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MR. CROWELL: Thank you. Good evening everyone. I want to welcome everyone here to New York Law School. My name is Anthony Crowell. I am the new dean and president of the law school.

Many of you may know me through my former role as Mayor Bloomberg's counsel, and someone who presided as either an executive director or counselor or commissioner of the Charter Revision Commission committees. So I am no stranger to the good-governing community in New York City, and I am very excited that we can host the Districting Commission here tonight.

It is part of New York Law School's very strong commitment to fostering as much civic dialogue as we can, and part of our newest initiative is to really be New York City's community center, not only for municipal government, but for the good-government-reform community as well, and I look forward to having more of these events here in the future.

Tonight's event, the Commission hearing, is extremely important to the fabric of New York City. As someone, who was heavily involved in the 2010 census, and in the early days of actually helping to form the Commission as a dialogue between the Mayor's office and the Council got underway, I am really proud that we are having this dialogue here tonight.

It is incredibly important to the shape of our city and how democracy plays itself out, and important in terms of ensuring that everyone's voice, in the city, is heard, both at the community level and, certainly, in the City Council. So I welcome you.

I look forward to building a stronger relationship with the constituencies and groups in the room and I look forward to having you back at New York Law School as we move forward. So thank you and best wishes for a very productive hearing tonight.
(Applause).
MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Anthony, and thank you New York Law School for hosting us here tonight. Thank you all for coming and welcome to New York City's Districting Commission's second public hearing.

My name is Benito Romano and I am the Chair of the New York City Districting Commission. We have the facility until 9 p.m. tonight, I am told, and I want to make sure that we hear from
everyone who is signed up.
For those of you who did not sign up and wish to speak, please see one of our staff persons, Jonathan Ettricks, who is Director of Community Outreach, can identify himself, Eddie (unintelligible), Public Affairs Manager, and Brian Flynn, who is the Director of Operations, and he is standing right there in the front of the room.

Additionally, if you require a translation of your statement, please let one of our staff, at the registration desk, know. They will ensure that a translator will be provided when it's your turn to speak.

Before we begin to take testimony, I want to make a few comments. At the beginning of this month, the Commission advertised in community and ethnic newspapers announcing the Commission's public hearings schedule.

An e-mail blast was sent to over 5,000 individuals and organizations. Various advocacy groups helped spread the word, through their individual networks, and the hearing schedules were publicized on our Facebook page and Twitter feed. From the look of this room, it seems we were able to reach many of you. Nevertheless, as we go forward in this process, we will seek other additional ways to maximize participation.

Tonight represents the first stage in New York City's districting process that is laid out in the New York City Charter. After the Commission holds public hearings in each of the five boroughs, over the next seven days, the Commission will meet again on August 24th, at 1 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, in City Hall, to discuss what we have learned through this hearing process and other important issues.

At the August 24th Commission meeting, we will direct the staff to create a preliminary district plan according to the Commission's instructions.

On September 4th, at 1 p.m., at the City Council Chambers, in City Hall, the Commission will meet again. This time, to review and adopt the preliminary district plan, that will then be made available for public inspection and comment.

Please note that both of these meetings will be open to the public, but there will not be any opportunity for the public to speak or make comments at that point. The public will have an
opportunity to comment on this preliminary district plan during the second round of public hearings, held throughout the five boroughs, 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., on October 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 10th and 11th.

The precise places are yet to be determined, but the hearing venues will be in different locations, again, to maximize opportunities for participation by the community. Comments from this round of public hearings will then be considered during a stated Commission meeting, scheduled for October 18th, where staff will, once again, be directed to revise the preliminary district plan in response to the comments that we have received.

In the next stated Commission meeting, October 30th, the revised plan will be presented, considered and adopted by the Commission. The revised plan will then be delivered to the City Council for its inspection and approval by November 5th.

According to the City Charter, by November 27th, the Council must either adopt the revised district plan, at which point the plan will then be filed with the City Clerk, or the Council can object to the revised plan. In which case, the plan will be returned to the Commission with the Council's comments and objections.

The Commission will then have until
January 5, 2013, to create a revised plan. This will then set the stage for a new set of public hearings, which have been tentatively scheduled from January 28th to February 8th in each of the five boroughs. Again, we aim to have these hearings in different locations, from the prior two rounds of public hearings, to maximize opportunities for public participation.

The Commission will then have until March 5th to create, adopt and submit a final plan to the City Clerk and the U.S. Department of Justice for the Voting Rights Act, Section V preclearance. This process is described in a flow chart that is available for you tonight. Another handout, that is available, are two maps. One map is of the five boroughs, with the current City Council district lines, and another is a map of Manhattan, with the borough's current City Council district lines. Both maps include total population within the districts.

The population figures, reflected in the handouts, have already been adjusted to reflect prisoners serving State sentences, but having residences within the respective City Council districts as of the time of the taking the U.S. census as of 2010. The Commission will take these figures into consideration when drawing district lines.

It's important to note that, as we conduct these public hearings, that there are certain factors that obligates the Commission to consider during the districting process. These include the total population deviation, of any district, cannot be greater than ten percent of the average population for all districts.

District lines have to ensure fair and effective representation of racial and language minority groups in New York City. District lines should keep neighborhoods and communities, with established ties of common interest and association, intact. District lines should ensure the districts are compact and contiguous, and lines should keep districts within the borough, and avoid diminishing the effective representation of voters.

Finally, I want to bring to your attention our website. Www.nyc.gov/districting. The site is the central repository for all documents and videos related to the Districting Commission. It also contains a complete schedule of our public hearings and requests to be added to our mailing list. I hope you all visit the site and let us know how it can be made more effective and more informative.

One final note. We have a number of speakers tonight, and each of you has three minutes, which is not very long. But keep in mind that we have a substantial amount of data from the U.S. census and elsewhere. We will also take written submissions, if you wish to offer them. Today will be important to our decision, but these hearings provide critical input as well.

Tell us about your neighborhoods. Where are its natural boundaries as you see them. Share that with us. Thank you for participating tonight and we will have our first speaker, Christina Chang.

MS. CHANG: Good evening. Thank you to the Districting Commission members, staff and concerned citizens of Manhattan. My name is

Christina Chang, and I am here speaking on behalf of AACCORD, or the Asian-American Community Coalition on Redistricting and Democracy. AACCORD is a nonpartisan coalition, of 14 organizations, committed to advancing the opportunity of Asian-Pacific American and minority communities, to meaningfully participate in the political process.

AACCORD recognizes that redistricting plays a pivotal and fundamental role in these opportunities, and we support restricting plans that keep together communities of interest, that exist in and around ethnic neighborhoods across New York.

We are not working in the interest of just one type of Asian-American, one borough or one type of organization. We include organizations involved in housing issues, social services, legal advocacy and community-based organizing, as well as professional associations and civil organizations.

In short, we are a broad coalition, that has been active since the very beginning of this redistricting cycle at the State Assembly, State Senate and Congressional levels.

We are recognized as a voice for the Asian-American community across the city. The City Charter mandates that district lines preserve communities of interest. AACCORD considers Chinatown and the Lower East Side to share many interests and so should be considered a community of interest.

There are many shared socioeconomic and housing characteristics that make these two neighborhoods natural counterparts. However, the current configuration joins together the low-income, limited-English, immigrant residents of Chinatown to a vastly different population residing in the Financial District, Battery Park City and TriBeCa. We recommend reconsidering this configuration.

I would also like to address an issue that has been part of the redistricting dialogue for some time. We have been, and continue to be, concerned about accusations of the efforts of groups, such as ours, are against diversity in districts and we encourage segregation. Nothing is further from the truth.

If you think about it, some terribly gerrymandered districts can go from being the
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most diverse, simply from the fact that they fracture multiple neighborhoods, and join together a hodgepodge of residents who are diverse, in quite an unproductive way.

On the other hand, a very good district may, in fact, be rather homogenous. It might cover a large area in which residents share socioeconomic characteristics, geographical proximity and, also, ethnicity. This applies to anyone. Such ethnic enclaves are a staple of our city and they are not a product of anything so insidious as segregation.
(Three-minute timer alarmed).
Sorry.
Should I continue?
MR. ROMANO: If you could just conclude.
MS. CHANG: Sure. Drawing lines, that keep together communities of interest, will sometimes result in districts with a significant concentration of the minority voters. This is a representation that will reflect and respect the local presence of minorities. Thank you for your time and consideration.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Before we have our next speaker, $I$ would like to ask the Commission
members to introduce themselves.
If we could start from my right (indicating) and work our way down?

MS. PROVENZANO: My name is Madeline
Provenzano. I am from the Bronx.
MR. PADAVAN: Frank Padavan from Queens.
MS. WOLFE: Gloria Wolfe, Manhattan.
MS. LIN: Linda Lin from Queens.
MR. HUM: Carl Hum, staff to the Commission.
SPEAKER: Eddie (unintelligible), also staff to the Commission.

MR. ODOM: Oscar Odom, III, Brooklyn.
MS. HANKS: Kamillah Hanks, Staten Island.
MR. CERULLO: Scott Cerullo, Staten Island.
MR. HART: Rob Hart from Staten Island.
MS. PERSAUD: Roxanne Persaud, Brooklyn.
MR. YU: Justin Yu from Brooklyn.
MR. ROBERT: John Robert from the Bronx.
MR. WURZEL: Marc Wurzel from Manhattan.
MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker will be Henry Chang from OCA.

