical area reflected in map B-3. Thanks.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Maria C Corvalan	Favor	This is the best option as it is the most representative for our community, harbor area, PV Peninsula, etc.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Mark Narain	Favor	This map makes the most sense. Keeping historical tied communities with common interest together	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION B-3	Matthew Malinow	Favor	B-3 is the best map to properly represent the beach cities.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Matthew Wong	Favor	Of the three options presented, this seems to be the best. Asian American communities appear to be kept together.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Mayor Bill Brand	Favor	<p>As I have listened, remember there are 10 million people in LA County. I would give priority to minimizing changes in order to keep communities of interest in the same Districts.</p> <p>Map F-2, while it has received much support, clearly screams gerrymandering. Why else would there be a very narrow band of land where no one lives connecting the San Fernando Valley with coastal areas south of LAX? Or suddenly grab the UCLA/West LA areas and fold them into District 2.</p> <p>I support map B-3 as it better aligns the other cities of the South Bay and Long Beach and gateway communities. The South Bay has little in common with the San Fernando Valley, Malibu, or the areas adjacent to downtown Los Angeles as in F-2.</p> <p>But I agree with the South LA communities concerned about the dilution of their neighborhoods. This dilution can be eliminated with modifications by the working group formed to merge B-3 and G, by not extending D2 to the coast and including Carson in D2, and extending District 4 to include LAX.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Melissa Cunningham	Favor	Map B3 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 B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Melissa Dechandt	Favor	<p>Please leave the map as-is.</p> <p>Redondo Beach needs the continued leadership and expertise from Janice Hahn.</p> <p>Do not disregard election votes.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	12/8/2021	n/a

			Melissa TM DeChandt Redondo Beach Resident		
OPTION B-3	Michelle Rivera	Oppose	I am a worker of Thai Town in the East Hollywood Neighborhood and I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People's Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Nicolas Lippa	Favor	Please use this map and it will retain communities of interest in District 4.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Pamela Combar	Favor	This is more representative of the interests with the cities involved	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Pamela Combar	Favor	This map is the best for representation of our needs and interests for the cities effected	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Peter Kelley	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Pogos Salazar	Other	I think the Map and Map F2 can work with the small changes to Move SD5 east across Eaglerock, Galsell Park, Hollywood Beverly Hills etc. That would allow SD3 to be whole in SFV.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Pruek Wongsasitorn	Oppose	As a resident of Thai Town in East Hollywood neighborhood, I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the	12/8/2021	n/a

			<p>commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People's Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.</p>		
OPTION B-3	Robert Gaddis	Favor	The South Bay should not be combined with the San Fernando Valley.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Sergio Diaz	Favor	I would like a map that keeps Pomona in County Supervisor District 1, I spend the most time in District 1 boundaries and feel most connected to the area than any other in LA County.	12/7/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Susi M Kaplan	Favor	As a long time resident I feel this is the best choice for the county as well as the local communities of interest in the South Bay and the Beach cities because this map reflects the harbor, the beaches and the other coastal issues that impact our area.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Teresa Moretine	Favor	This map best represents the South Bay and or needs as a coastal community.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	Todd Elliott	Oppose	I oppose map B-3. The notion that Coastal Communities cannot be split between two districts belies the reality of representation over decades in Los Angeles County. Coastal Resources are valuable to all residents of Los Angeles County. Currently we have only 1 member from the Los Angeles Region on the California Coastal Commission (Representative from Long Beach). Having more than one Supervisor reviewing actions in the Coastal Zone gives all Residents more Supervision of a valued resource. Moreover, Coastal Zone Residents are wealthier and more likely to be able to	12/8/2021	n/a

			advocate for their representatives in elections; they are by no means disenfranchised. By contrast, an adoption of Map B-3 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. We must not go backwards in achieving diversity in Los Angeles County. Do not let the wealthy beach communities eclipse the rights of historically oppressed and poor people. We need to build affordable housing and protect minority interests. Todd Elliott, life member NAACP		
OPTION B-3	Wayne Craig	Favor	Map B3 is the best choice for the county as well as communities of interest in the South Bay and Beach Cities. This would also give priority to minimizing changes in order to keep these communities in the same Districts. Combining it with other areas as with map F2 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 B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	William Vaughn	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION B-3	William Vaughn	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Andrew Lippa	Oppose	Terrible choice as it appears to be a Gerrymandered map to disenfranchise residents in the South Bay and Beach cities.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Ann Wolfson	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Anneke Blair	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Barbara J Epstein	Oppose	This plan does not work for the citizens of the South Bay. Better to add five more districts based on geographical areas. The County has ten million people spread over huge distances. Break it into smaller pieces based on geography.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Brian Applegate	Oppose	Would lump the South Bay with considerably larger and different Valley area	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Brian McGovney	Oppose	This map has an absurdly gerrymandered district stretching from Torrance to the top of the San Fernando Valley. The South Bay,	12/8/2021	n/a

