

**REPORT OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL DISTRICTS
TO THE ANAHEIM CITY COUNCIL**

I. Introduction and Executive Summary

The Committee on Electoral Districts (hereinafter "Committee") was established by the Anaheim City Council on April 7, 2015, pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 2015-147 in response to the passage of Anaheim Measures L and M, which were approved by the voters in November 2014. Measure L establishes elections by district for city council seats other than the Mayor, who will continue to be elected city-wide. Measure M increases the number of council seats, not including the Mayor, from four to six and requires staggering of City Council district elections for those seats with four seats being up for election in 2016 (one of which would thereafter randomly be selected for a 2-year term) with three seats up for election in 2018.

The Committee is made up of five retired judges who served on the Orange County Superior Court. One, Justice Edward Wallin, who serves as the Committee Chairman, is a resident of the City of Anaheim and a retired Justice of the California Court of Appeal in Orange County. The other four, Judge James Jackman, Judge Nancy Wieben Stock, Judge Stephen Sundvold and Judge Thomas Thrasher, are residents of Orange, Fullerton, Placentia and Villa Park, respectively, and are each longtime residents of Orange County. These four were chosen at random from a group of fourteen retired Orange County Superior Court Judges who filed applications volunteering to serve on this Committee.

Summary of Recommendation to City Council: The Committee is pleased to unanimously recommend the attached Committee Recommended Plan (hereinafter "Plan", which, during the Committee's deliberations was referred to as "Map 3" or "Reyes 2, rev. Aug 29")) described in this report to the City Council of the City of Anaheim for its consideration. The Plan consists of two maps, one of the entire City and one showing only the central and western part of the City for ease of reference, as well as a demographic summary page. The districts are numbered one through six, with Council District 1 being the westernmost district and Council District 6 being the easternmost.

The Plan that we are forwarding to the City Council has received the overwhelming support of residents who testified from throughout the City at our 10 public meetings held in various locations in the City. More importantly, it received the most cogent and detailed testimony concerning how it met the legal criteria that guide our deliberations.

As retired Judges, we have spent our careers hearing cases in which we hear evidence and apply the law to the facts utilizing our own experiences, observations

and judgment. We have done this in this case and have concluded that this Plan does in fact best meet the legal criteria and best reflect the communities of interest within the City of Anaheim. In undertaking these deliberations we were also provided legal counsel and advice on the several maps that we reviewed during our deliberations.

The Plan has a total population deviation of 1.40%, with all deviation justified to follow major roads and keep communities of interest intact. It is a contiguous plan that strongly considers compactness, particularly in light of the elongated shape of the city. As the Plan description below details, it carefully delineates communities of interest as articulated in testimony during our public meetings. The Plan utilizes natural and man-made boundaries that are logical and easy to follow. This Plan carefully addresses voting rights. Significant and substantial public testimony supported how this Plan gives minority groups, particularly the large Latino population, the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice (this is also discussed below in more detail). Finally, we heard a substantial amount of support for this Plan from many individuals and groups from throughout the city, including support from those that had submitted "competing" maps, including maps that were in the final grouping of maps considered by the Committee (i.e., supporters of Map 1 and Map 2 before the Committee).

II. Public Outreach

A comprehensive outreach plan, "Shape Anaheim's Future," was developed and presented to the Committee. Outreach continued throughout this process which contributed to the notable community turnout and participation by over 600 attendees at public meetings held throughout the city from May through September, including submission of over 30 boundary map proposals. Samples of the city's outreach efforts are attached (Attachment E) and include:

- Designated districting webpage (www.anaheim.net/districts) – hosted all districting information (agendas, minutes, meeting videos, draft maps, public participation toolkit, Committee meeting calendar, and related documents etc.). A translation tool was made available to translate all related webpages (Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean and Vietnamese).
- Public Service Announcements (PSA) – Designed to encourage residents to join the conversation of districting. Anaheim residents participated in filming seven different PSAs (English and Spanish) and one group PSA explaining the process and encouraging participation. PSAs were aired on Anaheim's local channel, Time Warner cable, YouTube, linked to e-mail blasts prior to Committee meetings, and posted on the districting webpage.
- E-Postcards – grass roots effort to pass-forward information that was emailed prior to each Committee meeting (English and Spanish, with other languages available upon request) to groups/individuals identified by city staff in Police, Fire, Community Services, Public Utilities and Planning;