MR. CHANG: Good evening. My name is Henry Chang and, today, I am speaking on behalf of the OCA New York. Founded in 1976, OCA New York, formerly known as the Organization for Chinese Americans, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to protecting and advancing the political, economic, social and cultural rights of Asian-Americans.

OCA New York represents the five boroughs of New York City. In Manhattan's Chinatown, we have cosponsored candidates' forums for City Council District 1, the Office of the Mayor, and State Assembly District 64, and we have conducted voter registration on community street corners.

We have partnered with Chinatown groups, such as the Chinese American Planning Council, Asian-Americans for Equality, and Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, and family associations for voter empowerment, education and combating hate crimes.

OCA New York also extends to coalition-building and helping Asians living in Manhattan's Lower East Side. Working with Chinatown Youth Initiatives and the Ana Luisa Garcia Center, OCA New York held its fourth annual Hate Crimes Prevention Art Exhibit at the Educational Alliance and Seward Park, both located on the Lower East Side.

We were the lead advocate on securing the Governor's pardon for Kim Wu, an adult resident of the Lower East Side, facing removal from the U.S. because of a teenage criminal record.

Currently, we are the lead advocate for Danny Chen, who grew up in Chinatown and lived on the Lower East Side. Asian soldiers have been charged in connection with his death in Afghanistan.

Support for my testimony is based on my 40 years of living in Chinatown, and on other OCA New York members' input and data from the 2010 census. As a novelist, specializing in stories set in Chinatown, $I$ have written a trilogy of mystery books titled "Chinatown Beat," "Year of the Dog" and "Red Jade." The characters in my books are based on people I have known growing up in Chinatown, events that happened there and crimes that also occurred.

Not only do my stories evolve around crime and violence, $I$ also write about low-income people trying to better their lives. At least once a week, I walk the 15, 20 minutes, from my home in Chinatown, through the Lower East Side and Houston Street, which I can shop, and eat, and meet with family and friends.

Regarding the City Council districts for Lower Manhattan, OCA New York supports including more of the Lower East Side in the Chinatown community. The Lower East Side and Chinatown --(three-minute timer alarms) -- shares similar socioeconomic data. Ninety-two percent are renters, which is comparable to 82 percent on the Lower East Side. The median age, in Chinatown, is 40 and 39 for the Lower East Side. Seventy-four percent of Chinese speakers, in Chinatown, speak English as well, comparable to 70 percent on the Lower East Side.

And 40 percent of Chinatown residents reported income below the poverty level, similar to the 40 percent of Asians on the Lower East Side. With low-income areas, come the lack of services to fight crime, quality health care and other social services. Gentrification is a major threat.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MR. CHANG: Thank you for your time.
MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker will be
Margaret Fung of the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund.

MS. FUNG: Hi. Good evening. My name is
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Margaret Fung and I am executive director of the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Ours is a 38-year-old organization, that defends the civil rights of Asian-Americans, through litigation, advocacy, organizing and community education.

Voting rights have been a priority for AALDEF for more than three decades. We submitted testimony, in 1991, when the New York City Council was extended from 35 to 51 seats, and, again, in the 2002 redistricting cycle. We have monitored elections, for 20 years, to ascertain whether Chinese- and Korean-language assistance programs are in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

We have submitted comments, to the Justice Department, on redistricting plans and other voting changes. And this year, in coalition with the National Institute for Latino Policy and the Center for Law and Social Justice, at Medgar Evers College, we've developed a unity map for New York Congressional, State Senate and State Assembly districts.

As you well know, Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing minority group in New York City.
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The Asian-American population increased
32 percent over the last decade, and now it constitutes 15 percent of the City's population, numbering over one million. Now, New York City has the largest Asian-American population of any municipality in the nation, and yet only one Asian-American has been elected to the City Council from Manhattan, only two from Queens and none from Brooklyn.

Despite rapid population growth, high naturalization rates and steadily increasing numbers of registered voters, the Asian-American community's political representation has not increased at an equivalent pace.

District 1, in Lower Manhattan, was created, in 1991, as a 43 percent Asian district, linking low-income Chinatown residents with the more affluent residents of Battery Park City, SoHo, TriBeCa and the Financial District.

It was expected that a Chinese American would be elected in 1991, but that did not occur until 2009. And now, this district is 45 percent white, and the Asian-American population has dropped to 36 percent. Two decades ago, District 2, in Lower Manhattan, was created as a

Latino district, but, now, 57 percent of the district's residents are white, only 22 percent are Latino and 11 percent are Asian-American.

So in light of these populations, in lower Manhattan, we ask the Commission to consider all alternatives to Districts 1 and 2, that will maintain fair representation for Asian-Americans and Latinos, but also recognize that Chinatown and the Lower East Side are communities of interest and, in fact, one of the last affordable immigrant neighborhoods in Manhattan.

These Asian and Latino residents have common socioeconomic backgrounds and limited proficiency in English. They share common educational concerns and they face substantial developmental pressures as tenants in rent-regulation units in public housing. To assist the Commission in this process, AALDEF has already submitted two documents.

The first are the Asian-American neighborhood maps, in which we include detailed maps of 15 different Asian-American neighborhoods throughout the city. And the second is the Asian-American Communities of Interest Survey, in which we met with several community groups and
asked them to draw the boundaries, district boundaries, of their neighborhoods, and to articulate the common concerns and issues in their neighborhoods.

Finally, we ask the groups to identify the surrounding neighborhoods that are most similar to them and most different from them. So we hope you will consider this communities of interest survey, and with our unity map partners, we plan to submit a 51-district map, that reflects the ever-changing demographics of New York City, very soon.

We urge the Commission to ensure that Asian-Americans have a fair opportunity to elect candidates of choice in accordance with the Voting Rights Act -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- and also to keep communities of interest together. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mae Lee of the Chinese Progressive Association. MS. LEE: Good evening. My name is Mae Lee. I am the executive director of the Chinese Progressive Association. I will keep my comments very brief. The Chinese Progressive Association is a community-based organization located on the
border between Chinatown and Lower East Side.
We have been in existence since the late 1970s. I have worked in Chinatown for over 20 years and have worked with many of the low-income residents in Chinatown in providing services and also doing organizing. I would just like to, I guess, reiterate some of the support, for some of the arguments here, for keeping Chinatown and the Lower East Side together. Our community, particularly, works with new immigrants and we have seen Chinatown grow to the east and to the north of its traditional core, where there is more affordable housing, so new residents are moving to that area and moving to the area east of the Bowery, as well as moving north of Houston and, in particular, to the public-housing projects, which are right along the river.

So we, you know, also strongly support the idea, that you have heard before, about communities of common interest. The communities of common interest have many -- there are many factors involved when deciding that. Ethnicity is one of them, but there is also the socioeconomic background, immigration status,
your country of origin, educational background, access to health care and other services and needs, like housing.

So we are not here to propose any kind of lines, but we do want to say that Chinatown belongs with the Lower East Side. While our neighbors currently include the neighbors of SoHo, TriBeCa and Battery Park, we do always make an effort to work with all of our neighbors, no matter who they are.

But in terms of drawing a City Council District, the communities of common interest, defined by the characteristics, that I had just mentioned, should be strongly considered. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker is Cheryl Pahaham.

MS. PAHAHAM: Hi, my name is Cheryl Pahaham and I am a candidate for City Council District 7. I am just here to ask the Commission to consider how to take some of the politics out of redistricting the Council districts. I'm a candidate in District 7 and $I$ just learned of a purported proposal that would move me out of my Council District.

It's not a proposal that does anything to further the voting rights of protected populations, like African-Americans or Latinos. It's a proposal, that appears to be made by politicians, now in office, to support their allies. So I am just asking that, when you consider how to revise the Council districts, you take into account the declared candidates in those Council races. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. The next speaker will be Carol Greitzer.

MS. GREITZER: I am speaking, today, as a former member of the City Council, where I represented not just one part, but all of Greenwich Village. The Village used to be unified in one district. But for several years, this well-defined community has been gerrymandered into three districts.

The result, on virtually every issue, two parts of the Village do not have their elected council members speaking for them, as two of these three elected officials almost always deferred to the third.

Not only that, but in a recent vote, one of the Village Council members actually implied that she was against the project, as were her very vocal constituents, but in deference to her colleague, she would note yes. So much for representative government.

Greenwich Villagers had several issues facing them in the last few years, among them Saint Vincent's Hospital, the NYU expansion and Washington Square Park.

In each case, two out of the three elected representatives deferred, despite the fact that the loss of a hospital affected all Villagers, not just Speaker Quinn's constituents, and despite the fact that people from all parts of the Village use the park, not just former Council member Thurston's constituents, and all of the Villagers will feel the impact of NYU's expansion plans, not just Council Member Chin's constituents.

Greenwich Village has very distinct and clear-cut boundaries, as recognized by the City Council's planning of community board lines. Some past district commissioner felt that since Fifth Avenue was the line demarcating east and west Manhattan, it should also be used to define Council districts. That is why Villagers, east
of Fifth Avenue and south of Washington Square Park, have been gerrymandered out of the district that includes the majority of Villagers.

What looks logical, on a map, is not necessarily the way to define communities. I urge you to correct this situation by adhering, as much as possible, to community board lines. Please end this gerrymandering and make Greenwich Village whole again. In doing so, you will not only improve this district, you will, probably, improve the lines of the adjacent districts. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker will be Mark Levine.