			where I live, would not be well served by this district shape. I oppose this map, and would support either of the alternatives.		
OPTION F-2	Carrie Kessler	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Claire Stevens	Oppose	Combining the San Fernando valley with the south bay makes no sense. Disgusting political interests put ahead of quality of life. Textbook gerrymandering. Citizens did not ask for this. Follow the money. This does nothing but undermine our representation in LA county.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Dan Elder	Oppose	As a resident of Redondo Beach, I'm very unhappy to see proposed redistricting that would strip us and surrounding cities from our current district and attach us to such a geographically expansive area with so little in common. This is a massive change in representation being rushed through that disenfranchises a large number of residents who will have elected officials who know almost nothing about what their communities need. Please take the time to do this right, do not undertake this significant of a redistricting with so little opportunity for public feedback and participation.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Dan Elder	Oppose	As a resident of Redondo Beach, I'm very unhappy to see proposed redistricting that would strip us and surrounding cities from our current district and attach us to such a geographically expansive area with so little in common. This is a massive change in representation being rushed through that disenfranchises a large number of residents who will have elected officials who know almost nothing about what their communities need. Please take the time to do this right, do not undertake this significant of a redistricting with so little opportunity for public feedback and participation.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	David Hattrup	Oppose	The South Bay and Beach Cities have vastly different needs than the San Fernando Valley. Lumping them together is a disservice to both. The South Bay should remain in a district together with other coastal areas so that a dedicated supervisor can holistically address the needs and concerns unique to beach communities.	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION F-2	Dina Mills	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Dolores Acosta	Oppose	Combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay makes no sense and will undermine our representation in Los Angeles County. San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region. The proposed map appears to fit the textbook definition of Gerrymandering! 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.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Edward Mannes	Oppose	Seriously?? How does this even make sense unless one is trying to gerrymander the map for political purposes. The South Bay has nothing in common issues/concerns-wise with the San Fernando Valley and vice-versa. It just doesn't make any sense to have one county seat for these two very different areas.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	Removes significant portions of the NE equestrian/agrarian community from its current District 5 which will sever the unified voice/action of the NE equestrian/agrarian community and place the severed portions under the representation of a Supervisor who has little understanding of the needs of those sharing an agrarian heritage and lifestyle	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Jack L Epstein	Oppose	There are ten million voters in L.A. County. Divide the county by geographical area by adding five more districts.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	James Crawford	Oppose	This screams of Gerrymandering so do not adopt.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Janis Burke	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Karen Diaz	Favor	However, under the current map options CHIRLA believes option Draft Map Option F-2 is the best choice for the immigrant community. We like that in this proposal Pomona is being kept whole in District 1. For District 2 we would like for you to include Wilmington which is currently in District 4 by moving the line south to South Western Ave, including naval reservation, Wilmington	12/8/2021	View attachment

			waterfront park, and cut following the west and east basin. Also, include some of Torrance in District 2 by bringing down the line along state route 107 and Sepulveda blvd. For District 3 we suggest strengthening the San Fernando Valley by including the city of Lake View terrace and Sunland which are currently in District 5. Overall, we suggest using the overall architecture of Map C because it uplifts the low income and immigrant communities in the East San Fernando Valley by separating it from surrounding high socioeconomic neighborhoods of West San Fernando Valley. It also respects AAPI communities in the Southbay. Furthermore it keeps Southeast Los Angeles communities of Huntington Park, South Gate, Bell, Bell Gardens, Lynwood, Cudahy, and Walnut Park together in a district not along the coast.		
OPTION F-2	Karim Sahli	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Katherine Schryver-Stahly	Oppose	It makes no sense to lump the South Bay Coastal Cities with the San Fernando Valley. I lived in the SF Valley for 20 years and have lived in the South Bay for 20 years. The issues for both of these locations are quite different. We need a Supervisor well versed in coastal concerns here in the South Bay.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Kip Dtabeck	Favor	December 7, 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 community request that all three remaining map options G-1, F-2 and B-3 be adjusted to leave Chatsworth Lake Manor and the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas together within the 5th District as they are in the current 2020 County Map and have been historically. 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	12/7/2021	n/a

