March 8, 2021

Sent Via Email

Fullerton City Council
City Council Chambers
303 West Commonwealth Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92832
CouncilMembers@cityoffullerton.com

Re: Public Comment on the City Council Redistricting Process
March 8, 2022 City Council Meeting, Item 1

Dear Members of the Fullerton City Council:

We urge the City Council to consider Map 110 during tonight’s redistricting public hearing. Map 110 was created by community members throughout Fullerton, including residents from all five districts and individuals served by Ahri for Justice, Orange County Environmental Justice, and Orange County Congregation Community Organization. This group of organizations and residents are part of the Fullerton Redistricting Commission. Map 110 was widely supported during Fullerton Advisory Commission (Commission) meetings and workshops and follows mandatory redistricting criteria. We further urge the Council to comply with its obligations under federal and state law, including its obligation to adopt a map that captures communities of interest and that does not consider relationships with incumbents or political candidates when assessing communities of interest.2

The Fair and Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities and Political Subdivisions Act (Fair Maps Act) requires the City Council to, in order of priority: comply with the federal requirement that districts be substantially equal in population, comply with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act, and create districts that are geographically contiguous, maintain communities of interest, have boundaries that are easily identifiable and understandable by residents, and are compact.3 Map 110 complies with the Fair Maps Act’s mandatory redistricting criteria. The map contains districts that are geographically contiguous and maintain communities of interest. As discussed in greater detail in the map narrative, each of these communities share a series of interests and concerns. For example, districts 4 and 5 maintain communities south of Chapman Avenue that are lower income, Latino, housing insecure, and impacted by environmental toxins and pollutants.4 District 3 includes Fullerton College, Cal State Fullerton and Hope International University. There are also low-income communities in district 3 and these communities share interests around affordable and stable housing with college students in the area.5 Finally, Map 110

creates compact districts with borders that include major streets and landmarks and will therefore be easily identifiable by residents.\textsuperscript{6}

Although Map 110 has received robust public support,\textsuperscript{7} the Commission did not recommend Map 110 to the City Council. Instead, the Commission voted 4-3 to advance maps 111 and 112 and 5-2 to advance Map 114.\textsuperscript{8} The Commission’s recommendations, however, are not binding on the Council.\textsuperscript{9} We therefore urge you to consider Map 110 during tonight’s public hearing because it incorporates public testimony, has received strong public support from community members, and complies with federal and state redistricting criteria.

Map 114 is a version of a map submitted by Commissioners Gregory Sebourn and John Seminara.\textsuperscript{10} As we have flagged in prior correspondence, Commissioner Gregory Sebourn is a former councilmember. Commissioner Sebourn ran for district 3 in 2018 and lost to Councilmember Jesus Silva. This map not only splits Cal State Fullerton and Fullerton College into different districts, but according to community members, it also pairs Councilmember Silva with Councilmember Nick Dunlap in district 3. Taken together, this raises serious questions about whether some Commissioners improperly considered political candidates when they voted to advance Map 114. It is therefore imperative that the Council continue to keep in mind that state law prohibits you from considering relationships with incumbents or political candidates as part of your communities of interest assessment.\textsuperscript{11} We urge you to follow state and federal law and adopt lines that protect communities of interest, not lines that protect, or purposefully disadvantage, incumbents or ensure that certain candidates can be elected in the future.

We look forward to continue working with the City to make this a fair, open, and transparent process. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us at jgomez@aclusocal.org or evalencia@aclusocal.org should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Julia A. Gomez
Staff Attorney
ACLU of Southern California

Cynthia Valencia
Senior Policy Advocate and Organizer
ACLU of Southern California

\textsuperscript{6} Cal. Elec. Code §§ 21601(c)(2)-(3).
\textsuperscript{9} Compare Cal. Elec. Code § 23000(a) (defining an advisory commission as a body that makes map recommendations to the legislative body) with Cal Elec. Code §§ 23000(c) & (d) (defining a hybrid commission as a body that recommends two or more district maps to the legislative body that the legislative body must then choose from, and defining an independent commission as a body, other than the legislative body, that is empowered to adopt a final district map).
\textsuperscript{11} Cal. Elec. Code § 21601(c)(2).