MR. LEVINE: Good evening and thank you Chairman Romano and members of the Commission for this opportunity to testify. My name, again, is Mark Levine. I am a democratic district leader from the 71st Assembly District, Part A, representing 145th Street to 190th Street west of Broadway.

I am here to offer my input on drawing the Council District in my area in the 7th District. The considerable demographic changes uptown, over the past decade, have created challenges in
redrawing the maps in this area. The new lines must make up for a significant loss of population in the 10th District by uniting communities of interest and preserving minority voting power.

The need to grow the 10th District will move the surrounding district south. The simplest way to achieve all of the required goals would be to keep together three communities with deep ties and common interests. Those are West Washington Heights, including Hudson Heights, West Harlem, Hamilton Heights and Morningside Heights. These communities all abut the Hudson River along with the adjacent park path.

These communities share a common bus and subway line. All have high rates of homeownership, thanks to a large number of co-op buildings in each neighborhood. All are currently united in the 31st State Senate District and each of these three communities is home to one of Columbia University's campuses, with the main campus at Morningside Heights, the new campus at Manhattanville, the medical campus on 168th Street.

Critically, united West Harlem Heights with Morningside Heights would put all of Community

Board 9 in a single Council District for the first time in decades, allowing for common representation for a community with common interests. It would also put all of the 26th Police Precinct, which runs from 110th to 141st, in a single Council District, instead of splitting it in two, which is currently the case. One thing I believe is critical, we do maintain in the 7th District, is the connection between Community Board 9 and the western part of Community Board 12, which stretches north of 155th Street. These areas are united in virtually every possible way, by a common school district, extensive transit legs, large numbers of nonprofits serving both areas, and common representation of both the Assembly and State Senate and more.

The 7th Council District is currently one of the most diverse in the city, with Latinos comprising a plurality of residents, while no single group is in the majority. Under the lines I am proposing, Latinos would remain a plurality and minority residents, in total, would remain 60 percent. Minority voting power also would be maintained in adjacent districts, with strong
majorities remaining for Latinos in the 10th District and African-Americans in the 9th.

For all of these reasons, I believe that the 7th Council District, which includes Morningside Heights, Hamilton Heights and Western Washington Heights, would serve the best interest of local residents while meeting all of the legal requirements of the districting process. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Daniel Cohen.

MR. COHEN: Good evening. My name is Daniel
Marks Cohen. I am on the New York State Democratic Committee representing the 69th Assembly District of Manhattan's Upper West Side and the New York State Democratic Committee. The assemblyman for the 69th is Daniel 0'Donnell. I am a lifelong resident of the Upper West Side. My parents live in the district. My wife and I live in the district, raising a newborn son, a third-generation Upper West Sider as well.

The part of the Upper West Side I live in, between 96th Street and 125th, is the poorest portion of the 69th Assembly District. It is least served in terms of transportation and has
more crime. I believe at least one reason for that is its consistent and uneven status and the fact that the 69th is cut up into multiple pieces of nine different districts.

That has been approved, recently, by Federal redistricting legislation, which went through the two Congressional districts, the 8th, represented by Jerry Nadler, and the 15th, by representative Charlie Rangel. But it is made worse by the three State Senate Districts, Tom Duane of the 29th, Bill Perkins of the 30th and Adriano Espaillat of the 31st.

The latter, the 31st, is particularly egregious, stretching from 184th along the west coast of Manhattan Island. It looks more like the Latin American country of Chile than a proper State Senate District.

Sadly, that is not your in purview today. We are stuck with this absurd district for the next ten years. What is the Commission's charge is the City Council lines, and now we turn to look at the districts. There are four City Council districts in the 69th, Gale Brewer of the 6th, Robert Jackson of the 7th, Melissa Mark-Viverito of the 8th and Inez Dickens of the 9th.

Including Assembly Member O'Donnell, that makes it ten elected officials representing one community at three different levels of government. It is no wonder that people get confused about whom to talk to about one issue or another. It let's elected officials off the hook of matters that are important to one district or another, or overlapping district issues.

What is clear here is if everyone, all ten electors are to be responsible, and truly no one is responsible, this lack of clarity needs to be addressed, and we can correct one issue. The appropriate councilmanic location of Manhattan Valley, which is the area of 96th Street to 110th, east of Broadway to Central Park West. Looking more closely at the City Council districts, if you were to stand at 96th Street and Broadway, depending on what corner you were on, you would be in one of three different councilmanic districts.

There will always be confusion at the edges of districts, and with the 6th District south of 96th Street, represented by Ms. Brewer, that demarcation line is clear. But north of there gets confusing, depending on which side of Broadway you stand on. You could be represented in the 8th District, by Melissa Mark-Viverito, to the east, or the 9th District, by Ms. Dickens, to the west.

Both Council members are dedicated and hardworking, so this it is not a criticism of their individual work ethic. However, it may be time to reconsider the lines that these two members of Manhattan Valley, particularly the 8th District, which stretches all of the way over from East Harlem to Manhattan's West Side.

For constituents of limited mobility or restricted income, traveling to 116th Street and Lexington Avenue, to the Council district's office, is a great difficulty. Ms. Viverito does her best with limited resources and extended staff, but it is hard to meet the needs of such a wildly-disparate district, both geographically and economically.

Perhaps when Ms. Viverito's predecessor, Phil Reed, represented the district -- and in full disclosure, I was Phil's treasurer in his final election campaign -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- there may have been some justification
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in keeping Manhattan Valley District 8 out. Since Phil lived in Manhattan Valley, to redraw the area out of the district would have drawn Phil's home out of the district as well, but that is no longer the case.

Ms. Viverito lives on the east side of Manhattan above her district there as well. I propose that the Council redraw the lines more naturally to keep Manhattan Valley's representation on the West Side, where it belongs, rather than as an appendage in another district for incumbency for a demographic reason. I submitted a copy of my testimony when I came in. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker is Yang Chen.
MR. CHEN: Good evening. My name is Yang Chen. I am the executive director of the Asian-American Bar Association of New York, also known as AABANY, a professional membership organization of attorneys concerning issued affecting the Asian-Pacific American, or APA community.

AABANY is part of a core with the Asian-American Community Coalition for Redistricting and Democracy. AABANY urges the
establishment of districts that reflect, and do not divide, contiguous communities that, in Manhattan, represent large populations of APA voters.

The 2010 census revealed that APAs make up more than 11 percent of the population in Manhattan, a borough that grew, overall, by 3.2 percent since 2000. The growth among APAs, however, showed an increase of 24 percent, eight times greater than the overall Manhattan population. In New York City, APA is now over one million, representing nearly 13 percent of the population. APAs are the fastest-growing racial minority in New York City.

The drawing of district lines to accurately reflect the reality of Manhattan communities is not just good policy and good government, but good law. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 mandates that district lines be created that protect minority voting rights and political representation. To that end, they must fairly reflect minority voting strength.

While race cannot be the only factor due to the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution, it is clear that race can and should be one of the many factors considered, as in Shaw versus Reno, 1993.

We are asking this Commission to recognize, as required by Bush versus Vera, 1996, that there are communities of interest, that share common interests in Manhattan, that are not reflected in the existing district divisions. Chinatown and the Lower East Side represent neighborhoods that may not be fairly represented.

While not specifically defined by the court, it is clear that similarities in socioeconomic background, shared common goals, contiguous geography and common lifestyles are factors that define such communities. The Commission should look to Asian-Americans and the Asian-American Communities of Interest Survey as resources in this endeavor.

AABANY urges this Commission to franchise thousands of APA citizens to be active participants in the political process. APAs make up a growing community that is politically maturing, and this is a tremendous opportunity for this Commission to reflect the reality of the demographics of this borough, and to give voice to a community that enhances and enriches

Manhattan.
That concludes my remarks. Thank you for your time, and I also submitted, as part of the record, a letter that our association submitted, in 2003, to the DOJ, regarding the districting plan back in 2000. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Chen. We do have your written submission. Thank you for that. Our next speaker will be William Stanford, Jr.

MR. STANFORD: I was wondering if you called my name, because I understand this party started at five o'clock, and I just arrived here from City Hall. As I said before, the best way to redraw the City Council district lines is to go by the bus corridors.

Here in Manhattan, it's very easy. You have 145th Street, 125th Street, 116th Street, 106th Street, 96th Street, et cetera, and vertical -I'm sorry -- horizontally -- vertically, Third Avenue, Second Avenue, First Avenue.

All I ask is that you keep the neighborhoods together, so the constituents don't get disproportioned, because that is something they complain about, disproportion. Their
neighborhoods are disproportioned.
They've felt only one City, State or Federal representative should have to represent them here, for better and equal neighborhoods, and then this one street, in the neighborhood, becomes, the next thing you know, it's separated into two or three. So that's all I ask of you. It's easy.

Most of the streets are facing vertically, horizontally, facing sideways, northeast, southwest. It's real easy. Again, as I said before, don't do what LATFOR did. Okay? Please, don't imitate LATFOR. What they did was a joke and I understand they covered State and Federal lines. They covered City lines. Don't do the same job they are doing. Don't make the same mistake they do. Because if you do, it will haunt you ten years from now. You don't want that. So be fair to the constituents. Be fair to all of the City Council here. Just go by the bus corridors. That is the best way. If you need help, contact me. You have my contact information.

