

From: [PAULA PELOT](#)
To: [Anita Shepherd-Sharp](#); [Layne Long](#); [Matthew Mogensen](#)
Cc: [Jeff Tilton](#); [Douglas Johnson](#)
Subject: February 23, 2022 Public Hearing on District Mapping - Please distribute to the Council, Staff and post for the Public as Comments for Tonight's Public Hearing
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 11:59:27 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Preston & Abrams Parks have been a single community for nearly twenty-five years. We share resources, property management and a Tenants association with the below stated mission:

"To improve the quality of life in the Preston Park & Abrams Park communities and to promote a safe, clean neighborhood environment in which to live;

To serve as a focal point for maintenance and improvement of institutions and facilities serving our neighborhood, including but not limited to parks, schools, and public safety services, and to provide an avenue for neighborhood social activities;

To be a voice for our common tenant interests by acting as a liaison with governmental bodies and with institutions, schools, and businesses in and around our neighborhood, and by working with other neighborhood associations on common concerns;

To represent the interests of the tenants by providing testimony at public and civic forums and to the management and ownership of Preston Park & Abrams Park;

To promote and encourage positive community and civic spirit;

To provide a forum for discussing and addressing neighborhood concerns;

To encourage and facilitate vigorous citizen participation in all issues affecting our neighborhood, including but not limited to land use, development, zoning, traffic patterns and street modifications, public safety and environmental concerns."

As a single cohesive community with in-common interests, Preston & Abrams Parks should not be split between any of the proposed mapped districts. **I ask that the following maps that do split our community therefore be eliminated from consideration: 209, 401, 402, 503, 504, 505, and 506.**

In addition, I have noted that the cause of some of the maps showing the renter vs owner percentages to be very high, i.e., 89% renters is due to the included CSUMB student housing population in the very bottom of the city's jurisdiction and many of the proposed maps. That population, although citizen renters, have not historically participated to a large degree in our governing activities. That could be because they may not consider themselves to be a part of the Marina community. I sincerely hope

that in the future we do whatever possible to encourage more robust participation from this population. For now, it is an included student renter population count that makes for an **anomalously high percentage in certain maps**. Nonetheless, I urge you to keep those maps in the group to be considered and **not toss them out** based on this anomaly.

Because there are renter percentages that are lower in some proposed mapped districts than the average percentage of the renter population in the city overall, **I ask for the elimination of those maps from consideration as follows: 105, 501, 502, 507, and 508**. To not eliminate them would mean you are building in the potential for underrepresentation of a community of interest that is well over half of the population of Marina.

Of the remaining maps, all of which keep the Preston/Abrams Parks community of interest together and take into consideration the CSUMB student housing anomaly, there are some that have “cleaner” appearances. This is only because they have fewer odd “pieces” to balance the population.

Although this consideration is not critical to me as are the first two above items, I would also there ask that you eliminate the following maps as less “compact”: **101, 104, 107, 108, 112, 202, 203, 211, 212, 215, and 509**.

With the exception of maps **509** and **212**, none of the above are unacceptable. Maps 509 and 202 however cut across the city in seemingly unusual ways to balance out the maps.

I am therefore left with the following maps with the staff report scoring that I ask you to consider:

| Map # | Scored | Deviation % | R-4 Dominant | P/A - Central Marina | Econ Areas | City Park | Open Space | Schools |
|-------|--------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|------------|---------|
| 113 | 1 | 9.94 | | | | X | | |
| 111 | 2 | 8.74 | | | X | | | X |
| 206 | 3 | 6.03 | X | | X | | | X |
| 201 | 3 | 8.51 | X | | X | | | X |
| 208 | 3 | 5.92 | X | | X | | | X |
| 109 | 4 | 8.46 | X | | X | X | | X |
| 110 | 4 | 8.96 | X | | X | X | | X |

Please note that I believe Map 206’s score on the “Table 2. Draft City Council District Boundary Submissions Eligible for Adoption” was reported as “2” but had 3 categories checked. I don’t know if there were others wherein the tally may have been inaccurate.

As someone who has served on a regional redistricting commission, I do not understand the value of scoring Open Space, City Parks and Schools as considerations in the mapping of City voting districts. I have similar concerns about some of the other scoring factors, such as the connection of Preston/Abrams to Central Marina, as to their impact/intersection with the process of mapping for the

City's voting districts.

Although I believe these factors result in scores that have little relevance to the purpose of mapping voter districts, I find any of the maps in the above table (**109, 110, 111, 113, 201, 206, 208**) worthy of consideration.

Respectfully,
Paula F. Pelot
Preston & Abrams Parks Tenants Association