- included community leaders, organizations, faith based groups, individuals, as well as anyone who submitted map proposals and provided an email address and individuals who signed up at meetings and/or subscribed online.
- Press Releases – sent prior to each Community meeting to e-subscribers (over 10,000) and other city lists, including Police Chief’s Advisory Board and Chief’s Neighborhood Advisory Council, which represents 22 city neighborhoods.
 - Social Media (Facebook and Twitter) – posted e-postcards, press releases and general meeting announcements prior to each Committee meeting.
 - Fast Facts (English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Tagalog) – One page quick facts with meeting calendar. Placed at city libraries, community centers, city hall, provided to city field personnel and distributed hundreds of copies to residents for distribution.
 - Frequently Asked Questions – printed and posted online.
 - Public Utility Newsletter (over 115,000 residents and businesses).
 - Utility bill inserts.
 - Ad placement in:
 - Anaheim Magazine - online and print, reaching over 119,000 residents and businesses.
 - Andy Anaheim – monthly newsletter of city highlights reaching over 10,000 subscribers.
 - Community Services, Your Community Guide publication (Spanish – Tu Comunidad).
 - Media Outlets:
 - Articles written publicizing the process – OC Register, Orange Juice Blog, Anaheim Blog, OC Weekly, and Excelsior (Spanish paper).
 - Columns in OC Register, Our Towns Brief section and Anaheim Bulletin, community section.
 - Publicized by KPCC radio and Orange County Line- KCRW-FM 89.9.
 - Paid ads in print and online – OC Register, Anaheim Bulletin, The Notice, and Excelsior.
 - Aired all Committee meetings on ACTV (as well as posted online).
 - Save Water Expo – provided literature at city booth (June 6).
 - Presented update and process at Anaheim Beautiful luncheon, consisting of community volunteers and guests.

In addition to the foregoing outreach, following the release of consultant draft map plans, the City Clerk and city’s demographer attended all neighborhood council meetings (west, south, central and east Anaheim) to present the maps, encourage further participation and remind the public of the timeline to submit map proposals.

III. The Committee Process

The Committee conducted 10 public meetings from May through September to hear input from the public regarding the establishment of boundaries for the six council

districts. The meetings have been held at locations throughout the City. Committee meetings have been well-attended and there have been numerous public speakers at each meeting. In addition, the City Clerk and the demographic consultant made presentations to all four Neighborhood Councils in July to encourage public involvement in this process and to receive additional public input.

The City's demographic consultant and special legal counsel briefed the Committee on several occasions on the Constitutional, statutory and case law criteria for districting and there has been a large amount of public testimony regarding issues such as population equality, compactness and contiguity of districts, natural and man-made features, and communities of interest. The Committee has received more than thirty districting proposals (some of which were revised and modified with assistance of the demographer) from sixteen different individuals or groups. Members of the public have provided many comments on these proposals. The proposals submitted by the community and demographic consultant, in addition to the written comments on these proposals are attached to this Final Report.

The agendas for all Committee meetings were available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean and Chinese. A Spanish interpreter was available at each meeting and interpreters for other languages were available upon request. Half of the meetings were held at City Hall because of its central location and the enhanced ability to videotape meetings in the Council Chambers, the other half of the meetings, as indicated below, were held in the west, south and east portions of the City. The minutes for all Committee meetings through August 26 are attached to this Final Report. The City Clerk will provide the minutes of later meetings as they are prepared.

The first Committee meeting was held on May 12, 2015 at City Hall and was an organizational meeting at which the Committee and public heard presentations on the districting process and legal criteria. The Committee established a schedule of ten meetings with the first four meetings designed primarily to receive input on communities of interest and the following six meetings to receive and review districting plans submitted by the public. Approximately 25 people attended. Eight members of the public spoke regarding the process, during the two agendaized public comment opportunities.

The second Committee meeting on May 27 was held at City Hall and had more detailed presentations on the legal criteria and the process, including instruction on how members of the public could submit their own districting plans using the Public Participation Kit that was available in hard copy and on the internet. It was announced at this meeting and stated on the agendas for all following meetings beginning with the June 4 meeting that the demographer would be available for an hour before each meeting and immediately after each meeting to help members of the public prepare their own districting plans. Approximately 45 people attended. Fourteen members of the public spoke.

The third meeting was held on June 4 at the Brookhurst Community Center in west Anaheim. It was announced that for the meeting on July 1, the City's demographer would produce three sample plans with maps and statistical data. This was to stimulate public comment and encourage the public to submit plans of their own. Approximately 38 people attended. Sixteen members of the public spoke, many of whom spoke to their communities of interest in west Anaheim.

