

Communication from Public

Name: Russia Chavis Cardenas, California Common Cause
Date Submitted: 10/13/2023 04:01 PM
Council File No: 22-1196-S1
Comments for Public Posting: Comments are in the attached file.

District Numbering

We write to weigh in on district numbering with twin goals: To ensure that revised maps are not biased to protect incumbency, but to ensure consistency and familiarity for voters to the extent reasonable. We embrace a district numbering system that places the greatest number of people in a district with the same number as their previous (pre-redistricting) district – e.g. choosing a district to label District 2 that would include the most people who were in District 2 in the previous decade -- but with a critical caveat that this system only come into play *after* the district lines are drawn.

If keeping residents in the districts they were previously in was a line-drawing criteria used *before* district lines were finalized, the entire process would be rigged toward the status quo, resulting in totally inappropriate incumbency protections.

The recommendation, as proposed, could make existing City Council districts the starting point for new districts and is a significant departure from the purpose of establishing an independent redistricting commission. Instead, we recommend that the City of LA's independent redistricting commission start with a blank slate, as the state's gold-standard Citizens Redistricting Commission has done, prioritizing unbiased, ranked line-drawing criteria and community input.

On the question of district numbering, one strong option would be to add a clause that states that ensuring the greatest number of residents as possible remains in the same numbered district does not allow the Independent Redistricting Commission to start with or attempt to replicate previous maps.

Thank you for your time and consideration.