

Theresa Bass

From:
Sent: Friday, October 22, 2021 2:27 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2021 Redistricting Map submission
Attachments: DavidKlawe2022redistrictingplan.xlsx

Warning: This email originated from outside the City of Anaheim. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the message.

Attached is an Excel worksheet with my adjustments to the 2016 map.

I am moving blocks 73, 84 and 93 from District 3 to District 4. (Using Interstate 5 as the new dividing line).

Moving block 140 from D4 to D3, and block 134 from D5 to D3, using South Street as the separation between D3 and D4.

I am having problems with placing my comments on the Excel Worksheet.

>> I think this map make sense because it takes into consideration all the recent work done for the 2016 redistricting map including communities of interest identified, the CVAP breakdown, especially in the Latino community preference of having districts 3, 4 and 5 Latino majority and plurality districts. In West Anaheim (D1 and D2), the districts remain the same, which matches the 2016 decision to have the split vertical instead of horizontal, and using Euclid Avenue as West Anaheim's boundary. District 1 keeps the Beach Boulevard Specific Plan in the same district, District 2 keeps the Little Arabia community of interest in the same district. District 6 also remains the same, the eastern portion of the city. To equalize the populations on Districts 3, 4 and 5, I only moved 5 Population Unit blocks. I am using Interstate 5 and South Street to divide D3 and D4, this allows the Anaheim Resort District area on the north side to remain together. Then 2 Population Unit Blocks are given to D3 between Lincoln and South west of State College to equalize population amounts. This keeps the spirit of the People's Map, and uses geographic contiguity to draw easily identified areas of the city to match the 2020 Census information. Then 2 Population Unit Blocks are given to D3 between Lincoln and South, west of State College to equalize population amounts. This keeps the spirit of the People's Map, and uses geographic contiguity to draw easily identified areas of the city to match the 2020 Census information.<<

David M. Klawe

Theresa Bass

From: dklawe
Sent: Friday, October 22, 2021 2:44 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2021 Redistricting map submission
Attachments: DavidKlawe2022redistrictingplan.xlsx

Warning: This email originated from outside the City of Anaheim. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the message.

Attached is my idea for equalizing Anaheim's 6 districts to the 2020 Census figures.

It only consists of moving 5 Population Unit Blocks.

Blocks 75, 84 and 93 are moved from D3 to D4.

Blocks 134 and 140 are moved to D3.

I had problems attaching my comments to the Excel Worksheet.

>> I think this map make sense because it takes into consideration all the recent work done for the 2016 redistricting map including communities of interest identified, the CVAP breakdown, especially in the Latino community preference of having districts 3, 4 and 5 Latino majority and plurality districts. In West Anaheim (D1 and D2), the districts remain the same, which matches the 2016 decision to have the split vertical instead of horizontal, and using Euclid Avenue as West Anaheim's boundary. District 1 keeps the Beach Boulevard Specific Plan in the same district, District 2 keeps the Little Arabia community of interest in the same district. District 6 also remains the same, the eastern portion of the city. To equalize the populations on Districts 3, 4 and 5, I only moved 5 Population Unit blocks. I am using Interstate 5 and South Street to divide D3 and D4, this allows the Anaheim Resort District area on the north side to remain together. Then 2 Population Unit Blocks are given to D3 between Lincoln and South west of State College to equalize population amounts. This keeps the spirit of the People's Map, and uses geographic contiguity to draw easily identified areas of the city to match the 2020 Census information. Then 2 Population Unit Blocks are given to D3 between Lincoln and South, west of State College to equalize population amounts. This keeps the spirit of the People's Map, and uses geographic contiguity to draw easily identified areas of the city to match the 2020 Census information.<<

David M. Klawe

Anaheim, CA 92804-2233

Theresa Bass

From: dklawe
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2021 12:39 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments regarding Map 102

Warning: This email originated from outside the City of Anaheim. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the message.

I am writing to you today to add the following statement to my submitted maps, #101 and #102.

After submitting my two maps, I attended all the district community meetings to hear comments about my maps and others, looking for where communities of interests were being broken up. I heard none. So I have decided to not make a revised map.

