Jennifer L. Hall

From: Sarah Hert
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 11:53 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Focus map input

To whom it may concern,

I like map 102, 106, 116, and 117. I am in Anaheim that is part of PYLUSD and these maps best represent my community area.

Thank you,

Sarah Hert

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Brenda Barrera
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 5:25 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Testimony

My name is Brenda Barrera. I heard about the redistricting through the community forums that OCCORD is doing around our community. I have lived in District 4 since I was eight years old. I went to the local schools of the anaheim school district until I graduated from high school. Now I am 24 years old and I am a manager of a children's entertainment center. What I love most about my community is the diversity of culture and how they come together and work in unity to achieve things that benefit everybody. I am supporting the map 114 because it is what best represents my personal interests. It also maintains the historical neighborhoods like "The Colony." I hope that my opinion is taken into consideration and the vote of the mayor and council members goes to the map that the community is advocating for.

Best regards,
Brenda Barrera

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Jim Stevenson
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 10:21 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting map preference and comments

Of the 6 "Focus Maps" currently under consideration (102, 104, 106, 114, 116, and 117) I prefer 102 while I specifically don't like 104 or 114.

Some of the primary goals of going to district-based representation for city elections are to give constituents confidence that their voice is being heard, that their concerns are being considered, and that the system is fair and not being "rigged" in any way. The initial districts, adopted in 2016, created a path for minority groups to get onto the city council, and that effort has shown success with a more diverse city council than had previously existed. The districts have also put the spotlight on issues that are specific to different parts of the city, and we are seeing a shift toward addressing some of those issues such as blight along Beach Boulevard, traffic/parking issues in touristy areas, and parks in older neighborhoods. It's important that the new map not lose the ground gained on those goals while also building confidence in the process for all residents and voters.

Map 102 makes minimal, but sensable changes. As addressed above, the districts as they were created just a few years ago have had success and are beginning to bear fruit, thus it seems appropriate to not make dramatic changes. Districts 1 and 2 would remain unchanged which is in line with their comparatively steady demographics, and the western portion of District 6, a largely industrial area, is moved into District 5 with an adjacent industrial area. Possibly the most significant change from the current map would be the area south of the 5 and northwest of Disneyland moving from District 3 to District 4 and a neighborhood west of State College Boulevard moving from Districts 4 and 5 moving to District 3 to help balance out populations. This fairly minimal shifting of existing residents brings two neighborhoods into districts with their dominant feature. Specifically, the area south of the 5 is impacted by the traffic/noise/crowds of the Disneyland resort district, while the area west of State College Boulevard is of similar age and demographics, as the adjacent neighborhoods in the central District 3. My final points in favor of this map are in how it can address the "confidence in the process" goals of district representation. Multiple studies on both the state and national levels show that voters don't trust maps that have many odd shapes and fingers. Such maps give the appearance of elected officials selecting their voters, not of voters selecting their representatives. Even when made with virtuous intentions such as making majority-minority districts, "amoeba-like" political boundaries breed distrust in voters. This is why the State of California and many national redistricting advocacy groups promote and use metrics such as "polygon score" to encourage rational boundaries that common people recognize. In Anaheim, freeways like the 5, and major boulevards such as Euclid and State College should serve as such boundaries when possible to encourage public trust.

My final points in favor of Map 102 are also the reasons I don't favor Maps 104 and 114. Map 104 divides the neighborhood between State College Boulevard and East Street into parts of three different districts (#3, #4, and #5) with a finger of District 3 along La Palma and a finger of District 5 south of Sycamore. While possibly done with the best of intentions, it looks to the casual voter like a collusion between the representatives of Districts 3 and 5 to either grab political friends or keep out political enemies. Meanwhile, Map 114 muddies the clear border of Euclid Avenue by putting one neighborhood in the north of District 2 into District 3 and moving a

section on the southwest of District 4 near Disneyland into District 2. Map 114 also divides the neighborhood northwest of Disneyland but south of the 5 between Districts 3 and 4 with each being a stubby finger into the other's otherwise continuous space. This appears to be a map that is more concerned with balancing numbers and ethnicities of people but ignores geography, communities of interest, and polygon scores and thus opens the door to voter distrust.

