

from: Leslie Cox <Redacted>
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Oct 11, 2021, 2:15 PM
subject: Comment on district selection for Tustin

Good day,

I want to voice opinion to draw Irvine and Tustin District together. Both communities are very intertwined and to separate them would be a great disservice. Tustin and Irvine share shopping centers (Tustin Ranch Marketplace and The District). Both communities share schools including Beckman High and even UCI is considered "local" for those who live in Tustin.

Thank you,

Leslie Cox,

from: Becca Fong Emery <Redacted>
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Oct 13, 2021, 5:09 PM
subject: written feedback about draft maps

Dear Draw Tustin coordinator / committee,

Thank you for encouraging City of Tustin residents to participate in this process. My household received a mailer in the post. Though the in-person workshops are not conducive to our schedule, we appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on this issue.

At this time, I'd like to submit feedback based on the draft maps.

From the outset, I'd like to clearly state my understanding of the goal is to resolve *at-large voting* by establishing "at least one district in which voters of color are the majority of the voting-age population in that district." ([This NAACP LDF document](#) informed my understanding.)

Secondly, a relatively equal distribution of the population was important to me. So, draft maps 109, 112 and 114 were more closely examined. **At this time, draft map 114 has my highest level of support** for the following reasons:

- Proposed District 2 defines a district in which voters of color are the majority of the voting-age population. In particular, it has a predominantly higher percentage of Hispanic residents.
- Draft map 114 had no decrease in the percentage of non-Hispanic (NH) Black voter turnout between 2018 and 2020. The same observation doesn't apply to draft maps 109 or 112.
- Draft map 114 has the least disparity in ACS population estimate compared to both maps 109 and 112.
- Proposed District 2 had significantly less disparity in terms of percentage of single family homes as well as percentage of housing ownership in contrast to draft map 109 (District 1).
- Proposed District 4 residents have a more even spread based on formal education. The same observation doesn't apply to draft maps 109 or 112.

Thank you again for public outreach efforts, especially making so much information available online to help us deliberate proposals. Should future questions arise or clarifications about my remarks be requested, I may be contacted by email.

Kindly,

Becca Emery

City of Tustin resident