And I will show you how to -- give you some pointers. I would have done the same for LATFOR,
but they didn't bother asking me. So as I say, let's be fair to the residents and constituents this time. You know? Do what we ask. Do we ask you to do. Not what you wish to do. Meaning, your philosophy should be, do as I say, because -- I mean not do as I say, do as I do -- because that's what I've seen so far.

And thank you for keeping your cell phones off or on vibrate. Because one of you forgot to do that on Monday, and I had to tell you you should turn off your cell phone -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- and put it on vibrate before I get to the microphone. So thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker is Helen Rosenthal.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Hi, Commissioners, thank you for holding this hearing and giving the public an opportunity to talk. My name is Helen Rosenthal and I would like to talk about City Council District 6 on the Upper West Side. I have lived there for over 25 years, and I have been on the community board, which runs somewhat similar to the City Council district, from 59th Street up to 110th Street, for 13 years.

And I have been elected Chair of the Board
twice and I have also worked with our local community education council. And there are two things that $I$ have seen happen in this district, that I would ask you to consider in redrawing these lines.

The first is the nature of the population changes in this district. The population has primarily grown in the southwest quadrant where the Trump Towers went up. That population will continue to grow as Riverside Center gets developed. They are planning over 5,000 new apartments there just north of 59 th Street and south of 61st Street.

The second place, where there has been a population growth, has been between just north of the Council District, between 96th Street and 100th Street, in the northeast side, where, again, some very tall high-rises have gone in. What we learned, with this population change, over the last ten years, is that the schools, in the southern part of the district, became tremendously overcrowded.

And as we looked as at the numbers, what we thought and what is played out, is that school overcrowding is moving from the southern portion of the district up north. I think the community would be best served by having a representative who would be responsible for the entire picture.

So as the population grows just north of the district now, those schools around there are going to be having an increasing impact with overcrowding, just in the same way that the schools in the southern part of the district have seen overcrowding in the past ten years.

So we urge you to raise the line from 54th Street up to 59th Street, and similar to what Daniel Cohen was mentioning, on the north side of the District, raise it back up to 99th or 110th Street, where it was under the previous two Council members. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Frieda K. Bradlow.

MS. BRADLOW: Good evening. I thank you for the opportunity to address my third Commission on Redistricting. The problem is always the same, keeping communities intact.

I have been a resident of the Charlton-King-Vandam Historic District, in Greenwich Village, since 1958. I can only tell
you that the Village was described, in those days, as going from Canal Street to 14th Street, from the Hudson River to the Bowery. That makes a logical district and we acted under one governmental unit as Greenwich Village.

What happened in my analysis and long political and social involvement in the issues, is when we went over Robert Moses on two major occasions. One, to keep the entire northwest Village from being bulldozed, and the second, was the Broom Street Expressway, which we successfully fought off. A decision was made that we were too influential, too cohesive and too well-organized.

Therefore, the splits began to happen. I watched it first begin in the 1980s, after a redistricting, and then it continued through the 1990s. Until now, we are represented in that community, that I described to you, by three different Council members. The cohesiveness is gone.

We have had major, major issues in our community that, let's say, the mile that separates the southern part of the community from the northern part of the community is
ill-informed on the issues taking place in the northern part, because there's a difference in representation.

We most recently coalesced as a community against the issue of NYU's expansion, but we lost out on that one, because we were represented by three different Council members. That doesn't work too well. When you talk about things in the New York City Charter, your job is very complex -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- to balance out the numbers and other issues.

But I want to remind you of this quote: "District lines shall keep intact neighborhoods and communities with established ties of common interest and association, whether historical, racial, economic, ethnic, religious or other." And that certainly is the Village.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MS. BRADLOW: Thank you.
MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker is Brian Paul, Common Cause, New York.

MR. PAUL: Good evening. My name is Brian Paul and I am a research and policy coordinator at Common Cause, New York, a nonpartisan, citizens lobbying force in the battle for honest
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and accountable government. Redistricting is really a core issue for us. We were very involved in the State process. So I am glad to be here tonight to talk about the City Council.

This issue really affects two core principles of representative democracy. First, the ability of citizens to elect people who represent their collective interests, and second, the citizens' right to hold those individuals accountable at the ballot box.

And redistricting is really essential to protecting their fundamental principles of democracy. And we would like to thank you, the Commission, for holding these hearings in advance of the draft plans. But at the same time, we are concerned by the apparent lack of progress in online participation.

It's disappointing there is not yet some kind of interactive-online tool on the website. One option is to make draft plans available through some kind of a Google Maps tool, that will allow people to tag the map with comments, and specific lines that they like or dislike.

This is more doable than the whole tool, that people would draw their own districts, and I
think more people would use it, since they are drawing their own districts, the tool is really too complicated for most people.

Encouraging a robust participation should be a guiding principle of any redistricting process, because this process can empower or disempower voters with a similar stroke of the pen. New York City is a city of neighborhoods within neighborhoods. Even small changes in districts can have large consequences on politics and representation.

There was witness to these consequences, in mind, that the drafters, of the charter, carefully laid out detailed criteria for this Commission. The Equal Protection Clause and the Voting Rights Act are rightfully at the top, and third is the important concept of representing communities of interest, which others already have quoted the exact quote from the charter, so I will skip that.

The charter is really very clear, that the Commission should prioritize this concept over the political considerations of incumbents. This is why it's so important to encourage more participation, particularly online, where many
more people can get involved than at hearings.
I will jump to specific comments about Manhattan. Most significant, through the process here, is the population drop in Washington Heights District 10. We have been looking at this on the map. I think it raises significant challenges regarding reconciling the City Charter and the Voting Rights Act. The City Charter clearly states that two districts should not cross the same borough.

Currently, District 8 crosses East Harlem to the South Bronx, so the City Charter would appear to prohibit District 10 from crossing also. But it looks to us -- (three-minute timer alarms) -I will close quickly -- it looks to us that District 10 does not cross into the Bronx, it has to pick up populations south, which may create a conflict with the Voting Rights Act by dropping the Spanish share of District 7, and the same if you were to bump District 8 out of the Bronx. It may be the case where you have to override the charter to counter the Voting Rights Act.

Just one more thought. We would like to express our support for what many people, who have already testified today, say is the possibility of uniting Chinatown and the Lower East Side in a single Council District, preferably following the shape of Community Board 3, for socioeconomic parity, meaning homeownership and occupation. This is a distinct community of interest. Chinatown and the Lower East Side have more in common than Chinatown and Battery Park and Gramercy as the current districts are arranged.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MR. PAUL: Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

MR. ROMANO: The next speaker is Allison Tupper.

MS. TUPPER: Good evening. I am Allison Tupper. I live on 46 th Street, in the Clinton Special District, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak here today.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Turn the mic on.
MS. TUPPER: I want to urge you to take into account the boundaries of the traditional neighborhoods and the community board boundaries, so that we can keep communities of interest together. Districts should be compact and they should be equal in size. I see that you have a

10 percent variation and that's really too much. I hope you can keep the variation down to two or three percent.

If one district is 10 percent bigger than another, and another district is ten percent smaller than the average, that is a 20 percent deviation, and that's huge. I hope you can keep your deviation to two or three percent and I hope you can keep communities of interest, like the Clinton Special District Coalition, Chelsea, and Hell's Kitchen, and the community board lines. I hope you can respect those lines. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Tupper. Robert Jackson, Council Member Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Good evening everyone, and let me thank you for being part of this Commission. Obviously, it is extremely, extremely important for the lives of New Yorkers. My name is Robert Jackson. I represent the 7th Councilmanic District, which includes part of Central Harlem, all of West Harlem, which include Hamilton Heights and Sugar Hill, part of Morningside Heights, Washington Heights and Inwood.

I am here today to ask the Commission to keep the lines as they are. When you look at the

7th Councilmanic District, and you look at the geographical area, from the southern end, you have Morningside Gardens, which is a huge, huge development of co-ops, and Grant Houses, a public housing, and they work together on so many issues and concerns.

And two prime examples of that is they have formed the West Harlem Sanitation Coalition and they work on environmental justice, and they implemented, together, the first NYCHA recycling program, in the City of New York, working together.

But also, every year, they have Hands Across The Avenue. Morningside Gardens and Grant Houses. Families coming together. Mind you, if you don't know, Morningside Gardens is a cooperative, where a two-bedroom co-op goes for \$500,000, and right across the street is public housing. They work together on issues of concern and they have become like that for decades.

And even ten years ago, they asked me, as a Council member, Please don't allow them to separate us out. We are a family and we want to stay together. In fact, some of the leaders have said that already to me now. When you look at

Northern Manhattan, north of the bridge, the GWB going straight up, people know that if you live west of Broadway, you are in the 7th Councilmanic District. It's clean.

If you live east of Broadway, you know that you live in the 10th Councilmanic District. And let me tell you, it's clean as can be. In some parts of the district, you have to ask, Am I in 7 th or am I in the 10th or the 9th? People don't know. It's important to have continuity.

And so as someone, that knows the entire district, that has traveled and walked the entire district, if you ask the people in the 7th Councilmanic District, north of the bridge, in the Washington Heights area, you have an orthodox Jewish community that wants to stay together, and, in fact, you have about five synagogues. You have a yeshiva. You have the senior center there all together. To separate them out and to make a change, in my opinion, they would not want that.

