

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Clerk DL](#)
Subject: Comments for OSA Board February 24, 2022 Item #NB1: Redistricting
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 10:29:07 AM

Hello Open Space Authority Board and Staff,

Comments for your February 24, 2022 meeting
Agenda Item #NB1: Draft of Electoral Division Plans;
Redistricting Public Hearing #1

I was disappointed in the sparseness of the material in the meeting packet.

But to start on a positive note, I prefer map b or c over a.
I like d1 with mid-county horizontal boundary rather than extending up
the eastern edge of county; this reduces travel time and additional
communities for d1 outreach.

So now my disappointments.

#1: Maps at redistrictingpartners.com do not show city boundaries
nor major roads. So what land is actually covered by each district?

#2: Given the desired focus on Communities of Interest (COI) for this round
of redistricting (Specification of Criteria to Guide the Realignment of
Director Divisions #4), where and what are the specific COIs for each
district?

#3: Why does map c extend d3 north as opposed to map b extend d2 west?

Thank you for your consideration, Doug Muirhead, Morgan Hill

Attachment(s) Links:

Draft Plan A Redistricting Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority Districts:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/dt8pg8tnde18k2n/SCVOSA%20Draft%20Plan%20A.pdf?dl=0>

Draft Plan A web-map:
<https://redistrictingpartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/SCVOSA-Draft-Plan-A-1.html>

Draft Plan B Redistricting Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority Districts:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/ctioorlzz65jcin/SCVOSA%20Draft%20Plan%20B.pdf?dl=0>

Draft Plan B web-map: <https://redistrictingpartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/SCVOSA-Draft-Plan-B-1.html>

Draft Plan C Redistricting Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority Districts:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/2ub534kjgolsh1m/SCVOSA%20Draft%20Plan%20C.pdf?dl=0>

Specification of Criteria to Guide the Realignment of Director Divisions

1. The boundaries of the director divisions shall be realigned so that the director divisions are equal in population as defined by law.
2. The boundaries of the director divisions shall not be gerrymandered in violation of the principles established by the United States Supreme Court in *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), and its progeny.
3. The boundaries of the director divisions shall be realigned so that the director divisions do not result in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen to vote on account of race or color as provided in Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act.
4. The boundaries of the director divisions shall observe communities of interest, developed primarily around the current director divisions, but also including rural or urban populations, municipalities, county supervisorial districts, city council districts, social interests, agricultural, industrial or service industry interests, and the like, insofar as practicable.
5. The boundaries of the director divisions shall be compact, insofar as practicable.
6. The boundaries of the director divisions shall be created to contain cohesive, contiguous territory, insofar as practicable.
7. The boundaries of the director divisions may observe topography and geography, such as the existence of mountains, flat land, forest lands, man-made geographical features such as highways and canals, etc. as natural divisions between director divisions, insofar as practicable.
8. Unless otherwise required by law, the director divisions shall be created using whole census blocks.
9. The boundaries of the director divisions may avoid the "pairing" of incumbents in the same director divisions, insofar as this does not conflict with the constitutions and laws of the State of California and the United States.
10. The boundaries of the director divisions shall comply with such other factors which become known during the redistricting process and are formally adopted by the Board of Directors.