

Thank you,

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 7, 2015, at 10:00 PM, Greg Diamond [REDACTED] > wrote:  
Buena Park Demographic Consultants,

Please find enclosed a spreadsheet and colored-in map for consideration of the Buena Park City Council. I would have worked on one earlier, but I did not know until I read the MALDEF/LULAC letter today that no one until them had submitted a map with a Latino CVAP Majority District. I urge you to choose a map that has one.

Greg Diamond

[REDACTED]  
<buena-park-kit-v2 Diamond.xls>

<Buena Park Map.png>

From: Greg Diamond  
<[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Saturday, November 7, 2015 10:56  
PM  
To: Douglas Johnson  
Subject: Re: Submission for Buena Park  
Districting Map Proposal

Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for the quick reply. I have looked at all of the other maps and their stats.

I am submitting it for the consideration of the City Council. I believe (without having analyzed the "incumbent residences" factor) that this proposal is (mildly) superior, for reasons explained in the yellow comments section in the kit, IF ONE COUNTS ONLY WHAT IS WITHIN the submission. But based on my experience in Anaheim this year, I recognize that factors EXTRINSIC to the submission, such as whether anyone has organized political support for a proposal (as I have not), are likely to be given great weight -- and I can't say that that is improper. I do want it to be considered, but I expect that it will not likely be adopted unless they both agree that a Latino CVAP Majority District is in order and yet see some deficiency in those two Coalition plans, in which event I do want this to be available to them.

Essentially, I am offering them a third option to the Coalition maps that also meets that LCVAP criterion -- but while recognizing that they may legitimately ascribe importance to the political support behind it. If this becomes too complicated to convey to them, I'll happily trust you to edit out whatever you find ill-advised.

I would like to ask you if moving the district from 49.9943% Latino CVAP (which rounds to 50%) to 50.000% or even 50.005% really makes a difference when it comes to describing this district as "Latino majority." (In other words, what is "close enough"?) Without the ability to split population units, and given the need for contiguity, finding those extra couple of people are an irritant.

Thanks again for the reply.

Greg

From: Douglas Johnson <djohnson@ndcresearch.com>  
To: Greg Diamond <[REDACTED]>  
Cc: "stilton@buenapark.com" <stilton@buenapark.com>  
Sent: Saturday, November 7, 2015 10:26 PM  
Subject: Re: Submission for Buena Park Districting Map Proposal

Mr. Diamond,

Thank you for your submission. Just to be sure I understand correctly, are you recommending your submitted plan to the Council as preferable to the original MALDEF/LULAC plan and the follow up maps that MALDEF/LULAC and their Coalition have submitted (which are available on the website, [www.DrawBP.org](http://www.DrawBP.org)). Or was your purpose simply to demonstrate that a majority-Latino district was possible using the kit but you would defer to the Coalition plans as preferable for adoption?

Greg Diamond submission:

I think this map makes sense because: the LULAC/MALDEF (“Coalition”) letter that you have received is correct that, given the nature and placement of its population, Buena Park should have one Latino Majority district. As both the Coalition Maps and this map demonstrate, it is not difficult to create one; given the historical lack of Latino City Council representation, it should therefore be mandated. This map is submitted to provide the City Council with an alternative to the Coalition Maps that meets this criterion. It has the advantages of (1) being slightly more compact, (2) creating a slightly better Asian plurality (compared to whites and Latinos) in District 1; (3) is much further from the 5% limit of total deviation; (4) provides a more easily recognizable plan for the city (roughly speaking, two diagonal stripes from northeast to southwest along the city's norther and southern borders, and a wider stripe along the same diagonal between them, the northwestern part of which is in one district and the southeastern part of which is in another); (5) its districts give each major ethnicity in the city at least one plurality and advantages otherwise proportional to their CVAPs.; and (6) does not divide Population Units. (Note: because the Latino CVAP percentage in District 2 is actually 49.9943% - one eligible voter short of a minority – ideal one small census block with a Latino CVAP over 50% should be moved into, or one small block with Latino CVAP under 50% should be moved out of, District 2. Several other less elegant fixes could solve the problem as well.) This not does not take into consideration the residences of incumbents, potential candidates, or partisan registration or outcomes.

# Buena Park 2015 Districting

Population Unit Labels