Voters trust maps that make sense visually and have largely equal populations. If voters feel that arcane demographic data were used and the results are many fingers across logical boundaries, then they will feel that the new system is just as rigged and the old system, will disengage from the community, and will add to the divisions we see in society on the national scale. I'm not saying demographic data doesn't have its place; we don't want a pretty map that inherently disadvantages some groups, but if the current boundaries are largely working and minor tweaks such as those proposed in Map 102 would maintain or enhance the goals of the district process, then such a map should be the logical choice.

Jim Stevenson
A resident of Anaheim District 3

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Blessedmst
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 5:03 PM
To: Redistricting; Blessedmst
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on NDC Map 104

Greetings Anaheim Redistricting Committee:

I am a resident in Area 2. After reviewing the data provided for all maps, 102, 104, 106, 114, 116, and 117, I am in favor of NDC Map 104 for the following reasons:

- the deviation from ideal in number and percentage is lowest across all areas, 1 - 6, at a total of 911 and 1.57% respectively,

- Area 2 of NDC Map 104 remains the basically the same in all categories when compared to maps 102, 106, 116 and 117 because the % of deviation in number and percentage remains at -1 and 0.00%, respectively.

- the highest deviation from ideal appears to be in NDC Map 114, at 2,766, 4.77%, which had a slight impact on Area 2 at 164, .28%.

If there is a vote to be had, I would vote for NDC Map 104 specifically for Area 2.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. It is appreciated.

Theresa Hines

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Mitch Lee ·
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 4:52 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for redistricting..

After review of all maps, I believe Map 102 makes the most sense.
As the population changes, it makes more sense to realign some districts to the East as the East segment, AKA District 6 is getting further centralized to the East areas whereas the Western portions of District 6 is out of place. Aligning the Western residential portion of District 6 with District 5 makes more sense.
With that change, it also makes sense that portions of the western District 5 aligned with District 3.

Respectfully,

Mitch Lee
District 5 Resident

Sent from Mail for Windows

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Talia Barrera
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 7:52 PM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Map 114

Hello, My name is Talia and I live in District four. I am 20 years old and currently studying at Cypress College while working at a kids fun center for our community. In my time in high school I volunteered with a group called Project S.A.Y.. After I continued being a volunteer for the community because I love my community and want to continue seeing it evolve into the best it could be. I learned about the redistricting process with OCCORD and I would like to support map 114 because this map respects important neighborhoods and communities of interest. I hope that my voice gets accounted for when deciding on which map to input for the next ten years.

Jennifer L. Hall

From: al sg
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

Mi nombre es Ana L. Salas soy recode de Anaheim y soy líder comunitario en mi comunidad acudí a reuniones de redistriccion con occord apoyo el mapa 114 porque como líder comunitario es el mapa que tiene más equidad y beneficio para nuestras comunidades Sr Sidhu apóye a los recidentes que como yo siempre estamos trabajando para mejor nuestro entorno

Sent from my iPhone

Jennifer L. Hall

From: Griselda Martinez
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 9:53 AM
To: Redistricting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mapa 114

Mi nombre es Griselda Marin,vivo en Ponderosa. Soy líder comunitario en mi comunidad y he acudido a las reuniones sobre Redistricting en Ponderosa con OCCORD, apoyo el mapa 114 porque es el que representa mi visión sobre mi ciudad,la ciudad donde vivo y han nacido mis 3 hijos. El mapa 114 respeta comunidades con historia en Anaheim además que equilibra la población para que todos tengamos mejor representación con nuestros concejales.
Sr. Valencia, apoye nuestra comunidad de Ponderosa dando su voto al mapa 114.