When you talk about Inwood, okay, the Inwood community has been that way. You have anchors in the community, such as the Good Shepherd Men's Club. You have the school there and what have
you. People want it the way it is. It doesn't need to be changed. If you ask the people of Inwood, most of them will tell you leave it like it is. If it's not broke. Don't try to fix it (three-minute timer alarms). That's important. There's a lot of institutions in the area, in Hamilton Heights, the Hamilton Heights Homeowners' Association and groups likes that. When you look at the geographic makeups of the neighborhood, racially, it's about 50 percent Hispanic, about 27 percent black, and the rest white with about 2 percent Asian. It's a good mix.

Let me just give you a prime example of that. Eleven years ago, when I ran for the City Council, it was about 50 percent Hispanic, 32 percent black and about 14 percent white, and there were ten people in the race.

Five of those individuals were black, three were Latino and two were white. The people, of the 7th Councilmanic District, elected me to represent them. Now there is going to be a new representative, and I don't know who it is going to be. But I tell you, as someone that has lived in that neighborhood for 35 years, and I have
walked every aspect of my district, it needs to remain the same. It doesn't need to be changed based on the numbers.

The numbers are within the percentage. So if you go, yourself, and you go to Morningside Heights, and you ask them, they will tell you. You go to Hamilton Heights and you go to Washington Heights, they will tell you. You go to Inwood, they will tell you. It needs to stay the same. It doesn't need to change.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you very much.
MR. JACKSON: Thank you very much, and my testimony, I have in writing, is submitted for the Commission.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker is Larry English.

MR. ENGLISH: Good evening. My name is Larry English. I am the former chairman of Community Board No. 9 and I want to thank you for this opportunity to address you on this most important issue. I would like to echo my support for my Councilman (indicating).

We didn't work this out, by the way, but Councilman Robert Jackson, of West Harlem, particularly, Community Board No. 9, I believe is one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the city, both in ethnicity and race, but also economically.

And as you look at this process, I would urge you to resist the opportunity to gerrymander these districts for political purposes, because, ultimately, that's not what it is about. With all due respect to the elected officials, they come and go. The residents have to be here long after the elected are put in place.

And Community Board No. 9, I would encourage you to try to, if possible, put it all together. But also, we would also encourage you to look at, when you are looking at this map, it is important that there is some diversity in these neighborhoods. It's important that there is some economic diversity in these neighborhoods.

The worst thing you can have is to have a particular Council District that is not representative of the broader city, both racially, but also economically, to have a district comprised of nothing but housing projects, with no other social and economic diversity, I believe would not be in the best interest.

Community Board No. 9, West Harlem, again, it functions well. It's functioned great under the political leadership of Mr. Jackson. It has a long history of working together. That whole district has dealings with the Columbia expansion, which is certainly a part of this process as you move forward. So once again, we would ask that you keep the neighborhood, the existing district, together as much as possible.

But as when you look at drawing out, not only the district of Community Board No. 9, but across the table, it's important that these districts be drawn in a way that they bring diversity, both racially and economically, also. I thank you for your time.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you very much, Mr. English. Our next speaker is Kathleen Treat.

MS. TREAT: Good evening. I am Kathleen Treat, Chair of the Hell's Kitchen Neighborhood Association, a proud member of the good government community. I wanted to thank the Commission for the map outside. Until I saw that, I had no idea that District 3 included so much of the Village. And I would like to echo Carol Greitzer, that certainly, to include

Charles Street in District 3 is absurd. They belong back in the Village.

Other than that, please do not change our District 3, which works just fine, thank you. In other words, as Mr. Jackson said, if it works, don't fix it. The Hell's Kitchen Neighborhood Association works splendidly alongside our Community Board 4.

Hell's Kitchen and Chelsea must remain unified. There is power in numbers and our neighborhoods are facing enormous challenges. One being changes to the Hudson River Park Act. We must continue to face these challenges together as a unified whole. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Treat. Our next speaker is Debra Cooper, Democratic State Committee 67th Assembly District.

MS. COOPER: Well, since you have introduced me, I won't do it again. I represent the Upper West Side. The 67th Assembly District is, more or less, contiguous and overlaps a good deal of the 6th Council District. It goes from 44th Street to 97th Street. So it represents a good portion of the Upper West Side. So I am very
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familiar with the district.
And recently, I testified before LATFOR, the Commission charged with redistricting the State, and that was not a very praiseworthy outcome, as other people, before me, have said. And I certainly hope, for the sake of my community, that next time there will be something to praise from this Commission.

And from what $I$ have read about your goals, and your principles, and your working methods, it does seem a significantly more likely possibility that the outcome will be much a more accredited Commission and to the benefit of the communities.

I am going to reprise my testimony from LATFOR, because it also describes Council District 6. I usually tell people I represent the Upper West Side, and almost everywhere I go around the country, people know exactly what I am talking about. Now, that's because the Upper West Side is an easily-identifiable, historical, social and political entity. It is the very definition of a community of interest.

Those of us, who live there, think of ourselves in many of the terms we use to characterize the neighborhood. The Upper West Side has just about the highest voting performance in the city, and so that means in the state as well. It is, historically, a progressive district. It's kind of out there and inclusive and assertive. It's opinionated and it's long been a political powerhouse.

And unlike some people, who don't like the shape of their district, $I$ think a lot of us are very happy with how boring the actual shape is, because it's a nice, square, rectangle, that goes from 56th Street to 96th Street, from the river to the park.

What LATFOR did to the Upper West Side would meet none of the standards you are setting out, which is compact, contiguous, meaningful communities of interest. LATFOR cannibalized the Upper West Side. It was carved out, like a Thanksgiving turkey, into five, and later four, separate, almost irrational districts, that violated almost every tenet of the idea of community of interest.

I live at 74th and West End, which is one of the worst gerrymandered districts in the state. It goes from a few small blocks on the West Side, between Broadway and West End, and goes to Spanish Harlem and the South Bronx. And the 31st is a much skinnier version of the country of Chile, as I said back at the LATFOR hearings. LATFOR dismembered the Upper West Side into lots of small -- (three-minute timer alarms) -districts that didn't represent anybody. And so I urge this Commission to keep the district in the same basic shape and configuration it is.

The population difference is minor and it can be solved by going north a block or two or south a block or two. I think that that really would serve the interests of the people, who live there, and, historically, their boundaries are very similar for the last 40 or 50 years, so thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. Our next speaker is Yolanda Donato, National Mobilization Against Sweatshops.

MS. DONATO: (Speaking in Spanish through a translator) Good evening. My name is Yolanda Donato and I am a member of NMAS, the National Mobilization Against Sweatshops. I lived in the Lower East Side for 40 years. I have raised my kids and my grandchildren here.

We, in Chinatown and the Lower East Side, have many problems in common. We are facing displacement, rent increases, poor conditions in our apartments and we still have health problems from 9/11. So we don't not want to be divided.

Together, we have more power and we can demand what we need. That's why we have been united to demand for 100 percent low-income, New York community programs and affordable spaces for businesses. We want to focus on working people. Not the rich. We do not want representatives, of race, to sell us out to developers. For this reason, I have supported AALDEF's united proposal. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Donato. Our next speaker is Wendy Cheung of the CSWA.

MS. CHEUNG: Hi. My name is Wendy Cheung. I am with the Chinese Staff Workers Association and, also, we are a coalition member of the People First Campaign. I am here to state our support for the AALDEF's plan and position for a unified Lower East Side and Chinatown. I am represented by the Unity Map.

For too long, our communities have been divided, the Lower East Side and Chinatown. Working-class, low-income people, of color, have
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 been split. Instead of dividing this line over territory, our communities have been fighting and organizing for a united community, most recently, against the East Village Rezoning Plan and, also, right now, calling for 100 percent voting on housing (unintelligible). We have been doing this, also, along with the People First rezoning, as a plan that will protect this community and call for a united, not divided, low-income representation.The need for low-income housing, and services, and jobs, for this community, has been critical. We see this every day, when hundreds of people have been signing petitions, off the streets, demanding our voices be heard and be truly represented, the interests of low-income, working people, who make up a majority of this community, whether they are immigrant or native-born.

And I, myself, being born and raised in the Lower East Side, Chinatown, having grown up in Chinatown and, also, in public housing, that has been split in many different districts, and I think this is a very pertinent issue, and this speaks to a lot of the critical issues in
low-income, working communities, where we see common interests between our communities. And instead of being split, the Lower East Side and Chinatown, we need to see it as a united community.

We, also, don't want elected officials, who represent the interests of developers instead of the interests of working people, and so we, also, want to state that as well. So thank you for your time.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Cheung. Our next speaker is Marc Landis.

MR. LANDIS: Thank you. My name is Marc Landis. I am an elected democratic district leader on the Upper West Side of Manhattan. I also serve as the chairperson of the New York County Democratic Committee. I am the co-Chair of the Campaign Election Committee. I am also a candidate for City Council residing in what is currently District 6.

I am a steadfast supporter of democratic-party principles, but the issues and challenges posed by the semiannual redistricting process supersede any partisan concerns. Good districting ensures that people's voices will be heard and the council members will be able to effectively represent their districts, regardless of party membership.

My neighbors and I are counting on this Commission to ensure a fair districting process, where we hope the communities of common interest remain in the same district, so the strength of community views will be heard in government. When our Council member's voice, of a single constituent's concern, will be reflected, by echo, throughout the district.

The Upper West Side is, clearly, a community of common interest. My neighbors come from diverse demographic backgrounds, whether they live in public housing or penthouse condos, we are clearly one community.

We don't agree on every issue all of the time, but we share the same fundamental concerns about improving our public schools, expanding housing opportunities and protecting our qualities of life.

