

From: [Sandra Hay](#)
To: [cityclerk](#)
Subject: Council Meeting Comment
Date: Thursday, March 03, 2022 8:04:02 AM
Attachments: [Map_106.png](#)
[Map_107.png](#)

Regarding Item G1 - redistricting maps

There has been a lot of discussion regarding map 106 and how it is supposedly the best map. I would like to point out, however, that there are some problems with that map that need to be cleared up.

First of all, the population distribution is not supposed to exceed 10% difference in all of the districts and it appears that it does exceed that limit (unless there is evidence I'm not privy to that contradicts this). Map 107, for example, only has a 5.2% population distribution difference.

It has been pointed out that there needs to be three minority majority districts, but I believe all of the maps under consideration have that. I'm attaching some screenshots from Dave's redistricting website on those statistics (granted, the data for map 106 may be off a bit since I had to try and recreate it from the graphic on your website), but the difference in percentages of minority and hispanic population from one map to the other is not huge.

As you prepare to discuss these maps, I ask that you dig into why the push for map 106 that creates a district 4 with the highest population number while pushing district three to a population much less than all of the other districts (and 2k less than district 4). Again, I don't have access to the statistics for map 106 and had to do my best to recreate it so that I could look at the analysis, but I'm assuming you have all that data at your disposal.

Whose voice is being represented with map 106? Whose voice are they trying to dilute and why? Seems to me that we need to focus on equal representation which is why the population deviation rule was set at less than 10%. I could understand if the percentages of minorities in each of the maps was way different, but they are not. All I'm asking is that you consider the data and address these issues in your discussion.

Thank you.

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

| White | Minority | Hispanic | Black | Asian | Native | Pacific |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| 29.88% | 70.12% | 48.23% | 8.13% | 12.25% | 1.31% | 0.00% |
| 14.17% | 85.83% | 62.46% | 7.56% | 14.62% | 0.85% | 0.00% |
| 40.26% | 59.74% | 48.01% | 4.35% | 5.89% | 1.35% | 0.00% |
| 49.44% | 50.56% | 35.77% | 5.42% | 7.71% | 0.61% | 0.54% |
| 32.53% | 67.47% | 44.40% | 12.39% | 8.84% | 0.83% | 0.04% |
| 30.83% | 69.17% | 41.95% | 4.93% | 21.78% | 0.22% | 0.00% |
| 34.67% | 65.33% | 45.21% | 7.14% | 11.60% | 0.82% | 0.12% |

| White | Minority | Hispanic | Black | Asian | Native | Pacific |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| 28.55% | 71.45% | 48.90% | 7.98% | 13.17% | 1.26% | 0.00% |
| 14.88% | 85.12% | 61.08% | 7.25% | 15.68% | 0.88% | 0.00% |
| 42.51% | 57.49% | 46.88% | 5.71% | 3.44% | 1.20% | 0.00% |
| 45.50% | 54.50% | 36.96% | 7.99% | 7.70% | 0.49% | 0.56% |
| 27.88% | 72.12% | 47.07% | 10.63% | 12.95% | 0.71% | 0.04% |
| 38.27% | 61.73% | 38.68% | 3.57% | 18.60% | 0.60% | 0.00% |
| 34.67% | 65.33% | 45.21% | 7.14% | 11.60% | 0.82% | 0.12% |