
From: Alan Ferdman [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 16, 2023 11:48 PM
To: Jason Gibbs <JGIBBS@santa-clarita.com>; Marsha McLean [REDACTED]; Laurene Weste <LWESTE@santa-clarita.com>; Bill Miranda <BMIRANDA@santa-clarita.com>; Cameron Smyth <CSMYTH@santa-clarita.com>; Scott Rafferty CVRA [REDACTED]; Draw Santa Clarita <DRAWSC@santa-clarita.com>
Cc: Rick Drew [REDACTED]; Douglas Fraser [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments in relation to CVRA District Map Public Hearing April 13, 2023

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

Mayor Gibbs

To recap my impression and recommendations from the first Public Hearing on the proposed district voting map.

While I had no basic objection to the way the district map was presented in the first Public Hearing, my main concern revolved around District One, the remedial district, having the largest population. I did not submit a proposed map as I felt an inability to provide a suggestion without knowing the demographic implications. Instead, I submitted a suggestion to remove Happy Valley from District 1 to hopefully reduce the population disparity.

The second Public Hearing, held last Thursday April 13, provided a grouping of nine proposed maps. Seven of which were submitted by the public, one submitted by the Chamber of Commerce and one, created by the demographer, using the original map and implementing the changes I suggested. That map titled Map 108, not only showed a reduction in the population disparity between districts but also increased the Hispanic majority to 60%.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the council seemed to feel there needed to be some additional map tweaks and chose to use Map 107, the one submitted by the Chamber of Commerce, as the starting point.

Instead, it is my position, the demographer should start with Map 108 to clearly define any changes to the previously agreed map version. In that way any changes or reductions in Division One population can be offset by increases from other district areas maintaining the small population deviation identified in Map 108 data. I fully realize California law allows a deviation of up to 10%, but I am of the opinion we can, and should, work toward finding a result much closer to the smallest possible deviation, making the solution more equitable, and fair. I am also requesting any district map changes be revealed with a valid justification clearly documented.

Several individuals who testified at City Council meetings indicated their belief the CVRA intent is to elect a Hispanic council member. I beg to differ, as the CVRA was not implemented to elect a candidate of any ethnic origin, but to provide a protected minority class the ability to elect a candidate of their choice. Even that will not happen by chance. Looking at the data for Map 108, which has the largest Hispanic population, their numbers fall short in registered voters, meaning there is a lot more work to be done.

I also want to voice my adamant objection to the suggestion, the city name the remedial district, by any other means than used to identify the other four districts. We should not, in any way, make the naming conventions indicate the remedial district is any different, or less valuable. For far too long, the name Canyon Country has been used to belittle the neighborhood I have resided in for the past 58 years. I have lived here long enough to see my neighborhood in decline and come back better than it has ever been in the past. To imply that Canyon Country, or anywhere in the remedial district, is not as valuable as any other area in Santa Clarita would defeat the purpose of the CVRA and show our Santa Clarita City Council is not interested in representing all our residents.

I look forward to seeing the outcome of this latest set of comments at the next District Map presentation.

Sincerely,
Alan Ferdman

[REDACTED]