

Nicole Alvarez

From: Shannan starn [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 10:40 PM
To: Covina City Clerk
Subject: Public comment for meeting on the maps

Listening to the last meeting, I heard a lot about freeway districts. But the maps didnt line up with the concerns mentioned

The consultant maps claimed to draw freeway districts, but left out most of Puente St in order to include western section of San Bernardino road. Though oddly included Covina Hills road, despite the reduction in lanes and traffic at Grand. Covina Hills Road has stop signs, not stop lights. And doesnt see the freeway traffic we do off Workman. Last time I drove that road I saw a deer, I have never seen a deer by my home. [REDACTED] To be clear, I am in favor of a southern freeway district, ideally drawn between Azusa and Grand, and including as much as possible south of Puente. I live by Covina High school, and making a district that includes the issues we deal with from the major freeway off-ramps and traffic on Workman, Rowland and Workman is obvious. But I cant see the logic of including Covina Hills in the same district as Covina High. [REDACTED] Drawing a perfect square is hard while balancing population, but it doesnt make sense to be including areas further north above Badillo or East of Grand in a freeway district unless all of the area to the south of Puente is first included.

The freeway maps drawn by consultants are not workable and do not fit the city. Map 130 comes close, but would exclude me from the freeway district. Map 111,129, and 133 group everything south of Puente and west of Grand. Balancing population by adding some north of Puente. But not crossing over Badillo like the consultant maps do to to grab distant neighborhoods while ignoring freeway neighborhoods further to the south.

Map 111 is very close to 129. but with straighter lines. In this case I think the lower population deviation is more important. Map 129 is my first choice and best represents the neighborhoods most effected by the freeway.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)



Public Comment for Tuesday's Meeting

1 message

Mon, Jan 3, 2022 at 4:21 PM

To: "districting@covinaca.gov" <districting@covinaca.gov>
Cc: "cityclerk@covinaca.gov" <cityclerk@covinaca.gov>

Hello --

I have been following along the process, but didn't realize emailing was an option until I watched the meeting on Dec 21st. If the city allows for emailed comments, they should mention that in the agenda and online.

On the south end of town, Grand is a hard divide between neighborhoods. Especially south of Badillo. Big streets like Rowland change names and turn into a twisty one lane. Workman ends just shy of Grand, and Puente dead ends just after. When I exit the 10 and head north, I know that on my left side and right side are very different areas of town.

As someone who turns left, it makes no sense to group Covina Hills with Barranca Elementary, let alone with Covina High school. Instead, everything South of Badillo and east of grand should be split off into its own zone. On next door, this is often grouped together as 'Charter Oaks Best'.

From what I saw of the maps, there just isn't enough population to give that area its own district, unless we had a lot more districts. Ideally, I would like to make everything East of Grand a district, but that population is too large. If I had to pick a direction, Charter Oak High school is much more similar area to San Jose Hills than the car dealerships

Map 110 comes close to my experience, following Grand up to the tracks for the south eastern district, and keeping the Southern portion to the West of Grand and south of Puente together. But I can also see the benefit of sticking to roads as the split. In that case I support Map 129 or something close to it.

Thanks for listening!
-Robert

Nicole Alvarez

From: Barbara Baker [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 4:24 PM
To: Covina City Clerk
Subject: Redistricting of Covina

Nicole,

Please forward my message to the City Council Meeting on Tuesday Jan 4,2022.

To be honest I am not happy with redistricting Covina.

After review I would support WILLDAN MAP NUMBER 2

Respectfully,
Barbara Baker



Public comment for 1/4 meeting

1 message

jaclyn schmitt 
To: districting@covinaca.gov, cityclerk@covinaca.gov

Tue, Jan 4, 2022 at 10:06 AM

Dear Covina,

Regarding the high risk of gerrymandering currently being contemplated, I am deeply concerned for tonight's meeting. First, no one who spoke at the last meeting from the public liked a four district split. Second, the lawyer said the consultant maps opened the city up to future lawsuits. This is a costly and time consuming process in and of itself. Seeing as we clearly have ample understanding of the legal, (not to mention moral) pitfalls, let's prevent a lot of headache and wasted money now.

The idea of a council member living close enough to me that we get stuck at the same red light each morning seems like a good thing. I want to have a council member that experiences the same city I do. The idea of companies who work for the city submitting maps already begs unpleasant questions, especially when they draw districts that stretch from one corner of the city to another. I just don't understand why a consultant was needed when so many public map submissions are available. I saw no evidence that the consultant produced something better, and in fact seemed to be far worse in many ways.

I like the idea of districts. We already have them for everything else. Covina might of started off a mile square, but it no longer is. Now that I have glimpsed at the process, I wish that computers drew the lines based on fair and transparent metrics. But short of that I think that the most important thing is to end any legal questions currently being generated by this process. One of the lawyers at the last meeting clearly said that the consultant maps and others like them opened the city up to more legal cases. I don't want to see this process stretch out to a prolonged legal battle.

These maps have to last a decade. I just read the Mayor is not running for another term. We all wish him luck on his next endeavors. Two terms seems to be the average tenure of local city councils. It is unlikely that a majority of council will still be in their seats when we are still using these maps in 2030. Just as the majority of the council has turned over since 2010. Life happens, and we thank the council for their service. But no one expects these to be lifelong roles. For this reason I believe it is important to draw fair lines that don't consider existing members. If the lawyer is right that drawing districts around incumbents will open up the city to more legal challenges, then it is doubly important to not do so. It simply isn't worth the risk to the city to protect seats that often cycle anyway.

Ten years will already be too soon to go through all of this again, I would hate to see the selection of a map to be the start of a whole new headache. I am in favor of whatever map will result in a council member who lives near me. And once we are done with this, a map that will conclusively wrap up this process. Several acceptable and legally defensible maps have been submitted. We can move forward with the work already done, in a fair and legal manner. We cannot do this, however, with a map that looks to pander to current members of the council.

If the lawyer says certain maps are gerrymandered, eliminate them. He seemed open to many maps, so pick one of those. My guess with the breakdowns, he wrote 129 and 130. Some people liked map 129, go with that. End this madness.

And finally, thank goodness for streaming council meetings and double playback speed. This has absolutely helped with the transparency of the process. Here's hoping for a fair and legal conclusion.

Sincerely,
Jaclyn Schmitt