After the January 11th meeting, I will see if one is needed after reviewing the comments made.

The maps I submitted were based on the criteria Dr. Levitt set out, first The Federal Laws, and then the California's Ranked Criteria, along with using the 2016 REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL DISTRICTS TO THE ANAHEIM CITY COUNCIL as a guide to decisions made a few years ago.

While I drew two maps, the second one was drawn using the DistrictR software, which allowed me to fine tune my numbers and why Map 102 is my preferred design.

As a West Anaheim resident, and finding out that West Anaheim grew at the same rate as the city as a whole, it made sense to keep Districts 1 and 2 the same, leaving West Anaheim as the part of the city West of Euclid Avenue. While a Community of Interest, it is too large to be in a single district, but perfect for 2 districts. It also holds smaller communities together, such as the Beach Boulevard Specific Plan and Little Arabia.

And the same for District 6, keeping Anaheim Hills and the surrounding area together. I did make a small change to the border, using the "Easily Identifiable Border" standard in the ranked criteria. I opted to use the Santa Ana River, and Lakeview Avenue to follow existing borders and separations.

The other three districts needed adjustments in population to reach near the 57,804 average required by law.

Using the decisions made in 2016, District 3 was based on the Colony District and its smaller communities, and that District 4 would be the Anaheim Resort business district along with the housing surrounding it. District 5 was the Platinum Triangle, a mixed use area of housing, entertainment and businesses.

The 2016 report states – "While there was early testimony favoring putting the entire southern part of the City in one Council District (which would have combined the Anaheim Resort and Platinum Triangle areas into the same district), several of those speakers came to subsequent meetings and favored the boundary line between Council Districts 4 and 5 that places the Anaheim Resort area and the Platinum Triangle in separate districts. It was felt that residents would be better-served by having a council member for each of those areas. Much of the testimony focused on the connections between the Ponderosa, Guinida Park, and adjacent neighborhoods north of Ball Road."

To choose boundaries that balanced the three districts, and follow Dr. Levitt's guidelines, I opted to use Interstate 5 east of Euclid, South Street (South edge of the Colony), East Street and State College Boulevard for District 3.

District 4 gained a small section of District 3 north of Ball Road and west of Interstate 5. This section has much more in common with the Anaheim Resort, and the resulting traffic and parking issues. The entire area on the West side of Interstate 5 east of Euclid Avenue is in District 4. I used Lewis Street to separate The Resort District from the Platinum Triangle, just like in 2016. A small jut out to State College Avenue north of Ball Road was needed to balance out the population numbers.

District 5 is mainly the area east of State College, with a jut out for the Platinum Triangle, and another jut out to East Street north of Sycamore Avenue. This was done to balance population, but also help to bring up the Hispanic percentage in the district.

After coming up with districts that meant sense to me, I looked at the DistrictR calculations to make sure I was representing all races fairly. I wasn't focused on getting to a specific percentage, due to the 2016 report. It Stated –

“Citizen Voting Age Population figures relate to the ability of Latinos to elect candidates of their choice. As described by the demographer, these are five-year averages taken from the American Community Survey of 2009-2013. Citywide, the Latino CVAP is increasing at around 0.6% per year. It would be reasonable to assume that number is somewhat larger in the central parts of the City where the Latino majority and plurality districts are located. Several speakers testified to their belief that the actual percentages in 2015 are higher than this, thereby effectively making District 4 a Latino CVAP majority district and making District 5 a more effective Latino plurality district for the elections in 2016 and future years. As discussed above, they testified repeatedly that they prefer the opportunity to elect three members to the City Council to having a higher population in two districts but a correspondingly smaller population in a third. Significantly, this position was shared by at least two speakers who are Latino and previously were candidates for City Council. The only testimony to the contrary was from two Latino individuals who do not reside in Anaheim. “

And looking at the current council makeup, we have 5 people of color, including 3 Latinos. This reflects the very diverse population that makes up the city of Anaheim.

And while there is no one correct answer, I feel Map 102 has taken the required Redistricting rules and goals, including preserving the core of existing districts, to come up with a very good answer.

Respectfully submitted,

David M. Klawe