		<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>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 it is not just luck, it is preparation, activism, and enhanced communication with L.A. County Fire enabled through our relationship with the 5th District.</p> <p>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</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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 arbitrarily 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I, my neighbors and community urge you emphatically to include the unincorporated community of Chatsworth Lake Manor as well as the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas and keep them in the newly formed 5th District per Maps per any of the three currently remaining map options per Maps F-2 , G-1 or B-3.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Kip Drabeck President Chatsworth Lake Manor Citizens Committee Rural Town Council County of Los Angeles</p>		
OPTION F-2	Leah J Pressman	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION F-2	Leah J Pressman	Favor	Keeps Black representation	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Lee Coller	Oppose	I very strongly oppose this map. Putting the South Bay with San Fernando Valley makes zero sense, we have almost nothing in common and it screams of gerrymandering.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	Ridiculous	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Linda Maertzweiler	Oppose	This absolutely makes no sense, except perhaps it's politically motivated. Really, really disgusted that this would even be considered.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Lisa Youngworth	Oppose	The worse choice as it combines the San Fernando Valley with the Beach Cities and South Bay. This map makes no sense and will disenfranchise residents.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Marcie Guillermo	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Mark Narain	Oppose	This map does not make sense for the cities involved. It seems like a poor choice not based on the needs of the areas	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Matthew Malinow	Oppose	This makes no sense. Why should South Bay be lumped in with the Valley?!	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Matthew Wong	Other	This option is okay, but carves out Arcadia from the 626, which includes majority Asian American communities.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Mayor Bill Brand	Oppose	<p>Map F-2, while it has received much support, clearly screams gerrymandering. Why else would there be a very narrow band of land where no one lives connecting the San Fernando Valley with coastal areas south of LAX? Or suddenly grab the UCLA/West LA areas and fold them into District 2.</p> <p>I support map B-3 as it better aligns the other cities of the South Bay and Long Beach and gateway communities. The South Bay has little in common with the San Fernando Valley, Malibu, or the areas adjacent to downtown Los Angeles as in F-2.</p> <p>But I agree with the South LA communities concerned about the dilution of their neighborhoods. This dilution can be eliminated</p>	12/8/2021	n/a

			with modifications by the working group formed to merge B-3 and G, by not extending D2 to the coast and including Carson in D2, and extending District 4 to include LAX.		
OPTION F-2	Melissa Cunningham	Oppose	Combining the San Fernando Valley with the South Bay makes NO sense, does not reflect the most relevant community issues (to either area) and will undermine the representation of the South Bay in Los Angeles County. This map is the textbook definition of Gerrymandering and must be rejected.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Michelle Rivera	Favor	I am a worker of Thai Town in the East Hollywood Neighborhood and I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People's Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Nicolas Lippa	Oppose	This map is pure Gerrymandering and must not be adopted.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Pogos Salazar	Other	I think the Map and Map b3 can work with the small changes to Move SD5 east across Eaglerock, Galsell Park, Hollywood Beverly Hills etc. That would allow SD3 to be whole in SFV.	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION F-2	Pruek Wongsasitorn	Favor	As a resident of Thai Town in East Hollywood neighborhood, I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People’s Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Robert Gaddis	Oppose	The South Bay should not be combined with the San Fernando Valley.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Sergio Diaz	Favor	I would like a map that keeps Pomona in County Supervisor District 1, I spend the most time in District 1 boundaries and feel most connected to the area than any other in LA County.	12/7/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Susi M Kaplan	Oppose	Redondo Residents are fiercely protective of their home turf. And we recognize gerrymandering when we see it. As someone who has lived in this Beach Cities community for 25 years, I find it absolutely ludicrous that you are even considering redistricting to lump us in with San Fernando Valley communities – communities with whom we have very little, if anything, in common. This is a blatant attempt to stack the political deck and I am 100% against it.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Teresa Moretine	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Wayne Craig	Oppose	Map F1 is a textbook definition of Gerrymandering as seen in the analysis provided by the experts and has the highest max deviation of 8.16. How can combining the South Bay and Beach Cities with	12/8/2021	View attachment

