



---

## Public Comment on City Maps

---

**Erin Borland** [REDACTED]  
To: [districting@covinaca.gov](mailto:districting@covinaca.gov)  
Cc: [cityclerk@covinaca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@covinaca.gov)

Sun, Jan 2, 2022 at 9:22 PM

Voters should pick their politicians. Politicians should not pick their voters. I heard commenters at previous meetings ask for an independent commission. I was disappointed the council did not go that direction. Having plenty of time since September to do so.

I was a little worried, but seemed like the state had pretty solid instructions that had to be followed. So figured everything would be on the up and up and work out.

Then I saw the consultant maps. The Willdan map the city insiders are pushing its a blatant attempt at gerrymandering, using tried and true pack and crack methods. The Council gives up one seat, packing the solidly democratic voters in the North West corner of town into a single district. Then uses cracking to split up high propensity wealthy republican voters from the east end of town into the remaining 4 districts. Drowning out any real voice voters to the west have.

If the city had gone to a non partisan committee, residents could rest a little easier knowing that wiggly district might have been a coincidence and wasn't drawn to favor incumbents. With the council having the only say in the final map, there is an additional burden to pick a map that goes beyond any perceived sense of impropriety. Any map that doesn't look compact will have the taint of gerrymandering hanging over it, deserved or not. And hiring a consultant with ties to the city to create maps certainly creates a sense of backroom dealing.

As far as I can tell, the only neutral observer who doesnt have an existing connection to the city or the council is attorney behind the 129 and 130 maps. I dont think he gets paid more if one of his maps is picked. And seems to be creating maps from the data instead of granting incumbent advantage or bending to any special interest.

And the data he used fits the city well. I played with many maps and couldn't come up with anything better than map 129. Please pick that map and allow the process to conclude above board.

It doesnt prevent anyone on the council from running again, and it gives Covina's residence the knowledge that the lines were drawn fairly and impartially.

Respectfully,

Erin Borland

## 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](mailto:districting@covinaca.gov), [cityclerk@covinaca.gov](mailto: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



---

## Public comment for tonight's meeting

1 message

---

**Bridgette De Lellis**   
To: [districting@covinaca.gov](mailto:districting@covinaca.gov), [cityclerk@covinaca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@covinaca.gov)

Tue, Jan 4, 2022 at 12:18 PM

I am very familiar with the area of Covina Heights and San Jose Hills. I was surprised at the last meeting when listening to lawyers zoom in from far away say that Walnut creek is a geographic feature that breaks up the area. Here is a hint to those far away lawyers. In our little corner you cannot connect to the rest of the city without crossing the creek. Our hill is surrounded on the north and west by it. If that geographic boundary, then we are an island that doesn't belong. While our property ages and lot sizes match better with Old Badillo and Reeder neighborhoods, the home values and views match better with Chaparro and Covina Hills Road. The reality is we are tucked away in the corner of the city. Even the population areas the city map used have the creek running through two. We have to connect with someone. If the question is do we fit better with our city neighbors to the West or to the North, then my answer is both. In fact the chain of parks, trails, and recreation areas along the creek is one of the great features that our corner of the city shares. And Covina Heights south of the creek certainly belongs with Covina Hills south of the creek

Splitting up the hill neighborhoods splits our community. I ask you to eliminate the Willdan maps and others with similar lines. If the creek was a clear geographic boundary, then the people who made the mapping tool for the city would have used it as a boundary like they did for other washes in the city.

In fact I would love to see all of eastern Badillo and south grouped together. I may be alone on this, but my first choices are maps 105 and Map 133.

If the council has narrowed it down to the popular choices from the last meeting. Then I much prefer Map 129 over the alternatives. The Willdan maps dont respect our neighborhoods or follow the rules given for creating districts. Map129 seems like a consensus choice that I can get behind.

Sent from my iPhone



---

## Public Comment for Tuesday Meeting - Districts

---

**Yana Portuguez** [Redacted]  
To: [districting@covinaca.gov](mailto:districting@covinaca.gov), [cityclerk@covinaca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@covinaca.gov)

Tue, Jan 4, 2022 at 2:52 PM

I want to thank the council for moving toward voting districts. I think it is the first important step toward making the voting process fairer and more inclusive. At the end of the day, when more people participate in a democracy, the result is better for everyone

As a Charter Oak resident, I see this as a community of interest. I think it is crucial that there be a district that primarily comprises of Charter Oak, with any overflow Charter Oak areas that don't fit into the primary district be grouped into a second district.

I saw that the consultant maps, and a few others, Charter Oak is split up into three or more districts. This prevents Charter Oak voters from being a majority in any district, diluting Charter Oaks' voice. We often already feel like a forgotten about part of town and fear that splitting up our vote will only cement our second-class status. The Willdan maps do just this. I live on Lyman. We are a small street between Bonnie Cove and Sunflower. From this perspective, I do not understand why Willdan Map 1 places the junction of 3 districts so close to me. Depending on the corner of Reeder and Cypress I stand on, I could be in three different districts despite never leaving the neighborhood. It certainly doesn't feel like a clear border to me.

Or why on either Willdan Map, the small band of homes between Cypress and Ruddock is grouped with downtown Covina but not in the same district as Glen Oak Elementary.

My favorite map is 129. Using Glendora as the divider keeps Charter Oak High school in a Charter Oak district along with Glen Oak Elementary. Excluding only Royal Oak and Cedargrove, but keeping them both in a second district that is still substantially Charter Oak.

Map 133 comes close. It maintains a Charter Oak district with the overflow staying concentrated in a second district. It includes Royal Oak but at the cost of Charter Oak High School. Given a choice I think the clear lines and the inclusion of Charter Oak High makes Map 129 the best.

Thank you,

Yana Portuguez