The chief challenge, before you, is to determine where to draw district lines for a concise, exact district. The existing District 6, which encompasses West 96th to West 54th

Street, Riverside Park to Central Park, as well as a small park south of Central Park, is, functionally, a good model for an Upper West Side District.

However, Upper West Side residents, between West 96 th and West 100th Street, who are in the same community board district have instead been placed in two other districts. Currently Districts 8 and 9. Their inclusion in the Upper West Side City Council District is imperative to satisfy the goals of district coherence, collective voter power and representative effectiveness.

Accordingly, I propose the Commission to establish an Upper West Side district that runs from West 57th or West 59th Street up to West 100th. This would allow the residents of Central Park Gardens, Tower West, the Tower West Complex, now known as Stonehenge Village, Park West Village and Columbus Square to share the district with the rest of its Upper West Side neighbors, and with nearby access to constituent services.

Logically, the next district, to the north, starting from West 100th Street, would keep Manhattan Valley, Morningside Heights and
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Manhattanville in a single district, rather than dividing it up into three separate districts.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my testimony. I urge you to ensure that our Upper West Side neighborhoods will be fairly represented once your work is completed. Copies were made available. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Landis. Our next speaker is Henrietta Lyle.

MS. LYLE: Good evening. I am Henrietta Lyle and I have lived in the Central Harlem community for over 40 years. I am here to talk about our Council District, which is the 9th Council District. I am also the elected Chair of Community Board 10, and I am also speaking for the people in the Central Harlem community.

The central Harlem community has fought, for many years, to get the perfect representation in our Council District. And with all due respect, now is not the time to change the Council District lines, for the New York City Council District lines control the most important aspects of our lives, and redistricting may keep a community together or split it apart.

As it relates to the Central Harlem
community, it will split us apart. Our community needs our representative, that we have now, in our district lines. We need a representative who feels and understands Central Harlem's concerns. If redistricting occurs, Central Harlem may lose essential funding for services. Funding that is important to our community.

We need to protect voting in the Council District. We need to ensure that the current lines are maintained. Redistricting should not harm our community. However, it will, if it happens. We are a community of interest. A community of interest should be kept together within the same district to whatever extent possible.

I am asking you, on behalf of our community, to not change our district lines. We are a growing community and we need to continue growing by what we have in new resources. So thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Lyle. Our next speaker is Jonathan Geballe.

MR. GEBALLE: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I did not bring any prepared remarks. I am the president of Village Independent Democrats, which is the longstanding, reformed
democratic club in Greenwich Village.
And I would state that we very much just echo what you have heard from Council Member Carol Greitzer and Frieda Bradlow in terms of the unfortunate split of Greenwich Village into three Council districts, which has not worked for us, and hasn't worked for us now for many years.

But what I really want to talk about is what I have heard tonight, because tonight, interestingly, looking at these numbers, I don't see a lot of radical shifts in population, radical differences in the councilmanic districts, which would call for sharp changes in the boundaries.

And you are hearing mostly, from what $I$ can tell from the speakers, they don't want the districts changed too much. They, pretty much, want the districts to stay where they are. That is what we are hearing. The only place we are hearing something different, in a consistent fashion, is the minority population in Lower Manhattan, which seems to be growing into the Lower East Side, and we are hearing something different in Greenwich Village, which is that we would like to restore and regain the historic
center of that population and that neighborhood.
So we have a moving center of population in Lower Manhattan. It's now growing and changing, and we want to restore the neighboring population to its center. And I ask that the Commission pay attention to that, because it seems that that is really where, if there is going to be changes, that's where it should be.

And it seems like that change, moving the Greenwich Village boundary, councilmanic boundary, over to the Bowery and changing the minority representation in Lower Manhattan, is something that could be done with some fair sensitivity, but not too wild changes or radical changes, and the rest of the Manhattan, pretty much, wants to stay where it is. So I leave you with that reaction from what I have been hearing today. I thank you for your time.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Geballe. Our next speaker is Jim Fouratt, Seniors Take Action.

MR. FOURATT: Thank you, Commissioners. Greenwich Village is in the house, and I am here representing Seniors Take Action and the Lesbian and Gay Elders' Circle. I am 50-year resident of the West Village and I want to ask you to really
look at what has happened downtown.
I think the representatives of the minority communities, principally Chinese, have been pretty clear about their needs to make sure that representation remains on the City Council for the community. I am going to suggest that you look at this formula and I agree with the Carol Greitzer, the former City Councilperson, and Frieda Bradlow.

I suggest, to you, that you look at Canal to 50th Street with Broadway and West Street being the simple, not gerrymandered, sections. Let me tell you why. Because, as the mandate in your charter talks about communities, there are a variety of communities, both residential and business, within the district I have talked to you about.

You have the theater community. I am a member of the gay and lesbian community. If we haven't had the redistricting the way it has been, I don't know if we will have the same kind of representation and the progressive movement forward of equality within the city. You have the fashion industry. You have the digital industry.

There is friction between all of these residents and between all of these different communities to work and live in this community. You also have education. We have just been through a terrible time because of the way we have three representatives. We lost. The community was united almost as one.

Saint Vincent's, we have no hospital. We have a pipeline going in with the potential of a blast explosion. We have no hospital. We have NYU gobbling up everything, which will change the quality of life, and what was, historically, a community, and other issues that have not been represented, because of the political ambitions of our City Council person.

So I am going to ask you, please, please, keep our community and the people within it (three-minute timer alarms), and I am going to particularly talk to you about the need to continue to have a district that has representation for all of the residents, but particularly for the lesbian and gay community.

We need to be visible. We need to be on board and we stand behind -- or I stand behind the demand that has been put forward by the

Chinese-American community, to protect representation, too. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Fouratt. Our next speaker is Christopher Kui.

MR. KUI: My name is Christopher Kui. I am the executive director of Asian Americans for Equality, a citywide organization with concerns for social services and homeownership. Our main clientele, based in New York City, are Asian and Asian-American residents. Today, Asian and Asian-American residents constitute 13 percent of the city's population, numbering over one million. In our own study, published last year, "Distinct Places, Shared Opportunities," we found that over one million residents, of Asian descent, live in the city.

While Asians are the fastest-growing segment, they are still the least represented minorities on the City Council. While a population, of this size, can conceivably be represented by five or six Asian-American Council members, today, we still have only two Asian-American City Council representatives, Margaret Chin, and Peter Koo, in Flushing, Queens.

But even this was only possible, because 30 years ago, the redistricting commission met and heard testimony, and with tremendous foresight, created three districts, 1, 2 and 3, so that major pluralities were able to achieve political representation without impinging on each other.

This allowed Chinese-American, the LGBT community, and a Puerto Rican, who is also in his own right, is a champion of the LGBT community, to represent all of the constituents and major pluralities of the districts.

This was not done with the purpose of electing a specific individual. On the contrary, the districts were drawn so that an infrastructure was in place to allow for multiple candidates, drawn from major pluralities, drawn from major fields, to have viable choices for local voters. Current lines keep a specific official in office. Considering each election, after the redistricting 20 years ago, has since featured multiple candidates, in District 1, of Asian-American descent.

The boundaries are doing what it was designed to do, to allow for real plural choice and more than one candidate from more
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pluralities. As a result, history was made, barriers were broken, and for the first time in 160 years, Chinatown, the original Asian-American neighborhood in New York City, was able to elect a Council member, of Chinese descent, to represent itself.

At that time, and still now, arguments are made to combine the Asians and Latinos into one district, because from this, it ensures at least one minority, Asian or Latino, being elected. The premise of this argument is flawed, in subtle respect.

Firstly, this arbitrarily forces disenfranchisement, aided by a neighbor's situation, where it creates a forced choice of either/or, when the population is still large enough to create opportunities -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- for both.

No redistricting should be done at the expense of other groups, but to achieve and form neighborhoods where Asians and Latinos can elect representatives, through the political will and aspirations of minorities in the borough. It cannot be done by passively lumping Asians with the plurality of other districts. This will only
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foster division and put representatives against each other. Secondly, --

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MR. KUI: -- there is one argument on the assumption of declining populations, particularly, a percentage decline in Asians in the core Chinatown area. Asian-Americans and organizing groups, regardless of where one stands on district lines, can attest to the fact that population loss is not what is being experienced in the grassroots.

The gentrification and dislocation of low-income households does not simply make people disappear. Tenement after tenement find that households are doubling and tripling, in apartments, and are staying under the radar to avoid eviction.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Kui.
MR. KUI: Similarly, accepting population loss might not be Constitutional under the representation laws, especially in higher-plurality districts flung together with another on that false assumption. We are in strong support in keeping the current districts, 1, 2 and 3, more or less, intact during this districting process.

Any modification should be done to strengthen both Asian and Latino districts. While we are open to minor modifications, we fear that current major groups will not keep the integrity of the neighborhoods, and the aspirations of the electoral process will be put against each other.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MR. KUI: So let me conclude, other folks have stated -- and I am almost done -- that low-income Asian and Latino residents share common struggles. This is indeed true, but it is better that there are two voices in our City Council, fighting for those interests and needs. Not just one lone voice from the neighborhood.

As we look at the track record of Chin and Mendez, there is a strong collaboration, in the City Council, on issues of affordable housing, seniors, schools, public housing, immigration and public health and we see the wisdom of having multiple strong voices for our residents.

