

Theresa Bass

From: dklawe
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 11:27 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Submission of a Second Proposed 2021 District map for Anaheim.

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.

Good day,

Earlier, using the Paper Map tool with the Excel Spreadsheet (sent twice by accident), I submitted the Klawe 1 map on Friday. Since it is slightly different than the new one I am submitting, I am asking that both be submitted for review.

The new one, using the DistrictR tool is similar to the first map, but uses more Geographic Boundaries to draw District Border lines, especially between District 5 and 6. This creates more equal populations in all 6 districts, with a population deviation of just 1.67% per the DistrictR tool.

<https://districtr.org/plan/69921>

Here are my comments for the Klawe 2 submission.

>>This submission uses the spirit of the 2016 District Map, and uses geographic contiguity to help draw new lines where needed to equal out the population numbers from the 2020 Census.

The lines for Districts 3, 4 and 5 had to be adjusted, as they did not grow at the same rate as the city as a whole. This map creates fairly equal population counts.

Districts 1 and 2 grew at the same rate as the city as a whole, and needed no adjustments. This keeps "West Anaheim" as being located West of Euclid Avenue. Also all of the Beach Boulevard Specific Plan in District 1, and the Little Arabia Community of Interest in District 2. West Anaheim has about a 25% Asian Population, which is spread throughout the area. Districts 1 and 2 have about the same Asian breakdown. Also a Hispanic Breakdown of 50%, and like the Asian population, is spread throughout West Anaheim.

I moved the line separating Districts 3 and 4 using Interstate 5 and South Street. Using Interstate 5 keeps the southern area as part of the Resort Area, as it is impacted by the Resort area traffic and parking issues, along with businesses serving the resort. South Street was used in the 2016 District Map.

The Eastern Line between District 4 and 5 uses State College north of Ball, and Lewis Street south of Ball, and matches the 2016 boundaries. The 2016 District Map report states "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.", and using Lewis Street does that.

As for the segments between East Street and State College Blvd north of South Street between District 3 and 5, if you use Sycamore as the dividing line, you have two segments of about 10,000 people each. I gave the top portion to District 5, to reflect the 2016 map. It is possible to switch the two segments, giving the South of Sycamore to District 5, but that

would be the major change. Each segment is about 17% the size of an average district, so way above the allowable deviation, and cannot be combined without major changes to the entire map.

As for the CVAP numbers in Districts 3, 4 and 5, they reflect the same basic breakdown as in 2016. The 2016 report talks about having plurality numbers in all 3 districts. The DistrictR tool shows a Hispanic Voting Age Population of 68% in District 3, 63% in District 4, and 54% in District 5. The segment of District 5 West of State College between Sycamore and the Northern edge of the city helps get that count above 50%. This shows 3 districts with a Hispanic majority, and 2 Hispanic plurality districts in West Anaheim.

The border between Districts 5 and 6 use the Santa Ana River and Lakeview Avenue as clear geographic boundaries, and equals out population counts. District 6 remains the Eastern portion of the City, and keeps the Anaheim Hills community of Interest together.

I feel this map meets the goals of creating fairly equal populations in each of the 6 districts in the city, using geographic contiguity as the main tool in drawing the boundaries to create those equal amounts, which matches California Ranked Criteria top priorities. Using the 2016 Districting Process as the guide to this new map is trying to keep the communities of interest identified then together. Of course, some communities were divided then, as does this map, but I attempted to minimize those issues as much of possible. I attended 5 of the seven district meetings to listen to the residents and their concerns.

David Klawe, West Anaheim.<<

If you have any questions about this new submission, please contact me.

David M. Klawe
West Anaheim

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