**TO**: All Councilmembers

**FROM**: Councilmember Elissa Silverman

Chairperson, Committee of the Whole, Subcommittee on Redistricting

**DATE**: May 20, 2022

**SUBJECT**: Report on Bill 24-700, “Advisory Neighborhood Commission Boundaries Act of 2022”

The Committee of the Whole, Subcommittee on Redistricting, to which Bill 24-700, “Advisory Neighborhood Commission Boundaries Act of 2022,” was referred, reports **favorably** on the bill as amended and recommends approval by the Committee of the Whole by May 24, 2022.
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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

By law, every 10 years the District of Columbia needs to rebalance its population among its political boundaries, including its wards and Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) single member districts, so all are roughly equal in size. At the end of 2021, the District of Columbia completed part one, ward redistricting, with Bill 24-371, the “Ward Redistricting Amendment Act of 2021.” The second part of the District’s redistricting process is to rebalance its ANCs. In general, under District law, each single member district (SMD) must have approximately 2,000 people, with a relative deviation no greater than plus or minus 5%, resulting in between 1,900 and 2,100 residents per SMD. Given the increase in population from the 2020 Census and the change in ward boundaries, the District must redraw its ANC and SMD boundaries to reflect its changing population and ward lines, to ensure residents have equal representation in local government.

At the beginning of Council Period 24, Chairman Phil Mendelson created a Subcommittee on Redistricting within the Council’s Committee of the Whole to lead the efforts to redraw the District’s political boundaries. The committee is composed of three at-large councilmembers, Elissa Silverman (I), Anita Bonds (D), and Christina Henderson (I), and is chaired by Silverman. The Subcommittee’s first task was to rebalance the District’s eight wards so new boundaries would be in place for the 2022 June primary elections. Now that this work is completed, the committee must redraw the SMDs and ANCs so those boundaries are in place for the 2022 November general election. This report explains the ANC redistricting process and recommendations put forth by the Subcommittee, including a map with new ANC and SMD boundaries.

ANCs are non-partisan neighborhood bodies made up of locally elected representatives, one from each single-member district, called Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners. Commissioners serve two-year terms, and do not receive a government salary. ANCs hold monthly public meetings and serve as the official neighborhood voice on a wide range of issues, from zoning to street safety to the city’s budget. District agencies must give ANC recommendations “great weight” when making certain decisions. As of the beginning of this redistricting process, there were 40 ANCs across the city, and 296 SMDs. Each SMD must have about 2,000 residents, but there is no size limitation on how many SMDs may be in an ANC; at the start of 2020 the ANCs ranged in size from 2 SMDs to 12 SMDs. ANCs generally stay within the borders of one ward, although there is currently one ANC that crosses a ward boundary between Wards 3 and 4.

ANC and SMD boundaries must be redrawn to ensure residents have equal voice and opportunity to elect their commissioners. The Council must change ANC boundaries to match the new ward boundaries and change SMD boundaries to reflect shifts in the District’s population. Following the release of the latest population data in the 2020 Census, many SMDs were far above the 2,000-resident target size, while some are now significantly below that target. The Council must act to align the ANC boundaries with the new ward lines and bring more SMDs to the target resident range of 1,900 to 2,100 residents each.

ANC redistricting is significantly more complex than ward redistricting. There are far more electoral districts (296 versus 8), and therefore more decisions to make and lines to draw. The length of the two bills is a good sign of the increased complexity: the 2011 ward redistricting bill was 7 pages long, while the 2011 ANC redistricting bill was more than 90 pages long. Redrawing 296 SMDs requires significant knowledge of every corner of the District.

By District law, the ANC redistricting process is jumpstarted by ward councilmembers, who put together a task force composed of residents of the ward they represent. These task forces met for three months, beginning in January 2022, to create recommendations for new ANC and SMD boundary lines. These recommendations are the starting point for the Subcommittee’s work. Previous Council redistricting subcommittees had more time to consider the task force recommendations. For example, in 2011, the subcommittee took 5 months to deliberate after receiving the task force recommendations. This year, because the 2020 Census results were delayed by nearly six months,, the Subcommittee only had approximately a month and a half to consider the task force reports in order for the new boundaries to be in place in time for the November 2022 elections. Therefore, given the compressed timeline, the Subcommittee relied heavily on ward councilmembers and task force members to help resolve concerns about task force recommended boundaries from community members. The Subcommittee thanks all the task force members and their chairs for their hard work and willingness to find compromises when needed.

The Subcommittee held two hearings on the all eight task force recommendations, April 7 and April 28, and more than 200 residents signed up to testify. Those hearings were an opportunity for the Subcommittee to get feedback from District residents on each ward’s task force recommendations. Many residents also proposed alternatives. The Subcommittee thanks everyone who testified virtually or submitted written testimony for the record. Those can be found later in the report.

The changes between the 2012 ANC and SMD boundaries and the new Subcommittee boundaries are too numerous to list, as almost every SMD is seeing some kind of change. Instead, this report will discuss the changes between the task force recommendations and the Subcommittee print. The task force recommendations themselves can be found at the end of this report.

**The Subcommittee print makes some changes to the recommendations it received from the task forces in response to public feedback and input from ward councilmembers. Wards 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 saw either minor or no changes between the task force recommendations and the Subcommittee print. In Ward 3, the Subcommittee received hundreds of concerns from Cleveland Park residents about their neighborhood being split between two ANCs, so the Subcommittee print moves one SMD, 3A05, from ANC 3A to ANC 3C, to return a portion of the Cleveland Park neighborhood to ANC 3C. In Ward 7, the Subcommittee print retains the two cross-river ANCs created by the task force, but adopts a revision supported by a majority of Ward 7 task force members that better balances these two ANCs between east and west of the river. And in Ward 8, the Subcommittee print adopts a compromise map proposed by the ward councilmember and members of the task force, to reunite the Anacostia neighborhood under one ANC.**

# I. BACKGROUND, NEED, PURPOSE, AND EFFECT

Redistricting, or re-apportionment of electoral districts based on updated population numbers, is a requirement of both federal and local law. The fundamental legal requirement is to give each district a substantially equal population, so that residents in all areas may participate in District politics on equal terms. The following paragraphs provide an overview of the legal principles governing redistricting.

**Legal Principles**

*One Person, One Vote*. The overriding mandate of redistricting is to ensure equal representation, often embodied in the principle of “one person, one vote.” The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment forms the basis of the one-person, one-vote principle.[[1]](#footnote-2) This principle holds that whenever voters in different districts elect the members of a representative body, the districts must have substantially equal populations. If unequal populations were permitted, they would effectively give greater voting power to the residents of the smaller districts, while depriving residents of the larger districts of the full impact of their votes.[[2]](#footnote-3) This was an important principle during the ward redistricting process in 2021, but is no less important when considering redrawing ANC and SMD lines.

Yet the Equal Protection Clause does not require districts to have exactly equal populations. Deviations from exact equivalence are allowed to accommodate policy objectives such as preserving communities of interest or drawing districts that are geographically compact. Apportionment is presumed to comply with the one-person, one-vote principle when the population of every district is substantially equal, meaning within a range of five percent more or less than the average district population (with less than a 10 percent difference between the largest and smallest district populations).

The Subcommittee believes it is in the best interests of the District to present a redistricting plan that presumptively complies with the one-person, one-vote principle. Accordingly, the Subcommittee has treated this five percent threshold range as its main requirement for the population of each SMD.[[3]](#footnote-4)

*Racial Gerrymanders*. The Equal Protection Clause also may be violated by racial gerrymanders, in which boundaries are drawn to advantage one racial group over another. Racial demographics may be considered as one of many factors informing apportionment. But if race becomes the predominant factor driving apportionment, a court will strictly scrutinize the plan to determine whether it is narrowly tailored to promote a compelling state interest.[[4]](#footnote-5) A racial gerrymander may violate the Equal Protection Clause even if it is done to benefit racial minority groups, like Black and Latino residents.[[5]](#footnote-6)

*Voting Rights Act*. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 prohibits the adoption of a redistricting plan that has the effect of diluting the voting power of racial or language minority groups, where such groups are politically cohesive and there is proof of racially polarized voting patterns.[[6]](#footnote-7) Dilution may take the form of “cracking,” in which a large group of minority residents are dispersed among several districts so that they cannot play a decisive role in any of the districts.[[7]](#footnote-8) Dilution may also occur through “packing,” where minority residents are concentrated into a single district so that they cannot influence electoral outcomes in other districts.[[8]](#footnote-9)

While their work was underway, task forces sought additional information on the meaning of dilution and how to avoid it when developing their recommended boundaries. In response, Subcommittee staff shared guidance from the U.S. Department of Justice with each of the task force chairpersons.[[9]](#footnote-10)

*District Law*. District law governs this redistricting process and incorporates key concepts from constitutional and federal law.

First, according to District law, “each single-member district shall have a population of approximately 2,000 people, and shall be as nearly equal as possible.”[[10]](#footnote-11)

Second, redistricting plans must not result in districts with a deviation range more than 10 percent, or plus or minus 5 percent, “unless the deviation results from the limitations of census geography or from the promotion of a rational public policy, including, but not limited to, respect for the political geography of the District, the natural geography of the District, neighborhood cohesiveness, or the development of compact and contiguous districts.”[[11]](#footnote-12) The Subcommittee interprets this statute as a declaration of additional redistricting principles that should be considered in the District, even when an apportionment plan proposes boundaries within the range.

Next, a redistricting plan cannot have “the purpose and effect of diluting the voting strength of minority citizens.”[[12]](#footnote-13) A similar requirement for ward boundaries in the District has been interpreted as an equivalent of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.[[13]](#footnote-14)

Finally, District law requires the redistricting process to use concepts and data from the U.S. Census Bureau. SMD boundaries “shall conform to the greatest extent possible” with census block boundaries.[[14]](#footnote-15) Further, the decennial census report is the exclusive source of population data for use in apportionment of SMDs.[[15]](#footnote-16)

**Impact of Redistricting on Residents and Government Services**

The primary impact of changing ANC and SMD boundaries is on voting representation. Living in one SMD versus another changes which Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner a resident can vote for. This is why the Subcommittee takes seriously the requirement to keep communities of interest together in order to preserve their electoral voice at the ANC level. However, the Subcommittee could not identify any significant government services that are provided solely at the ANC or SMD level. Therefore, residents should not see a significant change in their government services, such as parking or neighborhood school.

**2020 Census Results**

This year, the results of the decennial Census were significantly delayed. The data are often released in the spring, allowing states time to redistrict by the fall. However, for many reasons, the data were not officially released until September 2021.

The 2020 Census results showed that the District did grow considerably between 2010 and 2020, although not as much as had been expected. The 2020 Census found the District to have grown from 601,723 residents in 2010 to 689,545 residents in 2020, a growth rate of 14.6 percent over the past decade. This growth rate is faster than that of all but six states.[[16]](#footnote-17) However, previous estimates had already placed the District population over 700,000 residents. In early 2018, the Mayor celebrated the 700,000th resident being born.[[17]](#footnote-18)

It isn’t clear if the previous estimates were incorrect, or the 2020 Census undercounted residents. However, there is evidence that the District saw significant undercounting in the Census. According to a recent study, the District saw the highest undercount of any state, at more than 2 percent.[[18]](#footnote-19) The Office of Planning testified before the Subcommittee that it is analyzing the Census data and considering officially appealing the District’s population. Such an appeal, though, would likely not be resolved until 2023. In the meantime, by law, the District must use the existing Census data for redistricting.

While the District grew by almost 15 percent over the previous decade, not all demographic groups saw the same increase. The District continued to lose Black residents, as the Black population fell by about 19,000 residents over the decade. At the same time, the District’s non-Hispanic white population grew by almost 25 percent. At the current rates, the District is likely to be plurality white within in the next several years.

The District’s Asian and Hispanic populations also grew significantly during the decade, growing by about 60 percent and 40 percent, respectively. And, mirroring a national trend, many more District residents are choosing to identify as “Two or More Races” or “Some Other Race.” District residents choosing to identify as Two or More Races grew by more than 130 percent, an astounding change over just a decade. While investigating this trend is outside of the purview of the Subcommittee, the Subcommittee encourages the Office of Planning to continue to research it.