			<p>the San Fernando Valley in a narrow of band of land where no one lives make any sense to any rational redistricting effort? The San Fernando Valley has no harbor, beach, or other coastal issues that impact the region.</p> <p>Compared to the actual Gerrymandering map used in 1812 (see attached graphic) this map clearly appears to be a repeat of what was done in the past.</p> <p>Please reject this poorly conceived map and instead adopt map B3.</p>		
OPTION F-2	William Vaughn	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	William Vaughn	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION F-2	Yvette Estrada	Other	<p>On behalf of NBCUniversal, I respectfully submit the following comments in support of the Commission adopting a supervisorial map that keeps our entire business operations on the Universal lot (100 Universal City Plaza) in one district.</p> <p>Option F-2 would divide the Universal Studios Lot, spanning 400 acres, into two different supervisorial districts. The Universal lot is already a multi-jurisdictional property with most of the lot located in unincorporated county, and parcels on property edges located within City of Los Angeles limits (see attached map). Dividing the property further into two supervisorial districts creates redundancies and could potentially make it more difficult for us to coordinate with the county on numerous business and community-related matters. To maximize coordination and efficiency for the property and the business operations on-site, it would be best for our entire property to be represented by one county supervisor.</p> <p>For these reasons, we ask that you reconsider Option F-2 and adjust the boundaries around the Universal Studios lot to include the entire property in one supervisorial district. This technical</p>	12/8/2021	View attachment View attachment

			change would not impact the population percentages allocated to each district. We are available to answer any questions regarding Universal lot property boundaries. Thank you for your consideration.		
OPTION G-1	Andrew Lippa	Oppose	Bad map please select map B3	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Ann Wolfson	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Anneke Blair	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Barbara J Epstein	Oppose	This map makes no practical sense. We prefer B-3 that will keep Supervisor Hahn as our duly elected choice who has represented us brilliantly.NYU22	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Brian Applegate	Oppose	Would lump the South Bay with DTLA which is considerably larger and different.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Carrie Kessler	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Claire Stevens	Oppose	Completely unacceptable. Disgusting political interests put ahead of real issues and topics of each community. Citizens did not ask for this. Follow the money.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Dina Mills	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Dolores Acosta	Oppose	Almost as bad as Map F-2 as it would combine the South Bay with Downtown LA.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Edward Mannes	Oppose	The South Bay and downtown have what in common exactly? Each face issues/concerns unique to their geographical location. It doesn't make any sense to lump these two areas together.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	Cuts a significant portion of the NE equestrian/agrarian communities and places them in a District whose Supervisor does not understand and will fail to support the needs of these communities. The unified voice/actions of the current equestrian/agrarian communities currently in District 5 will be	12/8/2021	n/a

			<p>muted and the existing organizations of disaster plans will be disrupted.</p>		
OPTION G-1	Elektra Kruger	Oppose	<p>Removes significant portions of the NE equestrian/agrarian community from its current District 5 which will sever the unified voice/action of the NE equestrian/agrarian community and place the severed portions under the representation of a Supervisor who has little understanding of the needs of those sharing an agrarian heritage and lifestyle</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Jack L Epstein	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	James Crawford	Oppose	A bad choice please use map B-3 instead.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Janis Burke	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Karen Diaz	Oppose	<p>We oppose map option G-1 because District 2 is being drawn to the coast to include El Segundo, Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach which are affluent communities with different economic engines compared to Inglewood, Lawndale, Hawthorne whose priorities are access to housing, homelessness and covid recovery. District 3 connects east San Fernando Valley immigrant COIs with coastal cities of Malibu and Santa Monica. In District 4 while it keeps all Southeast cities together it pairs them with coastal communities of Long Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes which have different socioeconomic priorities and industries.</p>	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Kip Dtabeck	Favor	<p>December 7, 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 community request that all three remaining map options G-1, F-2 and B-3 be adjusted to leave Chatsworth Lake Manor and the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas together within the 5th District as they are in the current 2020 County Map and have been historically.</p>	12/7/2021	View attachment