The fourth meeting was held on June 9 at the East Anaheim Community Center. It was once again announced that members of the public were encouraged to submit their plans by July 1 so the demographer could review those plans and provide input to the submitter. Approximately 35 people attended. Six members of the public spoke. After taking public testimony, the Committee provided direction to the demographer on the criteria that should be used in preparing the sample plans.

The fifth meeting was held on July 1 at City Hall. The demographer presented his three sample districting plans. Members of the public were reminded that they should submit their plans by July 31 in order for the demographer to review them and work with the submitter on any corrections. It was also announced that the demographer and City Clerk would be making presentations at each of the four Neighborhood Council meetings held in various parts of the City on July 15, 16, 22 and 23 and be available before and after each of those meetings to assist the public in creating their own plans or in reviewing available plans. The demographer also announced his availability all day on July 16 and July 23 to meet with individuals or groups interested in this process. The demographer did receive requests to meet on those dates and met with individuals and groups from various parts of the City in order to assist them in reviewing demographic information so they could provide input to the Committee. Approximately 74 people attended. Nineteen members of the public spoke.

The sixth meeting was held on July 8 at the Ponderosa Family Resource Center in south Anaheim. Staff reminded the public of the July 31st deadline for submitting proposals as well as the demographer's availability on July 16 and 23. Approximately 45 people attended. Sixteen members of the public spoke, many of whom spoke to their communities of interest in south Anaheim. At this meeting, Oscar Reyes spoke about his original plan. Based on all the testimony received, the Committee directed the demographer to prepare an additional sample plan that would divide the Anaheim Resort area and keep the historic Colony together.

The seventh Committee meeting, which followed the four Neighborhood Council meetings, was held on August 19 in City Hall. By this date, the City had received 20 complete submittals including maps and statistics plus one submission of a single district. Approximately 130 people were in attendance. Twenty-two people spoke, many detailing the features of their own submission. In addition, the demographer presented Consultant Draft 4 to the Committee, which responded to Committee direction at the July 8th meeting. At this meeting, Mr. Reyes spoke about his revised plan, titled "Reyes 2." This plan made a substantial modification to the westernmost

two districts in his original plan, shaping them vertically instead of horizontally in response to community concerns expressed by those in west Anaheim. Several members of the public expressed support for the Reyes Map 2 and some suggested possible further modifications to it. Individuals from the Colony area spoke in favor of the boundaries of the central district in Consultant Map 3. The Committee selected five maps for focused review at the next meeting. These were Chuchua Map 4, Gagne Map 1, Reyes Map 2 and Consultant Drafts 3 and 4. The Committee directed the demographer to report on what it would take to draw two majority-Latino by CVAP districts into Chuchua Map 4 and Reyes Map 2.

The eighth meeting was held on August 26 at Western High School in west Anaheim. The demographer provided test maps showing versions of Chuchua Map 4 and Reyes Map 2 with two majority-Latino by CVAP districts. Approximately 120 people were in attendance. Twenty-two people spoke, including several supporting their own submittals. A large majority of those present expressed support for Reyes Map 2 with some suggesting possible modifications, but no public comment favored and several opposed the demographer's test map that had modified district boundaries to form a second Latino CVAP majority district. The speakers expressed that the changes necessary to create such a district would break up established communities of interest and would weaken the Latino voting strength in the third most heavily Latino district. The Committee selected three maps for further focused review at the next meeting. These were Chuchua Map 4 (renamed by staff as "Map 1"), Gagne Map 1 (renamed by staff as "Map 2") and Reyes Map 2 (renamed by staff as "Map 3"). The Committee then directed the demographer to report on options for the two districts west of Euclid and to draw in the border between Districts 5 and 6 such that all of the Tustin/La Palma intersection was in District 6.