*ANC and SMD Population Trends*

The Office of Planning produced a very helpful table showing the change in population for each ANC over the past decade, which is reproduced below. A similar table for SMDs is attached to this report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANC Population Change: 2010 to 2020** | | | | |
|  | **Population** | | **Change, 2010 to 2020** | |
| **ANC** | **2010** | **2020** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| **District of Columbia** | **601,723** | **689,545** | **87,822** | **14.6%** |
| **1A** | 23,733 | 26,307 | 2,574 | 10.8% |
| **1B** | 23,835 | 29,089 | 5,254 | 22.0% |
| **1C** | 16,435 | 18,457 | 2,022 | 12.3% |
| **1D** | 10,459 | 11,432 | 973 | 9.3% |
| **2A** | 17,215 | 18,873 | 1,658 | 9.6% |
| **2B** | 18,115 | 20,432 | 2,317 | 12.8% |
| **2C** | 5,481 | 6,614 | 1,133 | 20.7% |
| **2D** | 2,708 | 2,836 | 128 | 4.7% |
| **2E** | 16,466 | 15,676 | -790 | -4.8% |
| **2F** | 16,660 | 17,473 | 813 | 4.9% |
| **3B** | 10,399 | 11,663 | 1,264 | 12.2% |
| **3C** | 18,141 | 19,574 | 1,433 | 7.9% |
| **3D** | 19,988 | 21,377 | 1,389 | 6.9% |
| **3E** | 10,278 | 10,947 | 669 | 6.5% |
| **3F** | 13,839 | 14,908 | 1,069 | 7.7% |
| **3G** | 14,205 | 15,186 | 981 | 6.9% |
| **4A** | 16,653 | 19,511 | 2,858 | 17.2% |
| **4B** | 18,519 | 21,857 | 3,338 | 18.0% |
| **4C** | 20,024 | 21,719 | 1,695 | 8.5% |
| **4D** | 12,614 | 13,219 | 605 | 4.8% |
| **5A** | 16,344 | 18,181 | 1,837 | 11.2% |
| **5B** | 9,890 | 11,724 | 1,834 | 18.5% |
| **5C** | 13,849 | 17,366 | 3,517 | 25.4% |
| **5D** | 14,529 | 17,012 | 2,483 | 17.1% |
| **5E** | 19,696 | 25,142 | 5,446 | 27.7% |
| **6A** | 16,390 | 18,297 | 1,907 | 11.6% |
| **6B** | 20,217 | 22,401 | 2,184 | 10.8% |
| **6C** | 11,879 | 20,891 | 9,012 | 75.9% |
| **6D** | 14,359 | 27,361 | 13,002 | 90.5% |
| **6E** | 13,393 | 19,252 | 5,859 | 43.7% |
| **7B** | 14,487 | 15,150 | 663 | 4.6% |
| **7C** | 14,088 | 14,687 | 599 | 4.3% |
| **7D** | 13,864 | 16,343 | 2,479 | 17.9% |
| **7E** | 13,570 | 14,840 | 1,270 | 9.4% |
| **7F** | 15,739 | 15,235 | -504 | -3.2% |
| **8A** | 14,627 | 16,254 | 1,627 | 11.1% |
| **8B** | 14,232 | 14,583 | 351 | 2.5% |
| **8C** | 14,629 | 14,782 | 153 | 1.0% |
| **8D** | 14,890 | 16,323 | 1,433 | 9.6% |
| **8E** | 15,284 | 16,571 | 1,287 | 8.4% |
| Source: District of Columbia Office of Planning/State Data Center using U.S. Census Bureau's Census 2010 and 2020 data. | | | | |

While the District overall grew by almost 15 percent during the past decade, the ANCs and SMDs saw a very wide range of growth rates. All but two of the 40 ANCs grew during that period, and half saw double-digit percent increases in their populations. The ANC population growth reflects the same trends as the wards, with the largest growth appearing in ANCs that had significant redevelopment during the previous ten years. ANCs in Ward 6 saw the most growth, with the three ANCs that experienced the greatest population being in Ward 6. ANC 6D, which includes both the Wharf and Navy Yard developments, grew by more than 90 percent over the decade, a staggeringly large increase. ANC 6C, encompassing the NoMA neighborhood, grew by more than 75 percent, adding almost 10,000 new residents.

The two ANCs that lost population over the decade were likely due to the effects of the pandemic. ANC 7F, which lost 3.2 percent of its population, would have had net growth if not for ANC 7F07, which saw its population fall by a third. ANC 7F07 contains the District’s Central Detention Facility, and the District intentionally reduced the population of the CDF during the pandemic. Similarly, ANC 2E lost 4.8 percent of its population, and that ANC contains Georgetown University, likely indicating that a significant number of students who were living in the ANC moved elsewhere during the pandemic as the school transitioned to virtual instruction. It is likely that, were it not for the pandemic, every ANC would have had positive growth over the past decade.

The disparate growth rates between the ANCs and SMDs means that, while the almost 300 SMDs all started the decade relatively close in population, there was a significant difference between the populations by 2020. After the last redistricting, 194 SMDs were within plus or minus 5 percent of the 2,000 SMD population target, but by the end of the decade in 2020, only 65 SMDs were within the deviation threshold. Therefore, it is essentially inevitable that every ANC and almost every SMD will require changes to its borders, to ensure equal representation between the SMDs.

**Subcommittee Process**

The ANC redistricting process is significantly different from the ward redistricting process the Subcommittee undertook in 2021. The ward redistricting process was primarily driven by the Subcommittee: the Subcommittee held almost a dozen hearings, solicited draft maps from the public, and released discussion maps to collect targeted feedback.

For ANC redistricting, according to District law, the process is instead initiated by eight ward-level task forces, which are tasked with creating draft ANC and SMD recommendations for their ward, to submit to the Council. The task forces are almost entirely created by the ward councilmembers. District law gives each ward councilmember significant discretion over the size and composition of the task force, as well as how much control or direction the councilmember can have over the task force. The only legal requirements are that task force members be residents of the ward, and that councilmembers “give full consideration to assuring fair representation for all racial and ethnic minorities, women, and geographical areas in his or her ward.”[[19]](#footnote-20) The at-large councilmembers and the Council Chairman may also appoint a member to each task force. The Subcommittee commends the eight ward members for appointing diverse and capable task forces, and thanks all of the task force members for their service.

In three short months, each task force was appointed, organized, held numerous public hearings and meetings, created draft maps, debated, and produced a final set of recommendations to send to the Council. The task forces reports, including a list of task force members, justifications for when SMDs went beyond the 5 percent population deviation, and results of the final votes on the recommendations, are included at the end of this report.

Following the receipt of the recommendations from the eight task forces, the Subcommittee held two public hearings on the recommendations, to receive testimony and feedback on them. The Subcommittee would have preferred holding additional hearings, such as holding one for each ward as was done for the ward redistricting hearings, but the delay of the release of the 2020 Census data made it difficult to have such an extended process. Previous redistricting subcommittees were able to have as much as 8 months to consider the task force recommendations, but this year, the Subcommittee found itself constrained by the upcoming general election. With ANC elections in early November, candidates were set to begin picking up nominating petitions in July, just three months after the task forces completed their work. Additionally, the Board of Elections needs a certain amount of time to implement the new ANC and SMD boundaries to prepare nominating petition documents for prospective candidates, further limiting the time available to the Subcommittee. While the Council did work with the Board of Elections to push back several election milestone dates, such as when nominating petitions are released, the Subcommittee was hesitant to delay the election itself, or delay when the new ANC boundaries would be used. Therefore, faced with a much-shortened timeline, the Subcommittee was limited in the number of hearings it could hold before voting on its own recommendations for the Committee of the Whole.

**Redistricting Principles**

The Subcommittee identified six principles of redistricting to guide its mapmaking process. These principles are not to be confused with the legal imperatives discussed earlier in the report, although several legal standards are reflected in the six principles. The principles are:

* **Equal Representation:** The North Star of redistricting comes from the constitutional principle of one person, one vote. Legislative districts must be roughly equal in size, plus or minus five percent of the average.
* **Racially Equitable**: According to D.C. law, redrawn legislative boundaries cannot dilute “the voting strength of minority citizens.”
* **Compact and Contiguous**: Boundaries need to be geographically sensible.
* **Communities of Interest Kept Together**: Identifiable neighborhoods should stay intact and not be divided among legislative districts to the extent possible.
* **Whole Census Blocks**: As much as possible, Census blocks should remain whole to make data collection more accurate and understandable.
* **Ward Continuity and Stability**: Given the volatility of the pandemic, make boundary changes guided by federal and local law but avoid unnecessary radical change.

Of all these principles, the first, equal representation, is the most important, and a legal imperative. The second is critical to voting rights. The other four principles may flow from District law or redistricting best practices, but the Subcommittee must, first and foremost, rebalance the ANC and SMD populations without diluting the voting strength of minority residents. In doing so, the Subcommittee may have to be more flexible with the other four principles. For instance, there may be no way to create relatively similar size wards without dividing communities of interest or splitting Census blocks. Similarly, the principles may contradict each other. For example, Census blocks are not drawn to reflect neighborhoods, so it may not be possible to preserve communities of interest while also keeping Census blocks whole. However, the Subcommittee will endeavor to follow the six principles as much as is possible.

To better understand how racial equity affects redistricting, the Subcommittee worked with the Council’s Office of Racial Equity (CORE). However, the required Racial Equity Impact Analysis (REIA) will be issued with the Committee of the Whole report, in accordance with the practices of the CORE office to only issue a REIA at the final committee stage.

**Subcommittee Print**

The Subcommittee received feedback on the recommendations from every ward task force. In reviewing the concerns, the Subcommittee found that all of the recommendations from the task forces were compliant with local and federal law. For instance, all the ANCs and SMDs recommended by the task force did not dilute the voting power of minority residents, and generally met the one person, one vote guideline. Additionally, the Subcommittee faced a shortened timeline for approving the new ANC boundaries and felt that the task forces were likely more knowledgeable of local neighborhood dynamics. Therefore, the Subcommittee generally deferred to the task forces and their recommendations.

However, three wards in particular received attracted a lot of discussion: wards 3, 7, and 8. The Subcommittee’s changes to the task force recommendations, described below, were made in consultation with the relevant ward councilmember and task force chair, as well as task force members. The Subcommittee was very hesitant to make changes at the last minute to recommendations that were the product of longer, more public deliberations.

**SPECIFIC BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS BY WARD**

***Ward 1:* The Subcommittee received a request from the ward councilmember for several changes, including rebalancing the ANC 1E/1B boundary, adjusting the ANC 1E boundaries in Park View and Pleasant Plains based on a resolution from ANC 1A, and exchanging Census blocks between 1A04 and 1A07 as was requested during the Subcommittee’s hearings.**

***Ward 2:* In consultation with the ward councilmember, the Subcommittee print makes only minor technical changes to the task force recommendations, based on comments received from the Office of Planning. However, the Subcommittee acknowledges it did receive testimony from a number of residents of the current ANC 2B, who expressed a desire to stay in ANC 2B.**

***Ward 3:* The Subcommittee print keeps the vast majority of the task force recommendations, and only moves one SMD. Following the release of the task force recommendations, the Subcommittee heard a significant amount of feedback from residents, primarily from residents of the Cleveland Park neighborhood, who were concerned their neighborhood was being split between two ANCs. The Subcommittee supports the vision of the Ward 3 redistricting task force, which generally sought to structure ANCs around population density, such as Wisconsin Avenue and Connecticut Avenue. Additionally, the Subcommittee is not persuaded that having a historic district spread across two ANCs will have a detrimental impact on the historic district; for example, the Capitol Hill historic district currently stretches across three ANCs, to no apparent ill effect.**

**However, in an effort to reach a compromise between the task force and neighborhood groups who supported an alternative map, the Subcommittee is recommending moving one SMD, 3A05, from ANC 3A to ANC 3C, without changing the borders of the SMD. This returns a portion of the Cleveland Park neighborhood to ANC 3C, while still maintaining the commercial corridor vision of the task force. It also shifts the Woodland-Normanstone neighborhood back from ANC 3A to ANC 3C, which was a near-unanimous request from residents of the neighborhood. This compromise was suggested by a vice president of the Cleveland Park Historical Society and has approval of the ward councilmember.**

***Ward 4:* The Subcommittee print makes no changes to the Ward 4 task force recommendations.**

***Ward 5:* The Subcommittee received a request from the ward councilmember and task force chairs, requesting several minor changes to the ward task force recommendations. Specifically, following this request, the Subcommittee print moves one residential building out of 5A01 into 5A02, and moves part of 5C07 to 5B06.**

***Ward 6:* The Subcommittee received a request from the ward councilmember and task force chair, to redraw the SMDs in ANC 6C. The Subcommittee print accepts the request, which eliminates a split Census block and better balances the populations between the ANC 6C SMDs.**

***Ward 7:* Following the ward redistricting, Ward 7 gained many more residents who live west of the Anacostia River including in neighborhoods known as Hill East and Rosedale. In reapportioning the ANCs and SMDs, the Ward 7 task force decided to create two cross-river ANCs, in an effort to foster unity between Ward 7 residents on both sides of the river. The Subcommittee heard a great deal of testimony from many residents in opposition to this proposal, almost entirely from Ward 7 residents west of the river. Most of this testimony called instead for a single Ward 7 ANC west of the river, arguing that the west of the river residents were a community of interest**

**While the Subcommittee understands the argument and the policy reasons for** **a single west of the river ANC, the Subcommittee decided to keep the cross-river ANC approach chosen by the task force. The Subcommittee hopes this approach will** **accomplish the unity goals of creating the cross-river ANCs and tie residents together in common interests.**

**The Subcommittee was clear in both public hearings on ANC redistricting that the main concern with the task force recommendations was balance in the cross-river ANCs. For instance, the new ANC 7A included an equal number of SMDs east and west of the river, but ANC 7F had 5 SMDs east of the river compared to just 3 east of the river.**

**The Subcommittee print section for Ward 7 attempts to rectify this balance, using a compromise map created by task force member Keith Hasan-Towery. The print creates a new ANC 7F, preserving its cross-river identity but balancing it, putting 3 SMDs on both sides of the river. To do this, the print transfers a portion of 7B01 into the new 7F, and reallocates the northeastern portions of the task force’s 7F to create a new ANC 7D.**

**The Subcommittee recognizes that this new map will not satisfy all Ward 7 residents, either east or west of the river. The Subcommittee will continue working with the Ward 7 councilmember, the task force, and the Council Chairman to try to identify a compromise map that all parties can agree to.**

**Additionally, the Subcommittee notes that the Census data shows one of the new SMDs, 7C07, has over 3,000 residents. The Subcommittee has discussed this with the Office of Planning, which indicated that there may be an error in the data in this SMD, incorrectly adding almost 1,000 residents to the SMD. Accordingly, the Subcommittee believes the SMD is within the acceptable population deviation range.**

***Ward 8:* Similar to Ward 7, Ward 8 added west of the residents following the ward redistricting process. The Ward 8 task force proposed bridging the divide with an ANC that both crossed the river and also crossed the ward boundary into Ward 6 (in coordination with the Ward 6 task force). However, many residents testified before the Subcommittee, raising two main concerns with the task force recommendations: that the task force recommendations unnecessarily split the historic Anacostia neighborhood, and that it provided an outsized voice to Navy Yard residents over the Anacostia and Fairlawn neighborhoods.**

**Following the two hearings on ANC redistricting, the ward councilmember requested the Subcommittee adopt a compromise map, created by a number of the Ward 8 task force members. While many SMDs and ANCs are changed in the print, the defining features are that ANC 8F no longer crosses the Anacostia River (although it still crosses the Ward 6 boundary), and that Anacostia neighborhood is contained in one ANC, ANC 8A.**

**Conclusion**

As a final note, while the Subcommittee is making changes to many of the task force recommendations, the Subcommittee wants to express its gratitude to the many residents who served on the task forces. Creating the task force recommendations took many, many hours, requiring careful work weighing many competing voices and priorities, in a relatively short period of time for no pay. Nevertheless, each and every task force submitted full, detailed, and workable recommendations to the Subcommittee, on time. The Subcommittee is grateful for the task force members’ service, and the Subcommittee print is far better thanks to their tireless work.