So let us protect our current lines, that the Lower Manhattan community achieved in the last 20 years, and let us keep these districts
intact, so we might continue to tackle the issues our residents continue to face. Thank you, very much, for the extension of time. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker is Ross Wallenstein. Ross Wallenstein? Zenaida Mendez? For the audience's benefit, we are going through the persons who preregistered first, and then we are taking people who showed up this evening.

MS. MENDEZ: Good evening, distinguished Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this important hearing. My name is Zenaida Mendez. I am a concerned citizen and the founder of the National Dominican Women's Caucus.

The National Dominican Women's Caucus is a nonpartisan organization that unites activists and advocates in pursuit of inclusiveness in forming policy. They are inclusive to all New Yorkers. In order to motivate more participation of the civic society, in general, we are out to work to foster participation and expansive responsible government.

The compass has one focus, for the training of women. Latinas, in particular, are understanding the United States funding of government. The last few years, we have focused,
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in New York City, on political participation in the letter opposing working with naturalized citizens.

Since 2010, we have been monitoring the redistricting process across the nation, including the particular conditions of district lines of different Latino communities throughout the United States. At a hearing, at City Hall, I was particularly concerned because the presenter, from the City's planning, continued to refer to Latinos versus animals, or something to that effect.

I am an Afro-Latina and I am very concerned about that. Latinos, we are mainly from three ethnicities. We are native Indian, African and from Spain. Therefore, we all have a common language, and most of us, a common culture. So I ask this Commission to, please, look at us as a United States with 21 countries. We are united here. Even though we come from 21 countries, and the Caribbean, in the United States, we are one Latino community.

I ask, that you keep in mind, that focus. Therefore, the more you divide us, these United States, to keep dividing and dividing and
dividing, we don't need to get divided. When you draw the lines, keep that in mind. We want to continue to have a common district. I agree with the gentleman that speak before me. The lines, as they are now, are fantastic. We have great representation.

But because of the population, I understand you -- (three-minute timer alarms) -- need to redraw the districts, but we, as a Latino community, like I said before, we don't need to be divided as black Latinos and white Latinos. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Mendez. Our next speaker is Yetta Kurland.

MS. KURLAND: Hi. Good evening. My name is Yetta Kurland. I am a resident of the 3rd City Council District. I was a candidate for City Council in 2009. I am speaking in my personal capacity, but $I$ sit on the board of Marriage Equality New York, as well as the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild and the Stonewall Democratic Club of New York City.

And I will start by saying that redistricting should never be about any single candidate, but rather about the wholeness of a
community. I echo the sentiment of many who have already testified. A community is a cohesive unit that must be represented. The political districts, at question here, are New York City districts and must reflect New York City realties.

Federal, voter-rights laws require two basic things: First, the district must be equal in population, and second, they must not be drawn in a way to disadvantage groups as it relates to race and ethnicity. I support this and I hope everyone here does.

There is one other consideration I hope will be observed. Community, as we understand it in New York City, must be observed. Chinatown, as a community, must be observed. Harlem, as a community, must be observed. Brooklyn Heights, as a community, must be observed. And as a resident of the Lower West Side, I must say the Lower West Side, as a community, must be observed.

Further, the LGBT, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community, as a traditionally underrepresented community, must be observed and preserved. As a proud member of both of these communities, I am here to respectfully give support to this process, which I expect will be done with fairness and without partisanship, so that it raises the mantle of our democratic process and does not diminish it.

As the song goes, "You know it don't come easy," as George Harrison says, but it must be done right and with a commitment to protect adequate representation and government. But the diversity and the community that makes our city so vital, must be a part of this process. And in summary, sometimes less is more. Thank you for your time.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Kurland. Our next speaker is Corey Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. Thank you Commissioners, and Benito Romano, for having us here tonight. My name is Corey Johnson, and I am the Chair of Manhattan Community Board 4, and I am a resident of Chelsea. The boundaries of Community Board 4 is 14th Street, to the south, to 59th Street, to the north, and the Hudson River on the west, and the boundary in Chelsea, is Sixth Avenue, and it goes over to Eighth Avenue in Hell's Kitchen.

I am also the candidate for City Council in the 3rd Councilmanic District, and that district is, basically, Canal Street, to the south, to 56th Street, to the north, and the Hudson River on the west, and the eastern boundary is one that zigzags along Thompson to Fifth Avenue, around Washington Square Park, Madison, Park Avenue. There is a strange eastern boundary.

I am here tonight to talk a little bit about how the Lower West Side community should stay intact, and there have been some good folks that have testified before me tonight, including Jonathan Geballe, Jim Fouratt and Frieda Bradlow, that have talked about the importance of keeping Greenwich Village intact, as one community, instead of being split between three different councilmanic districts.

But I wanted to just hit on something related to the LGBT population on the West Side of Manhattan. The U.S. census calculates LGBT residents not based on singular people, but as couples. So when you fill out your census form, you don't say "I am a gay man." You only mark it down if you are in a same-sex relationship and that's how they tally people.

In 2000, the corridor of neighborhoods along the West Side, stretching from the Village all of the way up to Hell's Kitchen through Chelsea, had 25,906 self-identified LGBT couples. Ten years later, that number has gone up to 32,972 same-sex couples, a 27 percent increase in ten years. In a small portion in Chelsea, from 18th Street to 22nd Street, Sixth Avenue to Eighth Avenue, 22 percent of all couples, in those blocks, identify as LGBT.

And I mention this because the concentration in the neighborhoods along the West Side have given our community representation in the City Council and the State legislature. And I think it's really important to keep in mind these numbers, along with the ethnic, racial, socioeconomic and other numbers that are considered in drawing lines.

And so I am not going to speak, particularly, about the boundary lines. But I hope that when you are looking at census data and moving forward, you keep in mind LGBT people and the numbers that were given from the U.S. census, this year, showing an increase of LGBT couples in the district, and, hopefully, keeping a compact
district that keeps that representation. Thank you for your service and thank you for being patient with all of us and hearing what we have to say tonight.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker will be Elizabeth Ritter.

MS. RITTER: Good evening. I didn't think I would get called up so quickly.

MR. ROMANO: You preregistered.
MS. RITTER: I did preregister and I wrote my testimony out and I decided I don't really like it, so I am going to use a slightly different version of it. But at least now, I actually have your attention, which is a good thing, because we have been listening to a lot of people, and you are probably bored.

My name is Elizabeth Lorris Ritter. I am the founder and president of the Hudson Heights Owners Coalition. It is an association of 36, owner-occupied, residential properties located in the Washington Heights neighborhood of Hudson Heights. That's the northern portion of the 7 th Council District.

In Washington Heights, in Northern Manhattan, we have a serious problem in terms of what happened with the census, and the loss of population, and the 10th, and the 9th. So clearly, you are going to have to seriously redraw the boundaries of something, and that is going to have an impact on my Council District.

It could have stayed the same, its population not having varied, but its neighbors have varied quite a bit, so you are going to have to change the boundaries quite a bit. I have to congratulate whoever came up with this map, which does not create the weirdly-shaped districts that were delivered to the entire State of New York from Albany.

And I hope that you are able to find reasonably contiguous, nicely-shaped districts. Having said that, I think it is a good idea to add real estate to the 10th District by moving Inwood, the portion of Inwood that is currently in the 7th, over to the 10th -- you have heard testimony on this already -- and by extending the 7th down south.

One of the other reasons I say that this would be an extremely good idea is that, among the core activities in which HHOC has engaged in, is uniting with other owner-occupied properties
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to work on issues related to parts of the waterfront, and to work on issues related to Columbia University.

If you were to extend down the 7th to Morningside Heights, you would unite all three of the campuses together, you would keep all of the Hudson Heights, core-catchment areas within one councilmanic district, and you would allow us to stay within a single assembly district.

I have written testimony, which expands on some of these points, which I will submit to you subsequently. So I thank you for your attention and for your service to the city.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. We will take the testimony. Our next speaker is Curtis Arluck.

MR. ARLUCK: Hello. I am Curtis Arluck, democratic leader for the 69th AD, which, essentially, covers West 106th to 125th Street, all of Morningside Heights, much of Manhattan Valley and the Upper West Side. Ten years ago, I had a very positive experience testifying for this august body. As Councilman Jackson said, two key complexes in my district, once great houses, were split up and we said this is not a good idea.

The Commission agreed. They are back together, and we hope they will stay together for the next ten years, but that's not why I am here. I am here on behalf of a larger, much larger community, the West Side of Manhattan, 96th Street to 125th Street, bounded by the parks and the river, which like the Village, is currently divided amongst three different councilmanic districts, and we would like, very much, to be together in one district.

This is not meant to disparage the current incumbents of Districts 8 and 9, both of whom I admire and supported for the election in 2009. It is simply a recollection of the reality that no Council members can effectively represent far-flung districts, and, inevitably, it's the most remote, inaccessible and tacked-on parts of the district, in this case, the Upper West Side from 96th to 125th, that is left unserved.

City Council districts are service-oriented districts. Residents of these districts need easy physical access to the office of their Council member. In Manhattan, above 14th Street, services run north/south. Police, sanitation, community board districts all run north/south.

This is especially true of 59th Street to 110th Street, where there is a very large and very famous park, that separates the West Side from the East Side, Morningside Park. From 59th to 96th, no City Council District jumps apart from the East Side to the West Side. But in the smaller area from 96th to 125th, it jumps twice in the 8th and the 9th Districts.