The ninth meeting was held on September 8 at Loara High School in south Anaheim. The demographer reported on options on the two districts west of Euclid as well as on the border between Districts 5 and 6. By this point, several modified versions of earlier plans had been submitted. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) submitted a revised map designated LULAC Map 1, Rev. Sept. 4. Greg Diamond submitted on behalf of Brian Chuchua several revisions to the earlier Chuchua map. The three plans that received primary focus were Map 1 (Chuchua Map 4), Map 2 (Gagne Map 1) and Map 3 (Reyes Map 2, rev. Aug 29). Approximately 115 people were in attendance. Twenty-six people spoke. Several speakers from various areas of the City spoke in favor of Map 3 (Reyes Map 2, rev. Aug. 29) including speakers who had earlier favored other plans, one of the plaintiffs in the settled litigation *Moreno v. Anaheim* and others who withdrew their own maps in favor of Map 3. Other speakers who continued to favor other plans also commented favorably on the Map 3 plan including Greg Diamond on behalf of Chuchua 4, Benita Gagne on behalf of Gagne 1 and Zeke Hernandez on behalf of LULAC Map 1, Rev. Sept. 4. Several who supported Map 3 expressed their support for the proposed modification to the District 5/6 boundary. Following the conclusion of public testimony and comments by members of the Committee, it was moved by Judge Sundvold, seconded by Judge Stock and unanimously approved by the Committee to

tentatively select the Map 3 plan (Reyes 2, rev. Aug 29), as amended by a technical amendment to the boundary line between Districts 5 and 6, to move forward for further discussion and potential action as the recommendation of this Committee to the City Council and direct Staff to prepare a Final Report that includes that plan as amended for this Committee's consideration, discussion and possible action at our meeting on September 16 at City Hall.

The tenth meeting, at which this report is being considered, is being held on September 16 to hear further public comment and to consider, discuss and possibly act upon the draft report.

IV. Districting Criteria

The Committee provided direction to the demographer and the public at the June 9 meeting on the criteria by which we would be evaluating the plans. These are guided by the United States Constitution, California statute and binding court precedent, including precedent of the United States Supreme Court. The criteria discussed were:

- Compliance with Federal law and Supreme Court guidance:
 - Total population equality (also required by state law)
 - Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965
- Compliance with California Elections Code section 21620:
 - Topography
 - Geography
 - Cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory
 - Communities of Interest
- Future population growth

The Committee carefully considered all the proposals received and the input from members of the public. In the opinion of the Committee, the Plan (Map 3) best meets the legal criteria for districting and the needs of the City's residents. A summary of how the Plan meets these criteria is as follows:

Population Equality. The total population deviation between the largest and smallest district is only 1.40%. The City's total population at the time of the 2010 Census, which is the population we are required to use by California Elections Code Section 21620, is 336,265. This means that the ideal population per district is 56,044. The Plan has a total population deviation of only 1.40% between largest to smallest. The largest district by population is District 1, which is only 424 people (0.76%) over ideal and the smallest by population is District 3, which is only 363 people (0.65%) below ideal. (While .76 and .65 add up to 1.41, this is due to rounding. The total deviation is only 1.40%.) In addition to the legal requirement for total population equality, numerous public comments expressed the importance of this criterion as a factor in support for maps.

Federal Voting Rights Act. The Committee received extensive testimony regarding whether a plan with two out of the six districts with a majority of Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (hereinafter "CVAP") would be more effective in giving Latinos the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice than a plan with one district with a Latino majority CVAP and two districts with a substantial Latino plurality CVAP. We were ultimately persuaded by the overwhelming testimony of the Latino community, and others, that there is an effective opportunity to elect candidates of their choice in three districts with the Plan we are recommending and that such an opportunity is preferable to having a possibly greater opportunity to elect candidates of their choice in two districts but a far lesser opportunity in a third district. Of course, while this criteria was important to us in ascertaining compliance with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act, we are equally persuaded that the recommended Plan best achieves other traditional districting criteria as discussed in this Final Report. Ethnicity was not the predominant factor in our decision to recommend the Plan.

While predicting the outcome of future elections in districts that have not yet been created and for which candidates have not even filed to run is beyond the powers or scope of this Committee, we were persuaded by overwhelming public testimony that a plan with one district having a majority of Latino Citizens of Voting Age and two districts with a significant plurality of Latino Citizens of Voting Age is most consistent with the goals of the Federal Voting Rights Act. Among the points brought out in the testimony were: (1) the Latino Citizen Voting Age population is growing and may already be larger than is reflected in the five year average in the American Community Survey, (2.) the Latino community is becoming more politically active since the mobilization for the successful passage of Measures L and M, (3) the working class neighborhoods in these districts are anticipated to have many voters of other ethnicities who tend to vote similarly to Latinos, and (4) creating two Latino majority districts by necessity reduces the Latino population in adjacent districts, such that election of a third Latino council member is much more difficult. Finally, we again point out that the recommended Plan best addresses the other criteria set forth in the law, notwithstanding this criterion.