# II. LEGISLATIVE CHRONOLOGY

March 3, 2022 B24-700, the “Advisory Neighborhood Commission Boundaries Act of 2021,” was introduced by Councilmember Silverman, Councilmember Henderson, and Councilmember Bonds.

March 11, 2022 Notice of intent to act on B24-700 was published in the *D.C. Register*.

March 15, 2022 B24-700 was referred to the Committee of the Whole with comments from the Subcommittee on Redistricting.

March 18, 2022 Notice of public hearing on B24-700 was published in the *D.C. Register*.

April 7, 2022 The Subcommittee on Redistricting held a public hearing on B24-700.

April 28, 2022 The Subcommittee on Redistricting held a second public hearing on B24-700.

May 20, 2022 Consideration and vote on B24-700 by the Subcommittee on Redistricting.

# III. POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE

The executive respectfully declined to provide testimony or express a position on Bill 24-‑700.

Nonetheless, the Office of Planning provided considerable technical assistance to the Subcommittee and the ward task forces. OP provided task forces and the public with access to the online redistricting application used to draw boundaries, estimate the population of alternative districts, print large-format maps, and generate the metes and bounds that form the bulk of the text of Bill 24700. The Subcommittee again recognizes the contributions of OP and its staff, particularly Dr. Joy Phillips and Mr. Dennis Waardenburg, to the redistricting process.

# IV. COMMENTS OF ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONS

Several ANCs commented on Bill 24-700 and ANC redistricting in letters and resolutions. Those comments are organized by ward (as applicable) and summarized below. In addition, many commissioners participated in an individual capacity by providing testimony that is summarized in Section V of this report.

The Subcommittee appreciates input from all sources, including ANCs and commissioners. With respect to this bill, however, the Subcommittee did not assign greater weight to comments from ANCs than comments from other witnesses.

Recognizing the inherent interest of ANCs in their own boundaries, District law provides for ward task forces to recommend ANC and SMD boundaries. The Subcommittee respects and appreciates the work of the volunteers appointed to ward task forces.

*Ward 1*

In a letter to the Subcommittee, ANC 1B asked the Subcommittee to take three specific actions regarding the Ward 1 Task Force recommendations: (1) move certain census blocks including the 9:30 Club and residents on the eastern side of Florida Avenue NW back to ANC 1B; (2) move the block of Bohrer Street, Florida Avenue, 6th Street, and U Street NW from 1B02 to 1B01; and (3) support the proposed inclusion of the area between Florida Avenue, 16th Street, and U Street NW in ANC 1B.

*Ward 2*

In March 2021, before the redistricting cycle had begun, ANC 2F adopted a resolution requesting the Council to require at least one member of each ANC, duly voted on by their Commission, be on the Ward Redistricting Task Force appointed by each ward member.

*Ward 3*

In a letter, ANC 3B raised many concerns with the process and the map proposed by the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force. ANC 3B urged the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force map in favor of the map proposed by Neighborhood Voices.

In September 2021, ANC 3D adopted a resolution requesting the Council to protect LGBTQ+ constituents by accounting for their status as a distinct community of interest through ward and ANC redistricting where practicable.

Later, ANC 3D adopted a letter addressing Bill 24-700 and proposing legislation to improve the operations of ANCs. (District law authorizes ward task forces to recommend operational improvements to ANCs.) Those proposals include language to address perpetual ANC vacancies, eliminate language that prohibits filling vacancies during a public health emergency, allow electronic signatures on nominating petitions, make nominating petitions available 144 days before an election, reject proposed single member district boundaries that dilute the voting strength of minority citizens such as students and prison residents.

*Ward 7*

ANC 7B adopted two resolutions on ANC redistricting. Resolution 2022-08 calls on the Council to adopt the Ward 7 ANC Boundaries as advanced by the Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force. Resolution 2022-12 specifically calls on the Council to follow the task force recommendation with respect to SMD 7B01.

In contrast, ANCs 6A and 6B (which include portions of Ward 7 that had previously been in Ward 6) submitted a joint letter opposing the Ward 7 task force recommendations. ANCs 6A and 6B support a single ANC area comprising the portion of Ward 7 that is west of the Anacostia River.

ANC 7C adopted a resolution urging the Subcommittee to adopt the Ward 7 ANC boundaries as recommended by the task force.

# V. HEARING RECORD AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

The Subcommittee held two public hearings on Bill 24-700 on April 7, 2022, and April 28, 2022. The hearing record remained open until May 13, 2022.

**April 7, 2022 Hearing**

The Subcommittee on Redistricting held a public hearing on Bill 24-700 on Thursday, April 7, 2022, at noon. A video recording of the public hearing is available at <http://dc.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=22>. The public witnesses’ testimonies are summarized below.

**Public Witnesses**

*Peter Wood, Ward 1 Redistricting Task Force Member, ANC Commissioner (1C03)*

Mr. Wood testified in his capacity as a District resident . He asserted that the task force did a good job in completing their task and emphasized his pride in how the task force engaged with the community. Upon reflecting about his time on the task force, Mr. Wood stated that he enjoyed his experience and learned a great deal in the process. He further emphasized that the task force focused on fairness, adding that he believed the task force did a great in being honest about the complexity of the task at hand. Mr. Wood went on to argue that neighborhood boundaries are fluid, and that when thinking about boundaries, neighborhood identity should be considered. He then articulated his belief that ANCs should reflect the residents that live in them, but he also mentioned that the ANCs should be functional. Additionally, Mr. Wood argued that the 5th ANC is warranted because of population growth and warned that adding a 6th ANC would be too much.

*Frank Chauvin*

Mr. Chauvin argued that the 9:30 club resides in the U Street neighborhood, emphasizing the importance and significance of Duke Ellington to the neighborhood’s history, culture, and foundational makeup. He further recounted that the blocks being recommended to move into ANC 1E has been a part of ANC 1B for the past 20 to 40 years. Finally, Mr. Chauvin argued that neighborhood cohesion was broken when the task force moved the blocks into the newly created ANC 1E, adding that the move came at the very last minute of the process. He urged the subcommittee to not move forward with this part of the task force recommendation.

*Santiago Lakatos, Ward 1 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Lakatos testified in opposition to shifting the three census blocks into ANC 1E, and subsequently urged the subcommittee to return the blocks to a more U-street centered ANC 1B. He maintained that returning the blocks to ANC 1B would be instrumental to avoiding separation of communities of interest.

*Kent Boese, ANC Commissioner (1A08)*

Mr. Boese emphasized that better recommendations could have been formulated than what the task force ultimately submitted to the subcommittee. He would go on to express concern and dissatisfaction with a variety of points. Mr. Boese argued that the recommended map failed to recognize the redistricting principle of neighborhood cohesiveness in the northwest corner of Columbia Heights. He further expressed concern over the high number of proposed SMDs that fall outside of the 1,900 to 2,100 population range. Additionally, Mr. Boese articulated displeasure with the task force creating SMDs and what he believed was a rushed process. Mr. Boese went on to offer some alternative SMD configurations he argued would serve the community better.

*Barbara Kahlow, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member; West End Citizens Association*

Ms. Kahlow testified on behalf of the West End Citizens Association (WECA) and pointed out that she has served on numerous ANC Redistricting task forces prior to this one. She asserted that this year’s process was much more time consuming and adversarial, much to her displeasure. She noted that the processes after the 1990, 2000, and 2010 Censuses involved more neighborhood residents as team participants who had in-depth knowledge about ANC-2A, adding that this year’s process included task force members without such in-depth knowledge. Ms. Kahlow also noted that she was subjected to lobbying she deemed inappropriate by a current ANC-2A Commissioner who wanted revised SMD boundaries to benefit him. She further argued that the 2022 task force short-changed consideration of internal SMD boundaries.

*Michael Lee Beidler*

Mr. Beidler clarified that while he is not in support of the process that led to the proposed map, he does support the ultimate result which he views as a compromise. Mr. Beidler went on to articulate his opposition of moving a corner block in Dupont Circle out of ANC 2B09 since it would negatively impact current neighborhood cohesion.

*Trupti J. Patel, ANC Commissioner (2A03)*

Ms. Patel articulated that she found some aspects of the Ward 2 map submitted for final approval deeply concerning. She maintained that members of the Ward 2 task force were rude, hostile, and non-cooperative with their colleagues and members of the community. She also reported out what she felt was deliberate bullying and intimidation, adding that such a culture prevented a cohesive process and the ability to have honest and transparent dialogue. Ms. Patel further asserted that there was a deliberate and blatant attempt to dilute the voice of specific groups of people in order to amplify the political power of others. Additionally, she felt the recommended Ward 2 map does not accurately reflect the principle of representative democracy.

*Ankit Jain, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Jain testified in full support of the task force’s proposed map. He admitted that there were contentious internal discussions during the process, but he asserted that politics is always contentious. Additionally, Mr. Jain mentioned that he believed the process worked as intended. He went on to argue that the proposed map protected communities of interest and minority voting strength. He also added that the task force only increased two ANCs in size despite the growth in population, with no ANCs having more than nine members.

*Howard S. Marks, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Marks expressed gratitude for the task force’s willingness to compromise, specifically regarding the decision to move the downtown ANC in a northwesterly direction toward the heart of downtown along K Street. He noted that his ANC was already familiar with mixed use development, as well as with balancing the needs of government and private sector office buildings, restaurants, retail, museums, art galleries, and sports venues. To account for growth, Mr. Marks advocated that the number of SMDs increase to four.

*Gretchen Wharton, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Ms. Wharton testified in support of the final submission for the Ward 2 Taskforce on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions. She noted the Subcommittee on Redistricting’s report that mentioned the history of Shaw being in Ward 2 and mentioned the support from residents in favor of uniting Shaw and Mount Vernon into a single ANC. Ms. Wharton indicated that this demonstrated support for reuniting Shaw and Mount Vernon guided the task force’s approach to the ANC that would encompass the neighborhoods – which they named ANC 2G.

*Austin Naughton, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Chair*

As chair of the task force, Mr. Naughton emphasized that the task force sought to be collaborative, inclusive, and transparent throughout the process. He also indicated that the task force strove to engage with the public through various meetings with neighbors, with the hope of building consensus in mind. While acknowledging that making all decisions by consensus is not possible, Mr. Naughton relayed that task force voting was decisive. Mr. Naughton would go on to emphasize the importance of population balancing when analyzing ANCs and SMDs during the process. Finally, he reported that the task force approved its final report by a vote of 13 in favor and 0 opposed, with 1 member choosing not to vote.

*Janet Adams Nash, Georgetown Reservoir Neighborhood Associates*

Ms. Nash endorsed the ANC redistricting Neighborhood Voice Map and the proposal proffered by a coalition of neighbors and their associates from across Ward 3. She asserted that the Neighborhood Voice coalition’s reconfiguration of the Task Force recommendations reflects substantial community input and engagement. She also articulated that the coalition formed out of frustration that arose from what was deemed a lack of community engagement and transparency by most members of the task force. Further, Ms. Nash argued that the Neighborhood Voice proposal meets the legal requirements of redistricting. Finally, Ms. Nash expressed concern over the perceived lack of racial and cultural diversity within the task force, in addition to the factors that caused two task force members to resign.

*Bonnie LePard, President, Cleveland Park Historical Society*

Ms. LePard asked the Subcommittee to reject the proposal of the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force and mentioned that the proposal would divide the neighborhood of Cleveland Park into two different ANCs and five SMDs. She further argued that the task force ignored the principle of maintaining neighborhood cohesiveness in favor of what she deemed an “abstract construct” that would give priority to commercial corridors instead of neighborhoods. Additionally, Ms. LePard articulated that dividing the Cleveland Park Historic District across multiple ANCs would force neighbors to attend multiple ANC meetings, represented by commissioners who may lack the connection and familiarity with a neighborhood that every ANC commissioner should possess. She urged the Subcommittee to adopt the Ward 3 Neighborhood Voices map.