		<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4) The 5th District Established a direct relationship with L.A.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>assistance to the community during these power blackouts due to our collective efforts but we have much more to accomplish.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 arbitrarily 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I, my neighbors and community urge you emphatically to include the unincorporated community of Chatsworth Lake Manor as well as the greater Chatsworth and West Hills areas and keep them in the newly formed 5th District per Maps per any of the three currently remaining map options per Maps F-2 , G-1 or B-3.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Kip Drabeck President</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			Chatsworth Lake Manor Citizens Committee Rural Town Council County of Los Angeles		
OPTION G-1	Lee Coller	Oppose	I oppose this in favor of map B-3	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Lezlie Campeggi	Oppose	Absurd	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Linda Maertzweiler	Oppose	Again, linking the South Bay with Downtown is terrible. Again, not feeling like this is in the best interest of either area. More like politics. Citizens of LA are so tired of this.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Lisa Youngworth	Oppose	A bad choice and you should instead adopt map B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Marcie Guillermo	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Matthew Malinow	Oppose	This map makes no sense. Why would South Bay be grouped with DTLA!?	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Matthew Wong	Other	This option is okay, but carves out Arcadia from the 626, which includes majority Asian American communities.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Mayor Bill Brand	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Melissa Cunningham	Favor	This is Gerrymandering, and also does not make sense -- combining areas with completely different issues relevant to the communities (issues which deserve dedicated attention and nuanced understanding).	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Michelle Rivera	Oppose	I am a worker of Thai Town in the East Hollywood Neighborhood and I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People's Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known	12/8/2021	n/a

			whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.		
OPTION G-1	Nicolas Lippa	Oppose	This map does not make sense for the South Bay and Beach cities and their shared community interests. Please adopt map B3 instead.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Pamela Combar	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Pruek Wongsasitorn	Oppose	As a resident of Thai Town in the East Hollywood Neighborhood, I work for the Thai Community Development Center. I represent the Thai community and the AAPI community and would like to urge the commission to oppose 2 maps, namely Map B-3 and Map G-1. We oppose Map B-3 because it divides Thai Town between SD1 and SD3 and is missing a block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. We also oppose map G-1 as it is missing that same block bound by Hollywood, Sunset, Western and Serrano. However, we support Map F-2 with modifications as modified by the People's Bloc in Map 81 as it keeps Thai Town, Little Tokyo, Chinatown whole and together in SD1, and Known whole in SD2. The Thai community needs to be kept whole and intact as we are comprised of limited English proficient, low-income, undocumented workers and renters vulnerable to gentrification and displacement. We need access to affordable housing and access to in-language and culturally competent healthcare. Thank you.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Robert Gaddis	Oppose	The South Bay should not be combined with the San Fernando Valley.	12/8/2021	n/a

OPTION G-1	Sergio Diaz	Favor	I would like a map that keeps Pomona in County Supervisor District 1, I spend the most time in District 1 boundaries and feel most connected to the area than any other in LA County.	12/7/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Susi M Kaplan	Oppose	Again this is an unacceptable option tying us to a community that doesn't share our particular geographic and environmental concerns.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Teresa Moretine	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	Wayne Craig	Oppose	Map G is a poor option as it has a max deviation of 8.16 and will isolate the beach cities from other similar communities currently served in District 4. Please reject this poorly conceived map and instead adopt map B3.	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	William Vaughn	Favor	-	12/8/2021	n/a
OPTION G-1	William Vaughn	Oppose	-	12/8/2021	n/a
-	Chris Rowe	-	<p>Dear Honorable Commissioners and members of the Los Angeles County Redistricting Commission team,</p> <p>I thank Commissioner S. Wong for asking about the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 overlay during last night's meeting.</p> <p>There are so many ways to view the various maps from the California Office of Environmental Health. My husband and I have weighed in during meetings on their versions 3.0 and 4.0.</p> <p>I have given you screen shots for Los Angeles County based upon various regions. I did this in a Powerpoint format with the idea that you would have this tool before you start any map drawing in the morning and certainly before your meeting tomorrow night.</p> <p>I know that if I had sent this to the box, it would not be posted in time for you to review it.</p> <p>I hope that by showing you that the San Fernando Valley has a significant pollution burden among other factors that it is another reason for you to keep us together.</p> <p>There are also significant pollution burdens in East Los Angeles, to the south, all the way to the Harbor.</p>	12/8/2021	View attachment