The Recommended Plan has one district with a Latino CVAP over 50% (District 3 at 50.8%) and two districts with a Latino CVAP plurality (District 4 at 46.8% and District 5 at 44.3%). One plan was submitted that had three districts with a majority of Latino Citizens of Voting Age but that plan was not supported by its own authors nor by anyone else who spoke. Furthermore, the Committee found that map to have districts that were not compact and which split communities of interest. It appeared that the map used race as its predominant, if not sole, criteria.

Citizen Voting Age Population figures relate to the ability of Latinos to elect candidates of their choice. As described by the demographer, these are five-year averages taken from the American Community Survey of 2009-2013. Citywide, the Latino CVAP is increasing at around 0.6% per year. It would be reasonable to assume that number is somewhat larger in the central parts of the City where the

Latino majority and plurality districts are located. Several speakers testified to their belief that the actual percentages in 2015 are higher than this, thereby effectively making District 4 a Latino CVAP majority district and making District 5 a more effective Latino plurality district for the elections in 2016 and future years. As discussed above, they testified repeatedly that they prefer the opportunity to elect three members to the City Council to having a higher population in two districts but a correspondingly smaller population in a third. Significantly, this position was shared by at least two speakers who are Latino and previously were candidates for City Council. The only testimony to the contrary was from two Latino individuals who do not reside in Anaheim.

Topography, Geography, Contiguity, and Compactness. The districts are contiguous and follow natural and man-made boundaries, such as Euclid Ave, Magnolia Ave., East Street and State College Blvd. The districts are as compact as possible given the irregular shape of the City, the need to respect communities of interest, and the need for equal population among the districts.

Communities of Interest. The districts in this Plan carefully delineate communities of interest as evidenced by the public testimony concerning areas such as west Anaheim, the Colony, the Resort Area, the Platinum Triangle, the Ponderosa neighborhoods, areas of west Anaheim north of Interstate 5 (referred to by some community members as the "Bermuda Triangle"), Little Arabia and Anaheim Hills. A full list of discussed communities of interest in each district is included under the "District Descriptions" below.

Another important dimension of communities of interest are the groups that have spoken out in favor of the Plan. To date, the Plan has drawn the support of several groups that are active in Anaheim. Speakers stated that they represented the Orange County Labor Federation, the Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development (OCCORD), the Korean Resource Center, the Council for American Islamic Relations, the Arab-American Chamber of Commerce, The Asian-Pacific Islander Community Association, Los Amigos and Unite Here.

One type of community of interest expressed by the public is to keep elementary school attendance boundaries wholly or substantially within a single City Council district. Speakers favored having the areas on both sides of the County island in the same District, District 2. One reason stated was that residents tend to form a community around their local elementary schools and the elementary schools in that area draw students from both sides of the County island. These are the Salk and Disney elementary schools in the Magnolia School District. Additionally, Juliette Low Elementary School lies within this corridor and creates this continuity with the schools along the Brookhurst Corridor.

For similar reasons, supporters of the Plan wanted to place the portions of the Centralia and Savanna Elementary School Districts that lie within Anaheim entirely within District 1. In District 4, the following attendance areas are kept entirely

within the District boundaries: Stoddard, Palm Lane, Ponderosa, Olive Street, Orange Grove, and Roosevelt Elementary Schools.

The 5th district includes the area west of State College north of Santa Ana Avenue. This allowed for the people on Anna Drive, who are in the Sunkist Elementary School District area to be in the same council district as well as keep the Juarez and Guinn attendance areas in the same district.

Future Population Growth. Because we are between Censuses, the population figures from the 2010 Census may be out of date. In order to consider this, the demographer looked at large-scale (more than 50 unit) developments throughout the city. All areas of the city except east Anaheim had projects either underway or planned. While the number of units planned is not equal throughout Anaheim, we can only make guesses about potential occupancy. As a result, a small shift to the boundary between Districts 5 and 6 as directed by this Committee ensures each district has at least one planned multi-unit development.

V. The Recommended Plan—District Descriptions and Communities of Interest

Council District 1 is bounded by Magnolia Avenue toward the southern end of the city north to Crescent Avenue, then east to Brookhurst Road, then north to the city border. It is bounded on three sides by the city border. This district has a Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) plurality of 37% non-Hispanic White, with 31% Latino, and 24% Asian-American. This district contains Brookhurst Community Center, the West Anaheim Youth Center, and Haskett Library.