*Marianne Steiner, Woodland Normanstone Neighborhood Association*

Ms. Steiner articulated that the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood was taken by surprise due to the final recommendations of the task force that divided the neighborhood across 2 ANCs. She relayed that the split was not circulated prior to the March 8 meeting of the task force, yet during the meeting the final recommendation was developed and sent to the Council without any opportunity for comment. Ms. Steiner requested that the Subcommittee restore her neighborhood into a single ANC with a single commissioner under one SMD. Additionally, Ms. Steiner noted that in splitting the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood, the task force’s proposal did not consider the unique geographical footprint of the neighborhood, the connection and bonds of its residents, the 110+ year history of the neighborhood, and the issues that are uniquely addressed by their neighborhood association working in consort with our ANC.

*Ryan Keefe*

Mr. Keefe fully supported the task force’s recommended map. He admitted that the map was not perfect, however, he went on to argue that the proposal moves the Ward in the right direction. He pointed out that the map addressed the underrepresentation of American University students. Additionally, Mr. Keefe argued that the creation of a new ANC along Wisconsin Avenue would be instrumental in ensuring the residents of that corridor had their collective voices heard. Furthermore, Mr. Keefe explains that the map would ensure that American University would be in ANC 3E, which he mentioned was the school’s preference. He felt the task force was open, transparent, and diligent, and subsequently urged the Council to adapt the proposed map as is.

*John Weiner, Cleveland Park Citizens Association*

Mr. Weiner testified on behalf of the Neighborhood Voice proposed map, which was the product of coalition of community groups that came together in response to what they felt was a lack of engagement by the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force. He argued that the Council can create a new Ward 3 ANC while preserving cohesive, established neighborhoods. He also maintained that the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force’s proposal created a geographically incoherent new ANC. In doing so, Mr. Weiner believed that the task force divided established, cohesive communities like Cleveland Park into multiple ANCs.

*Jerry Malitz, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Chair*

Mr. Malitz articulated the difficulties in constructing meaningful, data-driven maps, relaying that it took the task force over 1,750 hours to format its recommendations. In addition, Mr. Malitz emphasized the community outreach that the task force incorporated into its work, stating that they received approximately 300 total emails and 263 public comments via a public feedback form.

*Troy A. Kravitz, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Kravitz articulated the rules and guiding principles of the task force. He emphasized that all SMDs needed to conform with population limits, in addition to the adherence to the no split census blocks and no dilution of voter strength rules. Additionally, Mr. Kravitz stressed how important maintaining the one-person, one-vote principle was to the task force. He also explained that the task force attempted to build ANCs around people and the areas they frequent. Mr. Kravitz further mentioned that the task force prioritized community engagement when constructing SMDs.

*Abe Clayman, Ward 4 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Clayman recounted that the task force approved the map and report unanimously, and subsequently recounted the factors that helped foster a productive environment. He argued that limiting the task force membership to non-commissioners eliminated unnecessary political distractions, and indicated that the testimony heard from the public enabled the task force to hear a variety of testimonies. Additionally, Mr. Clayman praised the support the task face received from staff members in the Office of Councilmember Janeese Lewis-George in concert with the support received from the Office of Planning.

*Zack Israel, ANC Commissioner (4D04)*

Mr. Israel applauded the work of the Ward 4 Redistricting Task Force, stating that they were very open and transparent during the process. Additionally, Mr. Israel thanked the staff of Councilmember Lewis-George for their hard work. He advocated to expand his commission from 6 commissioners to 8. He ultimately expressed gratitude that the task force acted on this request, but also expressed concern with some of the SMD lines within ANC 4D.

*Conor Shaw, President, Eckington Civic Association*

Mr. Shaw reported the racial diversity within the Eckington neighborhood, stating that no racial group is a majority. He argued that northeast Eckington needs a cohesive single member district and urged the subcommittee to consider adopting adjustments in the newly proposed Eckington/Edgewood ANC. Additionally, he asked the Council to reject a proposal that would split ANC 5E north/south instead of east/west.

*Scott Roberts*

Mr. Roberts supported the map that had been submitted by the task force. He testified against an amendment to the map that would split Eckington horizontally, instead of vertically which is what the proposed map does. He urged the Council to reject such an amendment.

*Adrian Jordan, Ward 5 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Jordan testified in support of the proposed map. He articulated that although the map doesn’t include all of his preferences, he believes that it is a good map because it represents compromise and a variety of perspectives. Mr. Jordan also proposed that the Council’s Office of Racial Equity could potentially look at the map and indicate areas or changes that could be made to increase the diversity of commissioners and commissions. When discussing Fort Lincoln, Mr. Jordan reported that the goal was to unify the neighborhood into a single community. He relayed the challenges in accounting for population growth in Fort Lincoln, in addition to balancing older homes and new homes when considering the makeup of possible commissions. He also requested that the subcommittee make an exception and allow the approximately 200 residents in the northwest corner of Fort Lincoln who were redistricted outside of the technical neighborhood boundary be represented by one of the commissioners who represent Fort Lincoln.

*Roy L. Pearson, Jr.*

Mr. Pearson argued that carving out the northwest corner of Fort Lincoln is in direct violation of the basis in which the federal government ceded the land to the District. He maintained that the proposal fails to respect the political geography of the neighborhood and city. He went on to relay the history of Fort Lincoln becoming a District neighborhood, and argued that carving out the northwest corner of Fort Lincoln does not adequately respect the economic and racial diversity that the corner contributes to the larger community.

*Mollie Bates*

Ms. Bates affirmed her allegiance to Eckington, and relayed her various activities within the neighborhood. The proposed map would place her SMD in Edgewood, which concerned Ms. Bates a great deal. She expressed fear of having a commissioner who wouldn’t know much about her needs, and she also relayed that she had been addressing environmental concerns that stem from an issue specific to her SMD. Therefore, if she was to change SMDs, she maintained that her advocacy would be impacted a great deal.

*Uchenna Evans*

Ms. Evans advocated that the current 5A01 boundaries be kept intact. She argued that the task force carving out residents from the SMD was problematic and maintained that an exception to the population rule is warranted in the SMD. Ms. Evans also noted that the task force would split the Michigan Park Commons into two SMDs, which she believed to be unreasonable and unwarranted. Ms. Evans would go on to detail aspects of the process that she found problematic, including the task force’s website not being user friendly and meetings being scheduled without sufficient notice given.

*Joe Levesque, Assistant Recording Secretary, Bloomingdale Civic Association*

Mr. Levesque articulated support for the proposed map. He discussed the importance of keeping Bloomingdale intact, mainly due to its historic significance and neighborhood cohesiveness. Mr. Levesque further expressed appreciation for the task force and the work they had completed.

*Tequia Hicks Delgado*

Ms. Delgado advocated that the entirety of Fort Lincoln should remain within two SMDs. She argued that community is cohesive in identity, interaction, history, conversation and interests. She articulated that this can be done by keeping the 201 residents of Ft Lincoln located to the north along Bladensburg Rd./Eastern Avenue within 5C01/5C03 by splitting that block along 35th St/Pine View Ct. Ms. Delgado also expressed frustration with the prospect of separating newly proposed 5C03 residents from the attached Fort Lincoln Park/DPR real estate.

*Geoffrey Hatchard*

Mr. Hatchard, a member of the Redistricting Task Force both during the process ten years ago and the current process, explained a difference between the two processes. He articulated that the process ten years ago was somewhat easy when deciding boundaries, however the rapid population growth that the Ward has seen since then has made the process more difficult this time around. He expressed that in many instances, maintaining the current boundaries was impossible due to the population growth. In response to testimony advocating that there be an exception made to keep in Fort Lincoln intact, Mr. Hatchard argued that such an exception would have a spiraling effect and would cause other exceptions to be made elsewhere throughout the ward. He acknowledged that residents may be upset with the SMD lines changing, however he reiterated that the task force attempted to keep as many ANCs the same as possible.

*Nolan Treadway, Ward 5 Redistricting Task Force Co-Chair*

Mr. Treadway expressed pride in the task force’s work, and articulated that he believed they have presented a well-grounded and well-reasoned ANC map for the subcommittee and Council to consider. He stressed how important public input was to the task force’s work and decision-making. Additionally, Mr. Treadway reported that the task force report was approved by a vote of 16 to 0 with one abstention, and the map was approved by a vote of 16 in favor and one person opposed. When discussing the map, Mr. Treadway admitted that the task force struggled finding a balance between maintaining current lines and adhering to population requirements.

*Colleen Costello, ANC Commissioner (5B05)*

Ms. Costello asked the Council to consider leaving a portion of 5B05 intact. She argued that there was little room for public input after the task force made changes, and that public opposition was largely disregarded.

*Mark Eckenwiler, ANC Commissioner (6C04)*

Mr. Eckenwiler expressed strong disagreements with decisions of the task force , arguing that some of the work was left unfinished in ANC 6E. He objected to many of the census block splits, in addition to the proposed number of SMDs. Mr. Eckenwiler would go on to suggest that similar issues remain when looking at ANC 6C. He informed the subcommittee that he has created alternative maps, and he expected his ANC to vote in favor of an alternative in the coming weeks.

*Corey Holman, ANC Commissioner (6B06)*

Mr. Holman recommended that the Council ensure that new ANCs are well funded from the beginning. Additionally, he informed that Council of his belief that task forces and residents need more direction from the Council related to SMD size in the future. He expressed support of the task force’s work regarding ANC 6B, and praised the task force’s inclusion of a majority-minority SMD. Additionally, Mr. Holman commended the Ward 7 Task Force for the vision and dedication to ensure residents of the DC Jail would continue to retain their ability to elect an SMD to represent their unique population.

*Alison Horn, ANC Commissioner (6B09)*

Ms. Horn began her testimony by acknowledging tension within Ward 7 stemming from discussions around Ward Redistricting months prior. She expressed that her neighborhood is not a monolith and conveyed excitement regarding the prospect of working collaboratively with her new Ward 7 neighbors. Ms. Horn went on to express concern over her neighborhood being split and argued that such an act would lead to residents not being as involved in the political process. She also mentioned that the reality of having to travel greater distances for ANC meetings would negatively impact residents with fewer resources, prohibiting them from being as involved.

*Ashley Renee Ruff, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; President, Fort DuPont Civic Association*

Ms. Ruff stated that the process seems to heighten racial tensions. She relayed sentiments that as a 7F resident, she often feels ignored. Additionally, Ms. Ruff mentioned that conversations held during task force meetings have made her uncomfortable when visiting different areas of the ward, largely due to what she declared as an emphasis on race.

*Brynn Barnett, Former Chair, ANC 6B Hill East Task Force*

Ms. Barnett requested that the subcommittee reject the proposed map submitted by the task force. She argued that the recommendation fails to support the needs of Ward 7 residents who live west of the Anacostia River. She further maintained that the task force’s process lacked objectivity, and did not follow the guidelines provided by the subcommittee. Ms. Barnett emphasized that her neighborhood into two different ANCs, and argued that such a divide would negatively impact the representation that residents west of the river would have.

*Patricia A. Stamper, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; Secretary, Deanwood Citizens Association*

Ms. Stamper requested that the Deanwood neighborhood reside within one ANC. Being as though a majority of Deanwood residents reside in ANC 7C, Ms. Stamper requested that the entire Deanwood neighborhood be placed within that commission.

*Keith R. Hasan-Towery, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; Marshall Heights Civic Association*

Mr. Hasan-Towery emphasized his focus on unity during the redistricting process. Mr. Hasan-Towery discussed the population statistics of residents living west of the river compared to residents living east of the river, and commended Councilmember Gray for ensuring that residents who live to the west of the river were involved in the task force. He would go on to share a checklist that the task force utilized when crafting the map, which was used to ensure the final map was as equitable as possible. He also reported that when trying to work with a select number of residents west of the river, many people refused to collaborate and were solely focused on having one ANC. However, he also clarified that he had a positive working relationship with neighbors from both sides of the river.

*Travis R. Swanson, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; ANC Commissioner (7B03)*

Mr. Swanson reported that the task force members all worked well together, and commended Councilmember Gray for comprising the group. He also expressed appreciation of having all parts of the ward represented on the task force. Mr. Swanson spoke in support of the task force’s recommended map and declared that the map was a product of collaboration, compromise, and fairness. He supported the increase of ANC 7B from seven SMDs to nine, and appreciated that the Greenway neighborhood would remain in 7B.

*Laura Szymanski*

Dr. Szymanski requested that residents west of the river be united under a single ANC. She explained that if the goal is to keep identifiable neighborhoods intact, then residents west of the Anacostia River should not be divided as proposed.

*Ceara Nicole Flake*

Ms. Flake declared that this phase of the redistricting process is not a race issue, but rather an issue of fairness and equity. She argued that moving her community out of Ward 6 violated redistricting guidelines articulated by the Council. She also indicated that the Council has the chance to redeem its commitment to redistricting principles during this phase of the process. Ms. Flake would go on to express resentment with communities being united east of the river, when that same courtesy hadn’t been given to residents west of the river. She maintained that if Ward 7 constituents west of the river aren’t unified under a single ANC, their interests will continue to be disregarded.

*Mandla Deskins, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; Capitol View Civic Association*

Mr. Deskins began his testimony by appreciating the virtual nature of the hearing, stating that the virtual platform makes it easier for parents to engage. He enthusiastically supported the recommended map from the task force and emphasized the need for communities with historical ties to not be split into multiple ANCs. Therefore Mr. Deskins was pleased that Capitol View would remain united. He went on to relay a sentiment that some residents felt remaining in Ward 6 was more important than helping the Ward 7 task force create equitable boundaries. He expressed concern that the same residents who fought to remain in Ward 6 were now fighting to have their own ANC west of the river. Mr. Deskins ended by emphasizing the collaborative nature of the task force, reporting that over 80 percent of task force members supported the recommended map.