			<p>I will try to submit other maps to you that show other factors that may help you draw lines based on various burdens.</p> <p>I know that I mentioned the Exide facility to you in the past, oil well locations, the Santa Susana Field Lab, and Aliso Canyon.</p> <p>Again there are many layers, and I will see what I can accomplish in sharing more with you about this aspect of our County.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Chris Rowe West Hills, San Fernando Valley</p>		
-	Chris Rowe	-	<p>Dear Commissioners and Honorable Support Team,</p> <p>I have not had the opportunity to learn how to use your mapping tool with its overlays. When I saw Thai demonstrate it last night, I realized that a lot of the various pollution burden layers are obscured by the blue colored background of your software.</p> <p>I do apologize that the CalEnvironScreen 4.0 tool that I use does not allow me to capture just Los Angeles County. Therefore, I named screenshots things like the Los Angeles County area or Los Angeles County area north, or Los Angeles County area south.</p> <p>There is a whole new list of factors in the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 tool that create the overall Pollution Burden Score that I sent to you in various screen shots earlier today.</p> <p>If I have an opportunity I will submit those other factors to you.</p> <p>I do hope - that since Commissioner S. Soto did ask about things like Ozone and Lead that this portion is helpful to her and others.</p> <p>The other factors - the social factors like age, and other categories will also take me several hours to take screen shots in order to create a Powerpoint with those factors.</p> <p>With that in mind, I did want you to observe that the San Fernando Valley has its share of Pollution Burden which is just another reason to keep us whole in order to elect one Supervisor to represent all of us.</p> <p>While I do recognize statements from residents of the Westside Communities of Interest that spoke last night including the Jewish</p>	12/8/2021	View attachment

		<p>Community, I would then have to point you to maps to show you that there are significant Jewish populations not only where they referenced last night, but throughout the San Fernando Valley. This point was brought up by a presentation to the LA City Council Redistricting Commission that allowed various groups to make presentations on their Communities of Interest. One of those groups was the Jewish Federation of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Again, by keeping the San Fernando Valley together with Glendale and Burbank, you are also keeping a large Armenian Community together.</p> <p>I genuinely believe that the Westside Council of Governments which was mentioned last night should be with their neighboring communities outside of District 3.</p> <p>This is a link to their website: https://www.westsidocities.org/mission</p> <p>"The Westside Cities Council of Governments (WSSCOG) engages in regional and cooperative planning and coordination of government services and responsibilities to assist the cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, the City of Los Angeles (Districts 5 and 11) and the County of Los Angeles (Districts 3, 2, and 4). These members have partnered in a voluntary cooperative endeavor to forge consensus on policies and programs of regional significance that enhance the quality of daily life, sustain the environment and enrich the future for Westside residents, businesses, and visitors." With the exception of the hillside portions of Beverly Hills and other areas of the Hollywood Hills, these areas belong with their adjacent communities which were mentioned last night such as Hancock Park.</p> <p>I do hope that I have sent a Google document Powerpoint on each of these emails.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Thank you for all of your hard work. Respectfully submitted, Chris Rowe West Hills San Fernando Valley</p>		
-	Chris Rowe	-	-	12/8/2021	View attachment
-	Kathy Banuelos	-	<p>Attached please find materials for public comment in advance of tonight's redistricting commission hearing. We submitted these via the portal yesterday before 5pm, but I am re-submitting to ensure they are included the in the record. NBCUniversal is seeking a technical correction to map F-2 to ensure that our entire property (100 Universal City Plaza) is located within one supervisorial district. The proposed F-2 map would divide our property into two districts. I've attached a map of our property boundaries for the commissioners' reference. We are available to answer any questions.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Kathy Bañuelos VP, Government Affairs</p>	12/8/2021	View attachment View attachment
-	McKenzie Bright	-	Please see the attached letter from the City of Rancho Palos Verdes in support of Draft Map B-3.	12/8/2021	View attachment
-	Maria Brenes	-	Please see the attached MEMO to support the Commission's ongoing deliberations. Please review the specific feedback on how F-2 and G-1 can integrate elements of 81. Let me know if you have any questions. Thank you again for your tremendous efforts.	12/8/2021	View attachment