

from: Vicky Schulte <Redacted>
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Oct 26, 2021, 12:52 PM
subject: Please consider adopting map 115

Dear Tustin City Council:

I ask that the City Council adopt [Map 115](#) . I also encourage the council to recommend that District 2 be one of the districts up for election in 2022.

- This map creates a majority Latino district while maximizing the integration of the Latino population throughout all City Council districts.
- This map keeps intact major communities of interest: Old Town, Tustin Ranch, Tustin Legacy, and northern Tustin.
- This map has the most geographically compact districts, as far as possible with Tustin's weird shape.
- District 2 (SW Tustin and Old Town) has been historically underrepresented, currently does not have a member of the City Council, and should be able to elect a representative in 2022.

Vicky Schulte

from: Cathy Threadgill <Redacted>
to: "drawtustin@tustinca.org" <drawtustin@tustinca.org>
date: Oct 29, 2021, 10:59 AM
subject: Tustin Districting

Greetings,

I am a resident of Tustin, Tustin Ranch specifically, in Orange County. **I DO NOT support the draft maps/visualization.** This map splits up the northern part of Tustin and North Tustin from the rest of the City, and places those portions in a district with Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, and Chino Hills. I live, work, and shop in Tustin. I have never even been to Rowland Heights, Chino Hills or Walnut ...the latter isn't even in Orange County. They are not in Tustin's community of interest. I definitely have never been shopping, working, or visiting friends in any of those places.

The map the City voted to adopt (Map 113) is an effort to segregate the Latino population of Tustin. This map creates an overwhelming Latino district, whereas other maps (including Map 115) would create one Latino majority district and another Latino influence district. Instead, this map attempts to reduce Latino influence in Tustin elections.

Map 113 has the highest population deviation of any map considered, and most at the maximum allowable deviation. This map splits communities of interest. A portion of Tustin Ranch is split off (between Bryan and the 5, and Browning and Tustin Ranch Road. No other maps do this, and all submissions assumed that Tustin Ranch was a community of interest. It does this by placing Laurelwood and portions near Nelson Elementary in the Tustin Ranch district, rather in a district with most of the south east Tustin (including Tustin Legacy). This appears to be a clear effort to separate two or three councilmembers who would otherwise naturally be located in a southeast Tustin district. AND, it splits historic Old Town, which traditionally crossed I-5.

The sequencing adopted by this map is improper for several reasons:

- The sequencing was adopted with the express interest of allowing one member of the Council to seek re-election in this cycle. Districts and election sequencing should be implemented without regard to any candidate or officeholder, but solely in the public interest.
- The Mayor should be elected in Presidential years, when there is the highest voter turnout.
- The justification not to hold an election in District 2 in 2022 was because Latino turnout increased in the presidential years instead of the midterms. But if that is the case, then holding the mayoral election in midterm years appears to be an effort to reduce minority influence in City elections.
- This map and sequencing seem to be intentional gerrymanders.

from: Patricia Trujillo <Redacted>
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Oct 30, 2021, 7:00 PM
subject: Tustin Districting - New submission from Contact Us

I think that Map 115 is a fairer representation of our cities demographics.
Thank you

from: Jenny Golden <Redacted>

to: "drawtustin@tustinca.org" <drawtustin@tustinca.org>

date: Oct 30, 2021, 8:27 PM

subject: Redistricting

I moved to Tustin this year. One of the reasons I chose Tustin was the wonderful, multicultural and tolerant attitude of the city. In keeping with this ambience, please select. Map 115. This map preserves the essential nature of our community and allows all of us the most fair representation. Keep Tustin the open community it is now!

Jenny Golden

from: Kambiz Shoarinejad <Redacted>

to: drawtustin@tustinca.org

date: Nov 1, 2021, 6:56 AM

subject: District Maps

Dear Madam/Sir,

We have lived in Tustin Ranch since 2019 and we wanted to let you know that unfortunately the adopted Map 113 does not seem the most inclusive and non-partisan map. We like to request that it gets reverted and Map 115 be adopted instead. We support Map 115 as we find it the most non-partisan map.

Thanks for your attention.

Best Regards
Kambiz Shoarinejad

from: Ari Mishkin <Redacted>
to: "drawtustin@tustinca.org" <drawtustin@tustinca.org>
date: Nov 1, 2021, 12:28 PM
subject: Districting

Greetings:

I am writing today to express my opposition to the strategy of Tustin city Council. I see absolutely no benefit to it whatsoever. At worst, it creates an opportunity for districts to create a coalition and block all of the wants and needs of a particular other district.

Furthermore, I feel that as a citizen of Tustin my vote should be counted for all of my representatives in the city Council. Redistricting

from: Ari Mishkin <Redacted>
to: "drawtustin@tustinca.org" <drawtustin@tustinca.org>
date: Nov 1, 2021, 12:50 PM
subject: Districting(cont)

Sorry, I'm just getting used to my mail client and I hit send on accident.

As I was saying, I don't feel that districting would benefit any population in Tustin and would cheat voters out of their full representation. It would not create any opportunity for a lower income area to better finance candidates. It is just an attempt at dividing the city by property values from what I see.

The city is divided enough already. The Tustin Ranchers hate that when people get off the freeway at Red Hill that what they arrive to is a Big Lots and a big empty lot. But that is where you are. That is this neighborhood. There's a reason we have two 99 Cent Only Stores and two 7-11s within 2 miles of one another, a broken down Stater Brother's and supermercados. You can do all the gentrification you want down Red Hill Avenue and all the division of communities, but it's not going to change the demographic makeup.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the entire concept.

Ari Mishkin

from: Nancy Shumar(Redacted)
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Nov 1, 2021, 6:04 PM
subject: Tustin Districting - New submission from Contact Us

I am a 40 year resident of Old Town Tustin, and I think the selected map, 113, is by far the wisest choice. Those who say 115 best preserves OTT don't live in our neighborhood! I think the City did due diligence in drawing 113 to best suit the various neighborhoods. Most neighbors, like me, are saddened by the switch to district voting, but everyone I have spoken to favors 113, as it best preserves not only our neighborhood but the overall city as well.

from: Rachel & Sean Alcantara <Redacted>
to: drawtustin@tustinca.org
date: Nov 2, 2021, 10:26 AM
subject: Tustin Districting

Map 115 is the most reasonable map and aligns the current communities. Please support map 115.

Map 113 has the highest population deviation of any map considered. This map splits communities of interest. A portion of Tustin Ranch is split off (between Bryan and the 5, and Browning and Tustin Ranch Road. No other maps do this, and all submissions assumed that Tustin Ranch was a community of interest. It does this by placing Laurelwood and portions near Nelson Elementary in the Tustin Ranch district, rather in a district with most of the south east Tustin (including Tustin Legacy).

This appears to be a clear effort to separate two or three councilmembers who would otherwise naturally be located in a separate Tustin district. AND, it splits historic Old Town, which traditionally crossed I-5. The sequencing adopted by this map is improper for several reasons:

- The sequencing was adopted with the express interest of allowing one member of the Council to seek re-election in this cycle. Districts and election sequencing should be implemented without regard to any candidate or officeholder, but solely in the public interest.
- The Mayor should be elected in Presidential years, when there is the highest voter turnout.
- The justification not to hold an election in District 2 in 2022 was because Latino turnout increased in the presidential years instead of the midterms. But if that is the case, then holding the mayoral election in midterm years appears to be an effort to reduce minority influence in City elections.

- This map and sequencing seem to be intentional gerrymanders.

Thank you,
Sean and Rachel Alcantara