*Bob Coomber, Friends of Kingman Park*

Mr. Coomber emphasized that there have been residents west of the river that have been a part of Ward 7 for multiple decades. Mr. Coomber expressed support for one ANC west of the river, arguing that local communities know what’s best for them. He mentioned that the task force was receptive of keeping of communities together for neighborhoods east of the river and maintained that such courtesy wasn’t extended to residents west of the river.

*Dorothy Douglas, ANC Commissioner (7D03)*

Ms. Douglas articulated that the residents of her single member district were not able to be engaged in this process, and subsequently are not aware of what is happening. She mentioned that her request for assistance in making maps was not responded to, and that she felt shut out of the entire process.

*Lisa White, former ANC Commissioner, Friends of Kingman Park*

Ms. White expressed disagreement with the maps that have been submitted by the task force. She argued that the task force did not hear the voice of the Kingman Park community, in addition to the voice of Rosedale, Hill East, and the greater Capitol Hill neighborhoods. She advocated that the residents west of the river be able to form their own ANC considering how the task force accommodated other communities and made them whole.

*Aerica Kennedy*

Ms. Kennedy requested that the subcommittee reject the recommended map from the task force, stating that the map would divide the Hill East neighborhood along an arbitrary line. Ms. Kennedy reiterated the redistricting guidelines, and argued that the guidelines matter most during the ANC redistricting process. She maintained that the guidelines were not followed when the task force crafted Hill East ANC boundaries.

*Brian Alcorn, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; ANC Commissioner (6A08)*

Mr. Alcorn urged the Council to reject the recommended map submitted by the Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force. He argued that the task force’s recommendation ignored the concept of a neighborhood and failed to unify the Capitol Hill parts of Ward 7. Mr. Alcorn also maintained that the task force did not follow the Council’s redistricting principles.

*Tamara Blair, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Co-Chair; ANC Commissioner (7D01)*

Ms. Blair advocated that west of the river SMDs be united as a single ANC. She argued that the task force created a disjointed array of neighborhoods by not unifying west of the river SMDs, and further mentioned that discussions of a single west of the river ANC were held ten years ago as well.

*Laurence Blue*

Mr. Blue refuted the notion that residents aren’t aware of the redistricting process, insisting that his neighborhood is very aware of what is happening. Mr. Blue expressed his preference of wanting an ANC commissioner that would listen to residents’ voices instead of solely acting on personal judgement.

*Sondra Phillips-Gilbert, ANC Commissioner (6A07)*

Ms. Phillips-Gilbert asked the Council to consider the minority maps that act as an alternative to the task force’s recommendation. She argued that the alternative recommendations reflect the redistricting principles, and maintained that the task force intentionally divided her community. She also reported that meetings became hard to watch due to the disrespect task force members conveyed towards those with dissenting opinions, reflecting that she did not feel welcome as a new resident of Ward 7.

*Maria Marta Ferreyra*

Ms. Ferreyra testified against the final recommendation of the Ward 7 ANC Redistricting Task Force due to the prospect of her community being divided. She argued that redistricting principles have been violated by the task force, however she simultaneously affirmed that the Minority Position Map upholds such principles. In her opinion, the alternative map would satisfy the principles of compactness and contiguity.

*Tyrell M. Holcomb, ANC Commissioner (7F01) and Chair of ANC 7F*

Mr. Holcomb acknowledged that change is not easy to accept. He explained that the task force sought to create an even split in SMDs within ANCs that stretched across the river. Mr. Holcomb would go on to admit that he experienced negative racial and socioeconomic undertones during the process, stressing the importance of having every voice heard during redistricting. He emphasized that the task force did not rush this process in order to create the best possible product.

*Michael Cushman*

Mr. Cushman stressed that it is wrong to dilute the representation and subsequent political power of a given group of people. He asked the Council to reject the recommended map submitted by the task force. Mr. Cushman also indicated that members of the task force were not open to listening to dissenting opinions, which he explained is in opposition to the “stronger together” mantra.

*Brian Thompson, Ward 8 Redistricting Task Force Chair; ANC Commissioner (8A03)*

Mr. Thompson reiterated that the task force attempted to create a coherent, democratic, balanced, and engaged process. He emphasized that the process was truly democratic considering the task force’s willingness to receive public input. Mr. Thompson also expressed appreciation that new residents of Ward 8 by way of Navy Yard were able to work together with long-time residents of the ward.

*Jamila White, ANC Commissioner (8A05)*

Ms. White opposed the submitted map from the task force. She advocated that the subcommittee keep historic Anacostia together as a community, arguing that the community is comprised of residents who share similar concerns and would benefit from being in the same ANC. She also expressed concern that the recommended map would concentrate decision-making power regarding issues facing Anacostia outside of Anacostia’s boundaries. Ms. White articulated her belief that the recommended map did not accurately reflect the voices of the community.

*Alma H. Gates*

Ms. Gates argued that the Neighborhood Voices maps restore the voice of neighborhoods by placing institution and ANC representation within the same geographic boundaries. Additionally, Ms. Gates objected to the task force making wholesale changes to existing working relationships between institutions and their surrounding communities.

*Ann Haas*

Ms. Haas expressed support for the Neighborhood Voice Map. She advocated that the Foxhall School and Foxhall Village remain in the same SMD.

*Shelly Repp*

Mr. Repp expressed concern that while the task force reserved time for public comment, much of the work was done behind the scenes. He relayed that there was a strong push from community members asking the task force to delay the vote on a final map recommendation, however the task force refused to oblige. He argued that the task force ignored the instruction to keep neighborhoods together while refusing to engage with dissenting perspectives.

*Jane Slatter*

Ms. Slatter testified in opposition to the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood being divided. She advocated that the neighborhood remains in one ANC and SMD.

*Judith Kennedy*

Ms. Kennedy requested that the Council reject the task force’s recommendation, arguing that the task force violated redistricting guidelines.

*Leila Afzal*

Ms. Afzal opposed Cleveland Park being split into ANCs. She argued that citizens who already find it demanding to keep up with the system would now have to show up to twice as many ANC and Planning and Zoning meetings. She urged the subcommittee to implement the Neighborhood Voices map.

*Maggie Simpson*

Ms. Simpson objected to how the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force went about completing its task. She argued that the boundaries proposed in the Task Force Final Report do not correspond with the boundaries of neighborhoods where residents share common interests and care about the same challenges and issues. She expressed support for the Neighborhood Voices Map.

Mary Alice Levine

Ms. Levine advocated for an independent redistricting commission. She maintained that Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force members ignored public input, adding that the process lacked transparency at times. She expressed support for the Neighborhood Voices Map.

*Robert Avery*

Mr. Avery charged that members of the task force abuse their power and advocated for the implementation of the Neighborhood Voice Map.

**April 28, 2022 Hearing**

The Subcommittee on Redistricting held a public hearing on Bill 24-700 on Thursday, April 28, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. A video recording of the public hearing is available at <http://dc.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=22>. The public witnesses’ testimonies are summarized below.

**Public Witnesses**

*Camille Bourguignon, Historic Anacostia Preservation Society*

Mr. Bourguignon argued that the task force’s proposed map would dilute the voice of residents of the Anacostia Historic District. He explained that this dilution would occur due to residents of Anacostia becoming minorities in newly created SMDs. Mr. Bourguignon also expressed concern that residents of historic Anacostia would be losing their voice over the redevelopment of the area between Martin Luther King Jr. SE and the Anacostia River. He would go on to express concerns with the redistricting process, including a lack adequate communication to residents of the ward. He requested that the subcommittee reject the proposed map by the task force.

*LaTasha Gunnels*

Ms. Gunnels opposed the map submitted by the task force. She advocated that the historic district remains in ANC 8A and argued that the Ward 8 Redistricting Task Force map was not contiguous. She also maintained that the proposed map splits communities and expressed a concern that only 8 of the 39 task force members were present at the final meeting.

*Jamila White, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (8A05); Ward 8 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Ms. White presented an alternative map as an expression of her opposition to the task force’s proposed map. She explained that the alternative map combines two communities together while simultaneously keeping Anacostia and Fairlawn together.

*Salim Adofo, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (8C07); Ward 8 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Adofo advocated that ANC 8C keep the current commissions as close to what they currently are as possible in terms of geography. He explained that the task force’s map shifts the commissions, asserting that the new Ward 8 residents of Navy Yard should be split between 8A and 8C.

*Carolyn Johns Gray*

Ms. Gray explained that the Anacostia Historic District was initially approved to afford residents a sense of security. She expressed opposition to the task force’s submitted map.

*Greta Fuller, Historic Anacostia Preservation Society*

Ms. Fuller expressed support for an alternative map submitted in opposition to the task force’s map. She also urged the Council to reject the task force map outright.

*Guillermo Galdamez*

Mr. Galdamez opposed the submitted task force recommended map. He argued that many of the ANCs and SMDs don’t seem to be compact, and the reality of neighbors having to coordinate between various ANCs will create an unnecessary burden. Mr. Galdamez also expressed displeasure regarding Anacostia’s commercial corridor being split into different ANCs and maintained that the proposed map would limit neighbors’ voices in discussions surrounding new development.

*Rick Murphree*

Mr. Murphree expressed support for the map submitted by the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society. He indicated a preference for the historic district being kept together.

*Tracey Swan*

Ms. Swan opposed the map submitted by the task force. She argued that historic Anacostia is a community of interest and therefore should not be split up. Ms. Swan is in favor of the alternative maps presented by community members.

*Charles Wilson*

Mr. Wilson spoke in support of the alternative map submitted by Commissioner White.

*Kristina Leszczak*

Ms. Leszczak submitted a petition that urged the Council to ensure that residents east of the river have representation along the waterfront, and requested that the commercial corridor along Martin Luther King Jr. SE and Good Hope Road be placed in a single ANC. She also advocated that the Anacostia Historic District be placed in a single ANC. Additionally, Ms. Leszczak argued that the task force map does not reflect the community’s desire.

*James Thach*

Mr. Thach expressed support for the presented alternative maps. He reiterated the need to keep neighborhoods contiguous, as well as the need for community members to have a voice concerning incoming development.

*Dionne Brown*

Ms. Brown argued that ANC boundaries should remain the same as before, with the exception of a few minor changes. She claimed that the task force proposed several irregularly shaped SMDs that would ultimately destroy neighborhood cohesion. She also advocated that the Bellevue community remain whole in a single ANC.

*Rev. Anthony Motley*

Reverend Motley expressed appreciation regarding the work of Councilmember Silverman and the Subcommittee on Redistricting. He expressed a concern over the democratic process not being fair and equitable during the task force’s work, and explained that task force was possibly making decisions without a quorum being present.

*Francis M. Campbell*

Mr. Campbell articulated that as a task force member, he sought to keep preserve the neighborhoods of Hill East, Rosedale, and Kingman Park. He proclaimed that the final task force recommendation does not reflect the desired outcome for the 6A and 6B residents of Ward 7.

*Malissa Freese, Riverview Northeast, President*

Ms. Freese supported the recommended map submitted by the task force. She argued that the recommended map followed the redistricting guidelines by ensuring that ANCs were contiguous, and communities of interest were protected.

*Meredith Holmgren*

Ms. Holmgren advocated for a west of the river ANC. She argued that the task force failed to create compact and contiguous boundaries west of the river, which she believed would negatively impact civic engagement and participation.

*Brian Alcorn, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (6A08)*

Mr. Alcorn advocated for a single west of the river ANC and maintained that members of the task force who represented west of the river vied for the same thing. He argued that the task force recommendation would inadequately meet the needs of his compact community of interest.

*Nathan Schuur*

Mr. Schuur argued that the proposed boundaries for ANC 7A and ANC 7F are gerrymandered, and requested that the Council reject such a proposal. He articulated that the proposed boundaries would disproportionately harm neighbors with mobility issues, and subsequently mentioned that the proposal is widely opposed by residents west of the river.

*Sondra Phillips-Gilbert, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (6A07)*

Ms. Phillips-Gilbert supported a single west of the river ANC as it would connect the Ward 7 neighborhoods of Hill East, Kingman Park, Rosedale, Reservation 13 / RFK developments and include a Single Member District for the incarcerated residents of the DC Jail.

*Aerica V. Kennedy*

Ms. Kennedy argued that having a single ANC west of the river is the logical answer to addressing shared concerns that residents in the encompassing neighborhoods have. She requested that the subcommittee reject the map approved by the task force and maintained that the division of her community creates an imbalance between the eastern and western parts of Ward 7.

*Denise Rucker Krepp, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (6B10)*

Ms. Krepp emphasized that relevant issues differ based on neighborhood. She admitted that she was puzzled when the task force released its recommendation because it divided neighborhoods. She articulated that dividing a neighborhood fails to recognize and respect the unique identity of a given neighborhood.

*Tyrell M. Holcomb, ANC Commissioner (7F01) and Chair of ANC 7F*

Mr. Holcomb acknowledged that change is not easy, however he emphasized the necessity of being able to adapt to change. He advocated for the Council to ensure that there is funding available to inform community members of any changes to their voting precincts or commissions in which they reside.

*Patricia Stamper, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; Secretary, Deanwood Citizens Association*

Ms. Stamper reported that the entire Deanwood Citizens Association membership voted unanimously to support the Ward 7 ANC redistricting map proposed by the Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force. She appreciated Deanwood being placed into a single ANC.

