

On Sun, Sep 11, 2022 at 2:17 PM Craig Chernos <cchernos@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello again,

I had included the following comments with the map I've just submitted, but I'm not sure they'll be entirely visible. So I have included them below. Thank you.

Craig Chernos

1. General comments.

- (a) This map uses the 'DRA 2020' base map provided by the City, with the proposed districts assembled from the predefined precincts and groups of blocks.
- (b) Five councilmanic districts are provisioned, as there are five seats on the existing at-large city council.
- (c) Every effort has been made to adhere to the guidance of the federal 1965 Voting Rights Act as well as the 2001 California Voting Rights Act.
- (d) This proposal attempts to include two council districts particularly favourable to minority representation.

2. District-specific notes.

(a) District 1: This proposed district has the highest Asian CVAP (at nearly 45%) of the five proposed districts, and the highest CVAP in that district as well. It therefore offers the potential for minority representation on the redistricted council.

(b) District 2: With Hispanic residents comprising nearly 42% of the population and 36% CVAP - both figures being the highest Hispanic numbers for any of the five proposed districts - this district, like District 1, offers potential for minority representation on the redistricted council.

The 'DRA 2020' district statistics panel shows this district as being 0.02% over the 10.00% district population deviation limit. That overage percentage comes out to all of one single resident; thus, the author does not feel this is in any meaningful way a violation of the 'equal district populations' requirement.

(c) District 3: Taking in the campus of Loma Linda University and its affiliated medical centre, this proposed district also includes surrounding neighbourhoods where much of the University's student population lives. It represents an effort to create a district particularly respectful of our academic and medical 'community of interest'.

(d) District 4: A sprawling and hilly proposed district which includes the South Hills Preserve, and also much of the City's undeveloped lands, it is also the least-populated district; the 'DRA 2020' district statistics panel shows it about 700 residents below the average district population. This is a total deviation of about -19%, or 9% beyond the 'DRA 2020' allowable 10% deviation limit. Despite the author's best efforts to find a corrective solution, he could not do so without disturbing what he felt were the other districts' relatively close conformance to the federal and state voting rights laws' criteria. However, continued housing development near Reche Canyon and south of Huron St may correct the imbalance over the next few years.

The proposed map seemingly shows this district as non-contiguous; this is due to the precinct 'Block Group 1 from 20 blocks' being included. However, the 'DRA 2020' district statistics panel shows this district is indeed contiguous.

(e) District 5: This burgeoning proposed district includes Block Group 3. Although the 2020 census demographics indicates the block group has a high Hispanic CVAP, this formerly rural area is

now experiencing significant new single-family housing development. Due to what the author believes are its likely demographic trajectories, it has been included in District 5.

====*====

The author wishes to thank the Loma Linda City Council for this opportunity to constructively shape the future of our wonderful community, and hopes his efforts will be of some use to the City.

Craig Chernos