

From: [Alan Ferdman](#)
To: [Draw Santa Clarita](#)
Subject: Proposed District Map 113
Date: Sunday, May 21, 2023 10:32:36 PM

CITY WARNING: This email was sent from an external server. Use caution clicking links or opening attachments.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Alan Ferdman [REDACTED]
To: Jason Gibbs <jgibbs@santa-clarita.com>; Marsha McLean <marmclean@ca.rr.com>; Cameron Smyth <csmyth@santa-clarita.com>; Bill Miranda <bmiranda@santa-clarita.com>; Laurene Weste <lweste@santa-clarita.com>; Ken Striplin <kstriplin@santa-clarita.com>; Scott Rafferty CVRA [REDACTED]; Michael Cruz [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 21, 2023 at 10:25:05 PM PDT
Subject: Proposed District Map 113

Mayor Gibbs

I'm sure you recall, at the first public hearing held to collect public opinion related to potential district maps, my comments revolved around District 1, the remedial district, being the largest of the 5 proposed districts. In addition, the map included Happy Valley, a neighborhood which is both demographically and economically different from the rest of District 1. I therefore asked for Happy Valley to be removed from the district one assignment.

At a subsequent meeting the demographer presented a map (108) with Happy Valley removed from District 1, and because it was accomplished per my comments, he named it, the Alan Ferdman map. Map 108 showed a reduction in District 1 of 1254 residents, which reduced the overall District population spread to approximately 2500 residents with District 3 remaining the smallest district of our 5 City Districts.

I didn't comment further because I had wrongfully assumed when the demographer would implement the Chamber of Commerce's recommendations he would be adding and subtracting from district one, so that the overall population counts would remain essentially the same.

However now I can see a version of Map 113 loaded on the city website. It is dated the 16th of May and is indicated as a " compilation many previously requested changes and potentially final tune up of the map".

The included data however, seem to indicate a different story. District one has now grown back to 48,201 and with Happy Valley removed it shows the demographer to have added 1923 residents into District 1 by implementing the changes requested by the Chamber of Commerce.

If you believe that the justification of not having boundaries within neighborhoods as stated by the chamber are valid, combining them into District 1 and surrounding Districts equally would be a valid solution. But currently, the majority are being added to District 1 while other districts like Districts 2 and 4 shrunk by 1000. That increases

the disparity between districts.

Since reasonable justification of the changes were not included, I wonder if some of these changes disguise the movement of specific individuals into districts more favorable for them to run for City Council in 2024 and beyond.

To correct this matter, I strongly recommend you go back to the demographer and ask for changes to be reimplemented which would blend the Chambers Recommendations over all the district populations. In addition, each change must include a justification, for the Council and Public to accept, or challenge.

Your prompt action for correcting this disparity would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Alan Ferdman
CEO, Santa Clarita Community Coun