*Tamara Blair, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Co‑Chair; ANC Commissioner (7D01)*

Ms. Blair expressed concern with what she categorized as a diversion from the redistricting principles, arguing that the alternative Minority Map better supports the principles of redistricting. With the way current SMD boundaries are drawn, Ms. Blair articulated that it would be extremely difficult for residents west of the river to accomplish anything without significant buy-in from their neighbors to the east of the river.

*Ashley Ruff, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; President, Fort DuPont Civic Association*

Ms. Ruff argued that the proposed map would phase out ANC 7F. She expressed concern that history and culture would be erased with the implementation of the recommended map.

*Dr. Marla M. Dean, Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force Member; Ward 7 Education Council*

Dr. Dean emphasized that there was no effort to exclude the voices of residents west of the river during the task force’s work. She argued that the task force did not deviate from redistricting principles and utilized a neighborhood strategy when crafting the map. Dr. Dean also clarified that “west of the river” is not a single neighborhood but is rather comprised of a multitude of neighborhoods.

*Villareal D. Johnson, Building Bridges and Connecting People*

Mr. Johnson articulated that he cares deeply about equity, inclusion, and transparency. He expressed that simply choosing between the wants of people west of the river versus those of residents east of the river is the wrong premise to act upon.

*Brynn Barnett, Former Chair, ANC 6B Hill East Task Force*

Ms. Barnett expressed that having such broad ANC boundaries would present challenges when confronting public safety. She argued that Rosedale, Hill East, and Kingman Park form a compact community of interest, and therefore should not be divided.

*Dorothy Douglas, ANC Commissioner (7D03)*

Ms. Douglas expressed opposition to the task force’s submitted map. She maintained that the community did not have an opportunity to relay any input.

*Ebony Payne*

Ms. Payne expressed a love for Ward 7 as well as a fondness for her neighbors east of the river. She opposed the task force’s map, and relayed feelings that the task force failed to listen to arguments made by residents west of the river. She advocated for a single ANC west of the river.

*Chander Jayaraman*

Mr. Jayaraman emphasized the need for compactness and togetherness. He argued that having a single ANC west of the river would enable residents to speak with a unified voice, making them a better asset to the larder ward.

*Lisa White*

Ms. White argued that forming a single ANC west of the river is in the best interests of the community. She charged that the task force’s goal from the beginning of the process was to divide communities west of the river.

*Mark Eckenwiler, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (6C04)*

Mr. Eckenwiler proposed an alternative map to what was submitted by the task force. He argued that regarding ANC 6C, the task force’s recommendation would force the ANC out of compliance with population rules.

*Cheryl Dixon*

Ms. Dixon requested that the division of 5C and 5B also be implemented from the intersection of 20th Street and Rhode Island Avenue to the intersection of 24th Street and Rhode Island Avenue. She articulated that this would enable the three blocks north of Rhode Island Avenue to become a part of ANC 5B.

*Nolan Treadway, Ward 5 Redistricting Task Force Co-Chair*

Mr. Treadway testified in response to Ms. Dixon, explaining that she brought forth a valid point, however he believed the residents mostly advocated for a single ANC.

*Geoffrey Hatchard, Ward 5 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Hatchard informed the subcommittee that his presence at the hearing was merely to answer any questions and provide clarifications, therefore he had no testimony prepared.

*Rachelle Nigro, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (6E04)*

Ms. Nigro advocated for a cross-ward Single Member District, arguing that residents have built relationships with each other and have become accustomed to working with each other. She claimed that the Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force was supportive of the idea, however the Ward 5 Task force was not too receptive. She also proclaimed that having a cross-ward SMD would keep the majority of Mount Vernon Square together.

*Prita Piekara, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (5B03)*

Ms. Piekara reported that a group of residents felt like they weren’t engaged in this process. She advocated that a triangle of land/residents in the proposed ANC 5C be moved into ANC 5B. While she thanked the task force for their hard work, Ms. Piekara requested that in the future, sitting Commissioners be not allowed to weigh in on their boundaries.

*Naima Jefferson*

Ms. Jefferson supported the recommended map from the task force and explained that the task force was extremely diverse and representative of the population of which it served. She found the process very transparent and was thankful to the Office of Councilmember Lewis-George for their work. She advocated for more oversight, transparency, funding, and professional expertise both in the Office of ANC and within each Commission. Additionally, she recommended that ANCs be required to post recordings of their public meetings similar to the how the Council archives its meetings on its website.

*Leigh Ann Evanson, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Ms. Evanson supported the task force’s map and urged the Council to accept the task force’s recommendations. She argued that the map is compliant, with the product reflecting important values and principles.

*Tricia Duncan, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

As a member of the task force, Ms. Duncan expressed pride in the final product produced. She refuted the notion that homeowners were “real” residents compared to renters, and therefore deserved to have their voices centered. Ms. Duncan emphasized that the task force rejected such an idea through their work.

*Judith Kennedy, Cleveland Park Historical Society*

Ms. Kennedy charged that the task force “carved up” and gerrymandered Ward 3 neighborhood representation as to undermine the cohesiveness and integrity of neighbors' ability to speak with one voice on important neighborhood matters. She argued that the task force’s recommendation would effectively undermine neighborhood cohesiveness.

*Janell Pagats, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (3C03)*

Ms. Pagats acknowledged that change is difficult. However, she articulated that it is unproductive for an individual to categorize the redistricting process as unfair simply because the outcome was not what they wanted. She stressed that the task force allotted time for public comment, and voiced opposition to membership-based organizations concentrated in Cleveland Park being allowed to dictate how the lines of other ANCs and SMDs should be drawn. Ms. Pagats supported the recommended map from the task force.

*Ana Tejblum Evans*

Ms. Evans urged the Council to reject the changes proposed by the task force. She emphasized that residents of Cleveland Park have repeatedly attempted to share their opinions and argued that the task force created a gerrymandered product.

*Karen Lightfoot*

Ms. Lightfoot opposed the task force recommendation. She called it “cynical” and “shameful” to weaken the voice of a united Cleveland Park. She argued that it would have been more sensible for the task force to recognize neighborhood cohesiveness. Ms. Lightfoot urged the Council to keep Cleveland Park within one ANC.

*Gin Bell, Vice President, Woodland Normanstone Neighborhood Association*

Ms. Bell ceded her time.

*Maura Duffy*

Ms. Duffy supported the task force’s proposed map. She articulated that it made perfect sense to connect ANCs with commercial corridors.

*Shelly Repp, American University Park Neighbors*

Mr. Repp emphasized that neighborhood cohesiveness should be maintained. He explained that Advisory Neighborhood Commissions should respond to the needs of neighborhoods, which would be undermined if neighborhoods are split up. He argued that the task force proposal takes the “neighborhood” out of the ANC and divorces residents from their neighbors.

*Brian Flahaven, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Flahaven urged the Council to support the task force’s recommendations. He explained that the task force created a map based on guiding principles including organizing ANCs around “centers of gravity” and population clusters, trying to keep ANCs close in population size, avoiding the splitting of census blocks, and ensuring residents were treated fairly regardless of type of housing unit or taxes paid. He argued that by keeping the entirety of Cleveland Park in one ANC, the Neighborhood Voice map significantly weakens the new Middle Wisconsin ANC.

*Kirby Vining, Committee of 100 on the Federal City*

Mr. Vining argued that the task force ignored the Council’s directive to ensure neighborhood cohesiveness and keep communities of interest together, and instead has taken “neighborhoods” out of the proposed Advisory Neighborhood Commissions. He spoke in support of the Neighborhood Voices alternative map.

*Nancy MacWood, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (3C09)*

Ms. MacWood requested that the Council reject the task force recommendations. She objected to what she a deemed an artificial division that would break up Cleveland Park.

*Steven Seelig*

Mr. Seelig spoke in support of the task force map. He refuted the notion that residents in Cleveland Park have been gerrymandered, and opposed residents in Cleveland Park being able to comment on matters that don’t impact their immediate neighborhood.

*Alma H. Gates, Neighbors for a Livable Community*

Ms. Gates claimed that from the very beginning, the task force avoided engaging in public outreach. She argued that the Neighborhood Voices coalition demonstrates a viable alternative the map submitted by the task force. She also maintained that the ward hasn’t seen drastic population growth that would warrant the changes task force members have proposed.

*Kamolika Das, Former Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Ms. Das clarified that she resigned from the task force because she moved to Philadelphia. She urged the Council to accept the task force recommendations and argued that individuals who oppose the task force sometimes focus on ambiguous criticisms. Ms. Das also urged the Council to make decisions that would empower Ward 3 residents that have been previous ignored in past processes and debates.

*David Isaacs*

Mr. Isaacs strongly opposed the task force recommendations. He argued that binding neighborhoods to commercial corridors is a narrow approach.

*Christian Damiana, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (3D07)*

Mr. Damiana supported the proposed changes surrounding American University found in the task force’s recommended map. He explained that the District’s college students have been historically underrepresented when it comes to ANCs with their voting strength systematically diluted for decades. He argued that the task force’s map reverses the 2011 “gerrymandering” of American University students and subsequently protects their representation. Ms. Damiana also spoke in support of moving American University in an upper-Wisconsin Avenue ANC.

*Thaddeus Bradley-Lewis*

Mr. Bradley-Lewis spoke in support of the task force’s recommendations. He argued that the task force represents the “one person, one vote” principle than any alternative offering.

*Charles Cadwell, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (3/4G07)*

Mr. Cadwell spoke in support of the task force’s work, calling their process open and transparent. Additionally, Mr. Cadwell emphasized that the task force received public comment respectfully and seriously considered alternative maps and suggestions.

*Robert Avery, President, Foxhall Community Citizens Association*

Mr. Avery emphasized that it is difficult for people to react to something if they don’t visually see it. He argued that boundaries were deliberately drawn to separate neighborhoods from certain schools.

*William Clarkson*

Mr. Clarkson supported the task force’s proposal. He emphasized the difficulty of this process and stated that it is impossible to craft boundaries that would please everyone.

*Richard B. Nash, Cleveland Park Historical Society*

Mr. Nash claimed that no other Ward Redistricting Task Force deviated from the Council’s guidelines more than the Ward 3 Task Force. He argued that the task force failed to maintain neighborhood cohesiveness.

*Benjamin Tessler, President, Westover Place Homes Corporation*

Mr. Tessler endorsed the Neighborhood Voices map. He advocated that Spring Valley and Wesley Heights remain in ANC 3D, expressing a desire to remain with neighbors who share common issues.

*Jane Slatter, Woodland Normanstone Neighborhood Association*

Ms. Slatter requested that Woodland Normanstone remain within one SMD. She objected to the task force’s recommendation that would split the neighborhood into two different ANCs.

*Troy Kravitz, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Kravitz reiterated the rules and guiding principles that task force abided by. In an effort to distinguish the task force recommendation from the Neighborhood Voices alternative map, Mr. Kravitz went through each guiding principle to determine if either map followed the principles of redistricting. In his analysis, Mr. Kravitz found that the task force map followed the guidelines while the Neighborhood Voices map was in violation of the principles.

*Jerry Malitz, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Chair*

Mr. Malitz spoke in opposition of the Neighborhood Voices Map, arguing that it was impulsively put together and failed to garner widespread public comment during its creation. Additionally, Mr. Malitz presented a rebuttal to the sentiment that the task force did not engage in public outreach, speaking out against notions that gerrymandering has been a consequence of the task force’s recommendation.

*Bob Ward, Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Ward articulated that he believed ANCs should be focused on corridors where most people live. He emphasized the task force’s transparency and spoke in support of several decisions made by the task force. He argued that the task force finished the work of the previous task force ten years ago and claimed that many people who oppose the task force are fighting for a continuation of the status quo.

*James Harnett, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Harnett began his testimony by thanking the task force chair. He also thanked the Office of Councilmember Pinto for their help as well. He expressed excitement regarding the fact that no ward councilmember was a member of the subcommittee, yet also advocated for the future removal of elected officials from the redistricting process. He spoke in support of the recommended map.

*Robert Meehan, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Meechan argued that the task force recommendation fails to adequately represent the views of residents in ANC 2B of Dupont Circle. He noted that there had been large amounts of testimony from residents asking to remain in 2B.

*P D Klein*

Ms. Klein charged that the task force disregarded requests from her neighbors asking to remain in ANC 2B. She advocated to remain in 2B despite the task force’s proposal.

*Paul M. Cadario, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Cadario spoke in support of the task force’s report. He argued that the proposed map meets the requirements set by the Council, and clarified that alternative maps were discussed extensively but ultimately rejected.

*Mike Silverstein, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (2B06)*

Mr. Silverstein emphasized that although his SMD is being divided, he supports the decision made by the task force. He admitted that he may not have been in support of a multitude of changes proposed by the task force ten years ago, however the changes within the city have facilitated an evolution in his opinions.

*Kyle Mulhall, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (2B09)*

Mr. Mulhall spoke in support of the task force map, and endorsed the changes made to ANC 2B. He argued that the proposed map makes 2B more manageable, enabling commissioners to better serve their residents.

*Pleasant Mann*

Mr. Mann complimented the subcommittee for work done during the ward redistricting process. He stated that the task force recommendations have been beneficial to the Shaw neighborhood and argued that it seems unproductive to debate the boundaries of two blocks in Dupont Circle.

*Marie Drissel*

Ms. Drissel expressed gratitude towards members of the task force for not making any changes to her neighborhood, arguing that change was not necessary.

*Ed Hanlon*

Mr. Hanlon testified in opposition to the task force map, arguing that families who have lived in the same neighborhood for generations will be told they no longer belong. If the map is to be approved, Mr. Hanlon argued that 2B09 would lose its diversity and become overwhelmingly comprised of white residents.