The Committee heard testimony from residents in the area west of Magnolia south of the City of Buena Park that those areas share a common interest and should be kept together if possible. In addition, residents of the triangular area bordered by the I-5, the 91 freeway and Brookhurst consider themselves part of west Anaheim and share common concerns about freeway noise and traffic with the areas along La Palma just south of I-5. The Committee also heard testimony that the residents north of Crescent and west of Brookhurst have similar issues to the residents south of Crescent and west of Magnolia.

Council District 2 includes all of the city west of Euclid Street and east of District 1. District 2 has a CVAP plurality of 38% White, with 32% Latino and 24% Asian-American. This district contains the Dad Miller Golf Course and surrounds the County Island on three sides.

Many speakers, even those who preferred other alignments of the District 1 and 2 boundary, favored using Euclid as a clear boundary line between Districts 1 and 2 and the remainder of the city. In addition, this district contains all of the commercial areas along Brookhurst known as Little Arabia. Speakers from Little Arabia spoke in favor of keeping the business community on both sides of Brookhurst south of

Lincoln Avenue together in a single district along with the large Asian and Middle Eastern populations. Speakers from the southern part of the District strongly favored having the areas on both sides of the County island in the same District.

Council District 3 includes downtown Anaheim north of South Street between Euclid Street and East Street, including the entire historic Anaheim Colony area. District 3 has a CVAP majority of 51% Latino with 33% White and 12% Asian-American. Also, over 50% of registered voters had Spanish surnames in 2014. This district contains City Hall, the Central Library, several parks, and other city facilities in Downtown Anaheim.

Residents from the Colony spoke strongly about their desire to be in one district. They also expressed a desire to be in the same district as other historic neighborhoods north and west of the Colony, including Five Points and Historic La Palma.

Council District 4 includes the Anaheim Resort area, the Ponderosa neighborhood and other southern Anaheim neighborhoods south of District 3. District 4 has a CVAP plurality of 47% Latino, with 35% White and 14% Asian-American. This district includes the Ponderosa and Euclid Libraries and Ponderosa Family Resource Center. In addition, it contains the vast majority of the Anaheim Resort Area, which includes Disneyland and the Anaheim Convention Center, and most of the commercial developments serving the Resort Area.

While there was early testimony favoring putting the entire southern part of the City in one Council District (which would have combined the Anaheim Resort and Platinum Triangle areas into the same district), several of those speakers came to subsequent meetings and favored the boundary line between Council Districts 4 and 5 that places the Anaheim Resort area and the Platinum Triangle in separate districts. It was felt that residents would be better-served by having a council member for each of those areas. Much of the testimony focused on the connections between the Ponderosa, Guinida Park, and adjacent neighborhoods north of Ball Road.

Council District 5 includes most of the Platinum Triangle as well as the 57 freeway corridor with residents on both sides of the 57 freeway sharing its impacts. District 5 has a CVAP plurality of 44% Latino, with 37% White and 13% Asian-American. This district contains the Sunkist Library and the Miraloma Community Center in addition to the Angels Stadium, the Honda Center, the ARTIC facility, and approximately half of Anaheim Canyon.

Residents from the Miraloma area expressed a strong community of interest with areas to the west along La Palma rather than to the east and this keeps the northeastern parts of central Anaheim together.

Council District 6 consists of east Anaheim, primarily Anaheim Hills. District 6 has a CVAP majority of 63% White, 17% Asian-American and 16% Latino. This district contains the East Anaheim Community Center, East Anaheim and Canyon Hills Libraries, the Oak Canyon Nature Center, and the east half of Anaheim Canyon.

Given the shape of the Anaheim Hills area including its narrow geographical connection to the remainder of the City and that its population is nearly identical to the ideal District population, there was near-unanimity among all the proposals for the shape of this District. The only issue was the precise line between Districts 5 and 6. Many plans initially placed this line on Tustin Avenue. However, due to future development potential in the area east of Miller St and east of Glassell below La Palma in the Canyon Business Center, it was considered best to draw the line at this point.

VI. Attachments

This report includes the following attached documents that are incorporated into this report by reference:

- Committee Recommended Plan including two maps and a demographic summary (Attachment A).
- All correspondence received by the committee via U.S. Mail, hand delivery, or email (Attachment B).
- All proposals submitted by members of the public and the draft sample plans submitted by the demographer (Attachment C, numbered C1-C5 (Consultant Drafts); T1-T2 (Test Maps); P1-P32 (Public Submissions), respectively, attached to this report, accordingly).
- The agendas, staff reports and minutes of all meetings of the Committee (Attachment D).
- Samples of the press releases, email blasts, press coverage and other public outreach documents (Attachment E).