*Alexander M. Padro, Executive Director, Shaw Main Streets, Inc.*

Mr. Padro expressed support of the map for the new ANC 2G developed by the Shaw members of the Ward 2 ANC Redistricting Task Force. He mentioned that the proposed ANC 2G map places all of the commercial activity on Shaw Main Streets’ two principal commercial corridors, 7th and 9th Streets, in the same ANC, making it easier for commercial, residential, and institutional stakeholders to know which commission has jurisdiction over licensing and development issues.

*Ramon Estrada*

Mr. Estrada thanked the subcommittee for keeping ANC 2B09 in Ward 2. He expressed that he was joined by over 130 neighbors who signed petitions and/or wrote letters advocating that they don’t move into the Logan Circle Neighborhood. Mr. Estrada went on to emphasize the diversity of his neighborhood.

*Robin Diener*

Ms. Diener stated that she would have liked to see more women on the task force but articulated that she was pleased with the task force’s overall process. She spoke in opposition to changes made to SMD 2B04, stating that it was broken into three different SMDs.

*Donald J. Friedman, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member; President, Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council*

Mr. Friedman testified in support of the task force report. He articulated why the task force decided keep ANC 2D small with two commissioners, articulating that the ANC meetings would be short and narrowly focused. He requested that ANC2D be permitted to remain a two-Commissioner ANC dedicated to Sheridan-Kalorama.

*Marcy Logan*

Ms. Logan expressed concern that portions of Dupont Circle would be eliminated from ANC 2B despite objections raised by residents. She emphasized that the residents of ANC 2B contribute greatly to the larger community, and therefore should not be divided.

*Susan Volman, Dupont Circle Citizens Association*

Ms. Volman expressed gratitude that the task force implemented several of the recommendations she supported. However, she opposed the northeast corner of the current ANC2B, between 14th and 15th Streets, from S Street to U Street, not remaining in 2B.

*Jeffrey Rueckgauer, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (2B02)*

Mr. Rueckgauer spoke in support of the task force’s map. He urged the Council to accept the map with no further revision. Additionally, Mr. Rueckgauer maintained that the task force abided by the redistricting principles and sought to actively protect the rights of residents while preserving the integrity of neighborhoods.

*Austin Naughton, Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Chair*

Mr. Naughton stated that previous testimony demonstrates the debate that task force considered while deliberating. He explained that while the process has been more challenging than originally expected, he believed it was an amazing experience nonetheless. He acknowledged that while everyone did not get everything they may have advocated for, he expressed optimism that people could move forward knowing they’re still a resident of Ward 2.

*Santiago Lakatos, Ward 1 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Lakatos spoke in opposition to the shifting of three census blocks in the U Street neighborhood. He urged the Council to return the blocks to ANC 1B.

*Jennifer Prime, U Street Neighborhood Association*

Ms. Prime advocated for the three census blocks that were recommended to shift be returned to ANC 1B.

*J. Swiderski*

Mr. Swiderski is a resident of the Triangle between Florida Avenue and U Street. He spoke in favor of moving this area to ANC 1B on the new map.

*Paula Y. Edwards*

Ms. Edwards emphasized that this redistricting process has been the best that she’s participated in. She articulated that the 2022 process was inclusive, transparent, and considerate of all opinions. She also noted that moving part of her current SMD 4A02, into 4A01, will lessen the workload of ANC Commissioners and allow them to focus on matters specific to their constituents. Ms. Edwards went on to recommend a number of items she believed would improve the quality of ANCs.

*Rabihah Mateen, President, Citizens Aware*

Ms. Mateen expressed concern regarding the task force’s recommendation, and argued that the task force did not foster an inclusive process. She vocied opposition to what she believed was a lack of public engagement by the task force.

*David Alde*

Mr. Alde addressed a proposed map that would move the border of SMD 1C05 into Mount Pleasant. He argued that the current boarder, which is Harvard Street, is a very clear geographic border. He also noted that he rarely has any interaction with Mount Pleasant.

*Fiona Clem, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (1C08)*

Ms. Clem found the proposed change moving 1C08 from its current ANC appaling, and advocated for Adams Morgan to stay united.

*Alex Baca*

Mr. Baca testified in support of the Ward 1 Redistricting Task Force’s recommendations. He argued that the task force established new, yet appropriate paradigms for representation.

*Jeremy Sherman*

Mr. Sherman argued that the proposed lines between 1A04 and 1A07 be revisited and redrawn. He sugested an alternative he believed would better balance out populations and provide more relevant ANCs.

*Andrea Rosen*

Andrea Rosen expressed concern with mechanims used by the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force. They urged the Council to revisit their recommendations utilizing the imput of residents unafilliated with the task force.

*Andrew Fish*

Mr. Fish testified in opposition to the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force’s proposed map. He charged that the task force redifined what constitutes a “neighborhood”, and expressed concern regarding the splitting of Cleveland Park.

*Bill Gourgey*

Mr. Gourgey requested that the Council reconsider the proposal to divide the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood. He advocated that the neighborhood remain in one ANC and SMD.

*Christopher Vaden*

Mr. Vaden requested that the Council reject the recommedation that would move three census blocks, comprising 138 residents, from ANC 3E to ANC 3/4G. He argued that such a move would be inconsistent with the redistricting principles. He maintained that the task torce’s precieved error can be fixed without deviating from SMD size requirements or having a domino effect on other SMDs.

*Eve Chauchard*

Ms. Chauchard testified in opposition to the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood being divided. She advocated that the neighborhood remains in one ANC and SMD.

*Felix Jameson*

Mr. Jameson testified in support of recommendations proposed by the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force. She advocated for residents in apartments having equal voice as residents who live in single family homes and maintained that the task force’s map would provide greater equity.

*Jeffrey Denny*

Mr. Denny addressed the redistricting debate in Cleveland Park, and subsequently provided proposals the Council could utilize to rectify the situation.

*Jeffrey Keliel*

Mr. Keliel testified in opposition to the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood being divided. He advocated that the neighborhood remain in one ANC and SMD.

*Jeffrey Kraskin*

Mr. Kraskin expressed disappointment when discussing his belief that the task force was not representative of the entire Ward 3 population. He argued that the effect of the 2022 Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force’s recommendation is to disenfranchise residents from the ANC process.

*John Buchanan*

Mr. Buchanan requested that the Council adopt the Neighborhood Voices alternative map. He argued that the alternative map does a better job at respecting the established boundaries of Cleveland Park than the proposal submitted by the task force.

*Mary Alice Levine*

Ms. Levine explained that two factors greatly dictated how the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force drew its map: the need to create a new ANC due to population growth and the push by some task force members to split Cleveland Park. Additionally, she argued that the task force ignored many of the guiding principles in certain areas of the ward.

*Michael Rifer*

Mr. Rifer urged the Council to reject the recommendations presented by the Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force. He categorized the task force’s process as deeply flawed and objected to Cleveland Park being divided.

*Nancy Bryant*

Ms. Bryant testified in opposition to the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood being divided. He advocated that the neighborhood remains in one ANC and SMD.

*Paul London*

Mr. London testified in opposition to Cleveland Park being divided into two ANCs.

*Ron Del Sesto*

Mr. Del Sesto testified in opposition to the Woodland Normanstone neighborhood being divided. He advocated that the neighborhood remains in one ANC and SMD.

*Stacia Linde*

Ms. Linde conveyed the cohesiveness of Ward 3, and expressed fears that neighbors are no longer listening to each other.

*Walter Schumann*

Mr. Schumann requested that the Council adopts the map submitted by the Neighborhood Voices Coalition.

*William Krebs*

Mr. Krebs argued that the American University main campus and Wesley Theological Seminary belonged in ANC 3D. He maintained that the task force’s recommendation would disenfranchise students.

*Woodley Park Community Association*

The Woodley Park Community Association testified in support of the ANC and SMD boundaries proposed by the Ward 3 ANC Redistricting Task Force.

*Betsy McDaniel*

Ms. McDaniel expressed support for the creation of an additional ANC to accommodate the growth in population by creating two ANCs to replace ANC5E.

*Connor Shaw*

Mr. Shaw requested that the subcommittee amend the Ward 5 ANC Redistricting Task Force’s proposed map to create a cohesive and compact SMD in the northeast corner of Eckington.

*Mark Galvan*

Mr. Galvan expressed concern over the proposed Ward 5 map. He advocated for a cohesive and compact SMD in the northeast section of Eckington.

*Scott Roberts*

Mr. Roberts requested that the Council consider preserving historic districts and neighborhoods during the redistricting process.

*Annie Hunt*

Ms. Hunt testified in opposition to a cross-river ANC. She argued that making residents drive across a river to attend meetings would weaken political participation.

*Channing Jones*

Mr. Jones expressed support for a “west of the river” Ward 7 ANC. He argued that the map recommended by the task force fails to consider and abide by some of the redistricting principles.

*Elizabeth Eby*

Ms. Eby testified in support of a single ANC west of the river in Ward 7, arguing that west of the river residents represents a community of interest.

*Elizabeth Nelson*

Ms. Nelson reiterated the redistricting principles, arguing that the Ward 7 task force failed to comply with the guidelines. Additionally, Ms. Nelson argued that the task force unified neighborhoods on the east side of the river while simultaneously dividing communities on the west side.

*Erika Valentine*

Ms. Valentine advocated for a Ward 7 ANC to represent Hill East, Kingman Park, Rosedale, and the Reservation 13/RFK developments. She noted that cross-river ANCs have not worked well in the past and argued that the task force unified neighborhoods east of the river but failed to extend the same courtesy to residents west of the river.

*Nisha Patruni*

Ms. Patruni testified in support of the map submitted by the Ward 7 ANC Redistricting Task Force. She emphasized that the map would foster an environment where residents east and west of the river could work collaboratively.

*Pearl Donohoo-Vallett*

Ms. Donohoo-Vallett advocated for a single west of the river ANC. She urged the Council to protect the strength and voice of west-of-the-river communities in Hill East, Kingman Park, Rosedale, and the Reservation 13/RFK development.

*Rebecca Hunt*

Ms. Hunt advocated for a single west of the river ANC. She urged the Council to protect the strength and voice of west-of-the-river communities in Hill East, Kingman Park, Rosedale, and the Reservation 13/RFK development.

*Thea Dyson*

Ms. Dyson argued that the Ward 8 Redistricting Task Force broke up many neighborhoods and crafted irregularly shaped SMDs. She charged that a form of gerrymandering is present in the task force’s proposed map, and thus requested that the Council reject the proposal.

*Ra Amin*

Mr. Amin testified in support of the Ward 5 ANC Redistricting Task Force’s proposed map.

**Written Testimony**

*J.J. Swiderski – ANC 1C*

Swiderski states moderate support for moving the triangle between Florida Avenue NW and U Street NW to ANC 1B. The testimony largely rebuts the dissenting testimony presented by another resident. Swiderski feels the dissenting testimony misrepresent the results of the Task Force’s flash poll, the relationship between 18th Street businesses, Florida Avenue, and Dupont Circle, and the travel time to nearby grocery stores.

*Alexander M. Padro – Shaw Main Streets Executive Director*

Mr. Padro voiced the Shaw Main Streets, Inc. Board of Directors’ wholehearted support for the Task Force’s recommendation for creation of a new ANC 2G. The new SMD places Shaw Main Street’s primary commercial activity in one ANC.

*Austin Naughton Chisholm – Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Chairperson*

Mr. Naughton presented written testimony detailing the Task Force’s process for soliciting community input, deliberation, and decision making. He also provided a written version of his April 7th testimony.

*James Harnett – Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Harnett voiced his support for the Task Force leadership and members as well as the process in general, stating it is a significant improvement over previous years. Mr. Harnett expressed his disappointment that there will continue to be a two-member ANC in Sheridan-Kalorama and urged the Council to pass legislation that requires all ANCs to have at least three members.

*Marie Drissel – ANC 2D02*

Ms. Drissel voiced her support for the Task Force recommendation that maintains ANC 2D02 as a two-member ANC.

*Phyllis Klein – ANC 2B*

Ms. Klein presented an alternate map and data proposing the retention of the northeast portion of ANC 2B.

*Robert Meehan – Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member – ANC 2B*

Mr. Meehan’s written testimony was submitted as a supplement to his public hearing testimony on April 28th. Mr. Meehan stated his written testimony was largely presented to refute the testimony of a fellow Task Force member who stated Mr. Meehan’s alternative map retaining the northeast corner of ANC 2B were thoroughly considered and dismissed. Mr. Meehan claims that statement is untrue and further advocated for the alternative map proposal. He also provided copies of his proposed alternative map.

*Susan Volman – President, Dupont Circle Citizens Association*

Ms. Volman stated the DCCA works closely with all of the ANCs that share its interests and activities. She said the Association appreciates the Task Force accepting most of its recommendations for ANC boundaries but asks that the Subcommittee accept the final recommendation to retain the northeast corner of ANC 2B.

*Donald J. Friedman – Ward 2 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Friedman testified in favor of the Task Force recommendations, including the decision to allow ANC 2D Sheridan-Kalorama to remain a two-member ANC.

*Bob Ward – Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Ward voiced his appreciation for the redistricting process and support for the Task Force recommendations. He stated the process was an improvement on work that began during the last redistricting process and centers ANCs around people. He believes the new ANC maps create a more equitable ward with a local focus.

*Brian Flahaven – Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Flahaven stated his strong support for the Task Force recommendations and urged the subcommittee to vote in favor of the proposed map that creates two ANCs in the Cleveland Park area.

*Jane Slatter – Woodland Normanstone Neighborhood Association Board Member*

Ms. Slatter voiced her opposition to the Task Force’s recommendation to divide the neighborhood into two ANCs (from 3C05 to 3C05 and 3C07). Ms. Slatter presented maps and data to support a revised plan that would allow the neighborhood association to remain in one ANC.

*Janell Pagats – ANC 3C03 Commissioner*

Ms. Pagats presented comments that represent her personal view and not that of her ANC. She thanked the Task Force members and the Subcommittee for their work. She also encouraged passage of the Task Force recommendations in their entirety rather than accepting the proposed alternative Neighborhood Voice map.

*Jerry Malitz – Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Chair*

Mr. Malitz thanked the Task Force members for their service and presented information supplemental to his public hearing testimony. Mr. Malitz refuted the claims made by the Neighborhood Voice group stating the Task Force was more transparent and represented the input of many more residents. He urged the Subcommittee to accept the Task Force recommendations as presented.

*Don Tuttle and Judith Kennedy – Residents of Cleveland Park*

Mr. Tuttle and Ms. Kennedy took issue with the decisions made by the Task Force, claiming a group of unelected representatives were going against District government efforts to ensure future development benefits residents rather than developers. They urge the Subcommittee to rejected the Task Force recommendations and instead accept the alternative maps that allow Cleveland Park to remain in one ANC.

*Karen L. Lightfoot – Ward 3 Resident*

Ms. Lightfoot strongly opposes the Task Force recommendations stating they are an obvious attempt to weaken the voice of Cleveland Park residents as well as those of other Ward 3 neighborhoods. She urges the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force proposal.

*Kirby Vining – Chair of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City*

Mr. Vining stated the Committee of 100 is very concerned about the Task Force proposal and urges the Subcommittee to instead support the maps presented by Neighborhood Voices. He stated the Task Force maps, specifically related to the creation of two Cleveland Park ANCs, goes against the goal of maintaining and encouraging neighborhood cohesion. He believes the Neighborhood Voices accomplish that goal.

*Leigh Ann Evanson – Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Ms. Evanson encouraged the Subcommittee to support the Task Force recommendation as the proposal is compliant with the legislative requirements, does not dilute under represented groups, and ensures equity and equal representation.

*Richard B. Nash – Ward 3 Resident*

Mr. Nash urged the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendation in favor of the Neighborhood Voices proposal. He stated the Task Force failed to follow the guiding principles of redistricting and ignored the need for neighborhood cohesion.

*Robert Avery*

Mr. Avery provided both the Task Force recommended map and the one recommended by Neighborhood Voices. He did not provide testimony nor an indication of which map he supports.

*Shelly Repp – Ward 3 Resident*

Ms. Repp urged the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendations and instead support the Neighborhood Voices map. She particularly took issue with the changes to ANC3E and stated the Task Force proposal fails to preserve communities of interest or maintain continuity and stability.

*Troy Kravitz – Ward 3 Redistricting Task Force*

Mr. Kravitz provided a comparison of the Task Force recommendations and those provided by Neighborhood Voices, urging the Subcommittee to support the Task Force recommendations. He stated the Task Force plan complies with all of the Council directives, was created in an open setting, and treats all stakeholders equally.

*Naima Jefferson – Ward 4 Redistricting Task Force*

Ms. Jefferson testified in her personal capacity and not as a Task Force member. Ms. Jefferson first thanked Councilmember Lewis George and her staff for helping the Task Force create a transparent process that was diverse and represented the ward well. She encouraged the Council to continue to build on this process in the future.

Ms. Jefferson then turned her attention to the role ANCs play in the redistricting process and in the wards. She stated that if the District is ever to achieve statehood, there is a need for more oversight, transparency, funding, and professional expertise at the Office of ANCs and within each commission. She specifically spoke to concerns with technology as ANC meetings are largely virtual and in dealing with Freedom of Information Act requests.

*Rabihah A. Mateen – President, Citizens Aware, A Block Association of Lamond Riggs Citizens Association*

Mateen urged the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendation stating the process was not transparent and inclusive. Mateen also stated the community was presented with four potential maps for consideration but that an alternative map was approved and submitted to the Subcommittee. There were also concerns about the changes to existing ANC4B boundaries.

*Paula Y. Edwards – Ward 4 Resident*

Ms. Edwards voiced her support for the Task Force recommendations stating the process had been inclusive, transparent, and considerate of all opinions. She also urged the Subcommittee to consider ways to support the Office of ANCs and the ANCs themselves stating they are a long way from functionality and need supports such as virtual parliamentarians, IT support, and standardized policies and procedures.

*Cheryl Dixon – Ward 5 Resident*

Ms. Dixon requested the Subcommittee make a change to the ANC5B boundaries along Rhode Island Avenue to match the boundary in ANC5C between 20th and 24th Streets.

*Nichols Roland – Ward 5 Redistricting Task Force*

Mr. Roland asked the Subcommittee to amend the Task Force recommendations proposing multiple boundary changes to ANCs 5F01, 02, 03, 04, and 05.

*Kathy Henderson – Former Ward 5 ANC Commissioner*

Ms. Henderson urged the Council to reject Bill 24-700 until the residents of ANC 5D have a meaningful opportunity to participate in the adjustment of boundaries within ANC 5D, but she supported the boundary change proposed by Cheryl Dixon. Ms. Henderson also criticized the administration of ANC 5D with respect to redistricting and in general.

*Brian Alcorn – ANC Commissioner 6A08 and Ward 6 Redistricting Task Force Member*

Mr. Alcorn asked the Subcommittee to reject the portion of the Task Force recommendation that create two ANCs in the areas of Ward 6 that are being redrawn into Ward 7. He asks that the current 6A, 6B, and 7D01 create one new ANC that unifies the Hill East, Kingman Park, and Rosedale neighborhoods. Mr. Alcorn also presented the Subcommittee with a copy of an ANC Resolution supporting this recommendation.

*Francis Campbell – Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force*

Mr. Campbell encouraged the Subcommittee to consider the proposals contained in the Minority Report related to the Ward 7 Task Force recommendations. Mr. Campbell stated the Minority Report is rational and addresses the needs of Ward 7 residents in general and the new areas of Ward 7 specifically.

*Nathan Schuur and Sarah Porter – Ward 6 Residents*

Mr. Schuur and Ms. Porter asked the Subcommittee to reject the section of the Task Force Recommendations that creates two new ANCs west of the river. They stated the proposed map is not compliant with Council direction and received wide opposition from the community.

*Patricia Stamper – Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force*

Ms. Stamper presented a statement from the Deanwood Citizens Association stating the group unanimously voted to support the Ward 7 Redistricting Task Force recommendations and urged the Subcommittee to do the same.

*Sondra Phillips-Gilbert – Ward 6 Resident*

Ms. Phillips-Gilbert asked the Subcommittee to support the Minority Report proposal that would create one ANC west of the river, unifying the Hill East, Kingman Park, Rosedale, Reservation 13 neighborhoods and the SMD provided for the DC Jail.

*Bea Hernandez – Resident of ANC 8A06*

Ms. Hernandez asked the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendations that detail changes for Historic Anacostia. She stated the Task Force recommendations are extremely detrimental to the preservation of Historic Anacostia, mute the residents’ voices, and represent a small number of Task Force members’ opinions. She asked the Subcommittee to instead support the map proposed by the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society.

*Camille Bourguinon – Historic Anacostia Preservation Society*

Ms. Bourguinon presented information on behalf of the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society and asked the Subcommittee to accept the organization’s proposed maps regarding ANCs 8A05 and 8A06 instead of the Task Force recommendations. She stated the Task Force proposal dismantles the community built in the two current ANCs and scatters them between four ANCs. She also stated the process for approving the proposed maps was flawed and did not represent a majority of the Task Force members.

*Dionne Y. Brown – Ward 8 Resident*

Ms. Brown stated multiple concerns with the proposed Task Force maps and asked the Subcommittee to make many changes. Her proposed changes were specific to ANCs 8B, 8C, 8D, and 8E.

*Jo Knight – Ward 8 Resident*

Ms. Knight asked the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendations related to ANCs 8A and 8B and instead approve the proposal submitted by the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society.

*Rick Murphree – Ward 8 Resident*

Mr. Murphree’s submitted written testimony was “I agree with HAPS map because it keeps the historic district together.”

*Thea Dyson – Ward 8 Resident*

Ms. Dyson stated the Task Force recommendations contain many neighborhoods that have been broken up and there are many irregularly shaped Single Member Districts. She asked the Subcommittee to reject the Task Force recommendations and allow the community more time to propose improved maps.

# VI. IMPACT ON EXISTING LAW

Bill 24-700 is a freestanding act adopted in accordance with section 738 of the Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code § 1-207.38) and sections 3 and 4 of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code §§ 1-309.02, .03).

Consistent with prior practice, it is anticipated that the non-amendatory provisions of Bill 24-700 will not be codified, but instead will be printed in the notes to D.C. Official Code § 1‑309.03.

# VII. FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The attached fiscal impact statement issued by the District’s Chief Financial Officer states that funds are sufficient to implement the Subcommittee Print of Bill 24-700. See Attachment 6.

# VIII. RACIAL EQUITY IMPACT STATEMENT

A racial equity impact statement is not available at the time of the Subcommittee markup. The Council Office of Racial Equity has advised the Subcommittee that its racial equity impact statement will be finalized by the time when Bill 24-700 is considered by the Committee of the Whole, which is expected to be May 24, 2022.

# IX. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Each section of the Subcommittee Print is summarized below.

Section 1 contains the long and short titles of the legislation.

Section 2 establishes the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions and single-member districts and sets forth their boundaries. These boundaries will take effect as of January 1, 2023, except that the boundaries will apply earlier in connection with the November 2022 general election. Subsection 2(c) includes specific rules of interpretation with respect to the metes and bounds.

Section 3 provides for the succession of the new and adjusted Advisory Neighborhood Commissions to the assets and legal interests of their predecessors, copying legislative language that has been used previously for this purpose. In addition, Section 3 directs the Chief Financial Officer to reapportion funding allotments among the new and redrawn Advisory Neighborhood Commissions based on each Commission’s share of the District’s population as provided in section 738(e) of the Home Rule Act.

Section 4 provides for the reasonable costs of future decennial redistricting efforts to be included in the current services funding level beginning with fiscal year 2031. The current services funding level is a forecasting tool prepared by the Office of Budget and Planning at the initial stage of budget development. In addition to identifying the funding and other resources necessary to carry out the next redistricting cycle, the Subcommittee hopes that this section will promote planning on the part of the Office of Planning, Board of Elections, and Council.

The Council should be a better partner in this process. Between Bill 24‑700 and its predecessor, Bill 24‑371 (ward redistricting), the Subcommittee on Redistricting has moved two of the longest and most controversial bills of Council Period 24—with greater transparency and many more opportunities for public input than in previous redistricting cycles. Yet the Subcommittee has discharged this responsibility without the benefit of any additional resources, save for $10,000 to advertise ward redistricting. Meanwhile, the Subcommittee members have relied upon their own legislative staff, sometimes to the detriment of their ability to support their members through the budget and ordinary legislative meetings. Further, in specifically identifying professional meeting facilitators to support the ward task forces, the Subcommittee hopes to standardize the quality of the task force process across wards, so that task forces receive the guidance and support they deserve regardless of the capacity or direct personal involvement of the ward council offices. Task force members are volunteers, and the Subcommittee notes with deep regret that chairs of at least three task forces have independently described their participation as their worst-ever experience in civic life.

Section 5 requires the Secretary to the Council to transmit a copy of the enrolled version of Bill 24-700 to the Board of Elections and Office of Planning. BOE is operating under tight time constraints ahead of the November 2022 election and will need to begin updating the voter rolls as soon as possible upon approval of the legislation.

Section 6 references the fiscal impact statement of the Chief Financial Officer.

Section 7 contains the effective date clause.

# X. SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION

The Subcommittee on Redistricting convened on May 20, 2022, at [\_\_\_ p.m.] to consider and vote on the Subcommittee Print of Bill 24-700. [Chairperson Silverman recognized the presence of a quorum, consisting of herself and Councilmembers Bonds and Henderson.]

Councilmember Silverman then made the following statement:

[\_\_\_]

Discussion having ended, Chairperson Silverman then moved the proposed Subcommittee Print and report for Bill 24-700, with leave for staff to make technical and conforming amendments.

The Subcommittee members voted as follows:

Chairperson Elissa Silverman [\_\_\_]

Councilmember Anita Bonds [\_\_\_]

Councilmember Christina Henderson [\_\_\_]

Thus, the Subcommittee Print and accompanying report [\_\_\_].

The Subcommittee meeting adjourned at [\_\_\_ p.m.].

# XI. ATTACHMENTS

1. Bill 24-700 as introduced, with the Secretary’s memorandum of referral
2. Notice of Intent to Act on Bill 24-700
3. Notices of public hearing and roundtable on Bill 24-700
4. Agenda, witness lists, and written testimony for the public hearings and legislative record
5. Reports of the Task Forces on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions
   1. Ward 1 Task Force Report
   2. Ward 2 Task Force Report
   3. Ward 3 Task Force Report
   4. Ward 4 Task Force Report
   5. Ward 5 Task Force Report
   6. Ward 6 Task Force Report
   7. Ward 7 Task Force Report
   8. Ward 8 Task Force Report
6. Single Member District Population Change Chart
7. Fiscal Impact Statement
8. Legal Sufficiency Determination
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