The effect of these mappings is the people, who live on the Upper West Side from 96th to 125th, themselves, live in a community board and police district that are completely disassociated from the districts that the locus of those districts are in. Board 9 is mostly in -- we are -- the West Side is mostly in Board 9. Council District 9 is also in Board 10, et cetera, et cetera.

Now we come to transportation. Subway lines run north/south. People, who live on West 96th to 125th, have to go east/west to visit the offices of their Council members. There are no streets, let alone bus routes, which run between 96th and 125th, except for 110th, which there is a bus that runs only to Fifth Avenue and does not go into East Harlem, the focal point of the 8th District.

And this means it is almost impossible for people, who live in the most economically disadvantaged -- (three-minute timer alarms) -part of the Upper West Side, Manhattan Valley, to go to their district office to get help with their problems.

With more geographically sensible Council districts, this would not be the case, and many more needy constituents would be helped.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you.
MR. ARLUCK: I will wrap up. I note the current 8th and 9th Districts exist largely because of the imaginings of what the Voting Act requires. We can all speculate on this, but I am sure it doesn't mean placing poor, minority residents into remote, inaccessible districts, somehow strengthens minority voting rights, especially when there is a better way.

What is the better way? Keep 96th/125th together, and if you ran it up further over 125th, you might also get a district which could elect a Latino Council member. But if you absolutely can't do this, please do what was suggested by Mark Levine and Liz Ritter, which is
to bring the 7th District down to 110th, or even a little further south, and then bring the 6th District up, keeping this on the West Side where it belongs. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Arluck. Our next speaker is Bob Botfeld. Bob Botfeld? Our next speaker is Keesha Gaskins. Keesha Gaskins? Keesha Gaskins? Mr. Brad Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Brad Taylor and I have my written testimony, which I will distribute to you. Before I get started with that, I just wanted to say I wanted to thank Curtis Arluck for his comments. My comments are related to Districts 7 and 9 as well. Up until Curtis Arluck's and Marc Levine's and Liz Ritter's comments, I really felt like I was in some kind of alternative reality.

I heard the Chair of CB 10 rightly say that, you know, we should keep a Central Harlem district. But if you look at CB 9 on the map, I mean, District 9 on the map, you would be hard-pressed to say that Riverside Drive and West End Avenue, at 96th Street, are in Central Harlem. Similarly, our Council member, who I respect greatly, talked about not wanting to
split up the Grant Houses with Morningside Gardens.

Well, absolutely, no one wants to do that, but the proposal to extend the 7th District will not do that at all. In fact, what it would do is actually retain the coherence of the Community Board 9 boundaries, much more so than the gerrymandered lines that we see now in the 7 th and 9th Districts.

We also heard from the former Chair of $C B$ 9, who seemed to feel that the community districts were fairly well-represented by the 7th District. That is not, in fact, the case, which may explain why he was only the Chair of Board 9 for one year, because one third of the residents of his district actually live in Community District 9.

Now, for my written testimony. I just want to say that $I$ have been a resident of Morningside Heights for 20 years and I am thankful to have this opportunity to speak before you. I support the redrawn 7th Council District, that extends south to 110th Street, that would unite all of Community District 9 based on the community district lines, pretty much.

I mean our district goes to 110th to 155th,
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the Hudson River over to the drop-off between the Heights and the point which is formed by Morningside Park, Saint Nicholas Park and Jackie Robinson Park.

These communities have so much in interest and many of the services are reflective of the topography and geography of our district. And so what you would be doing, by extending the 7 th District down, you would be making -- helping the coterminality of services to our constituents. So I would really encourage you do to that. That's, basically, are my comments. I have the written testimony.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, very much, Mr. Taylor. Our next speaker is Louise Velez. MS. VELEZ: Hello. Good evening. My name is Louise Velez. I am here to represent the People First Campaign. I support the united proposal that Asian-American Legal Defense and Education Fund is proposing. Chinatown and the Lower East Side should be one district. Not split into two like it is. By dividing us, it makes it worse for all of us who have the same issues. Working people, low-income, poor, it doesn't matter if we are black, Hispanic, Chinese. We all want similar things. We are all going through the same things.

We are fighting for the same things. We want 100 percent, low-income housing and to protect our communities. We also want to be able to vote for someone who represents our interests. Not some developer or someone who wants to help developers or the rich. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Velez. Next speaker is Maria Garrett. Did I get that right?

MS. GARRETT: Yes. It is Maria. I would like to thank everyone tonight for having me here. I am from Canarsie, Brooklyn. I missed the Brooklyn hearing. Sorry about that. But I still would like to speak tonight.

I am here on behalf of the residents of Canarsie. As it is now, we are split between three Council people, and we want to be under one or two Council people. One resident asked that I ask the Commission to consider drawing the lines from Avenue D to the shoreline and then from Ralph Avenue to 108th, because as it stands right now, one part of 108th is governed by a City Council person from East New York. When we need to have things done, he doesn't have -- they
don't have the same interest that we have on that side of Canarsie.

So we want to have all of Canarsie together, because we have tree-lined homes and we want to keep it that way. Actually, the part I am talking about is over by a nature preserve, a beautiful preserve. Five years ago, there was an incident with the preserve, that it needed to have a cleanup, and, you know, it was being destroyed. I reached out to my Council person, who I thought was my Council person, but it wasn't.

When I went to the Council person, that was my Council person, he was not interested in what I was talking about. So I had to organize a cleanup, you know, with 150 residents, to clean up that preserve. It is called Fresh Creek Nature Preserve. Now, because of my hard work, they are now restoring that preserve.

It is going to be, by the end of this year, looking like Central Park. Okay? It is a beautiful preserve and we want to keep it that way. So I ask again, that, do not split up Canarsie. Bring it back together the way it was. That's not what $I$ had written out here, but I have a little something to hand to you guys. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Garrett. Our next speaker is Regina Smith.

MS. SMITH: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for allowing me to offer testimony, this evening, on this important question. I would like to say, from the outset, that I believe it is highly important that the Commissioners take great pains to keep in place the existing, protected, voting rights district.

In fact, I strongly urge you to do so. The reason is that, as the record clearly bears out, the district, in which I live and work, is part and parcel of a generally protected district, and, again, that's my councilmanic district. The voting district, itself, is one of the main vehicles, residents of Harlem, have to let their voices being heard during this democratic process.

Significant modification will stifle the voice of a minority population, for their social and economic issues, and not be given a fair hearing by policymakers. This is especially true during these tough economic times, particularly
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 when unemployment is at a record high throughout our community.Many of our minority-elected officials come from Harlem. They were born and raised there and have firsthand knowledge of the protracted problems the residents of Harlem face each and every day. Since these officials have lived and breathed these problems, they are uniquely qualified to speak to them with authority, conviction, political courage and passion. Having said that, and in conducting your population data analyses, I strongly urge you to take note of the glaring and significant omission in the census, the individuals who are homeless and living in shelters. Granted, the census now reflects the prison population, however, it does not do justice to the districts' homeless and shelter populations.

Related to that, in conducting your review, I also urge you to honor, apply and safeguard the historic term that defines "minority." It is true that over the years, "minority" has been broadened. However, I submit that Harlem remains the historic meaning of the term "minority," and should be protected, as I trust you will do.

For the above-compelling reasons, I respectfully, but urgently, request that the Commission preserve our historically-protected voting rights districts. And again, I am grateful for allowing me to present this testimony this evening. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Ms. Smith. Council Member Gale Brewer.

MS. BREWER: Thank you very much. I know I came in late. Thank you. I am Gale Brewer and I represent the 6th Council District, the Upper West Side and Northern Clinton. I have been there since 2002.

I think you know the 6th Council District, as currently drawn up, extends from the north side of 54 th Street to the southern side of 96 th Street, from Central Park to the Hudson River.

I think this is probably the most compact, contiguous district in the whole city. And it's my opinion -- I think many share -- that the district lines should not dissect additional neighborhoods. Neighborhoods, in New York, as we know, just like us, have distinct personalities, and they should be represented by elected officials who are familiar with unique
neighborhood issues.
There has been much discussion, over decades, of how best to define communities of interest throughout neighborhoods and throughout the whole city. We know West Siders differ from East Siders, and the list goes on. I think only West Siders or only folks in Washington Heights understand the issues.

The Upper West Side is a distinct place and community with its own social and political history, it's own landmarks, gathering places, institution, bus routes, shops and so on, and everyone knows where it is. It is demarcated on maps, and the political representatives live within it, as they show the natural boundaries.

This is as it should be. It's not an artificial construct created by a committee or some arbitrary lines on a map. It's a real place with recognizable, physical boundaries and a constituency that knows where it lives and who represents it.

I have a few other points. I do believe that it is important for Council districts -- and I may be the only one who feels this -- to have more than one community board. I believe that it
is fabulous if Council District 6 includes part of Community Board 4 and part of Community Board 7, a majority of Community Board 7. Let me be specific as to why I think that.

Just recently, we had Amanda Burden's support, the City Council's support and the Mayor's support, and we passed the Upper West Side Neighborhood Retail Street Proposal, and we couldn't have done it without my colleagues to the north of me.

It was a huge amount of effort, and I think that kind of dual representation on the community board, or in this case, three representatives, helps the community board think more creatively and the whole neighborhood benefits.

I want to also back up what Curtis Arluck said. I talked about 96th Street to 110th. Maybe he talked to 125th Street. Those constituents reside in different Council districts. But to be very honest with you, those constituents come to my office, because Curtis Arluck indicated people move on a north/south access in Manhattan. And on the West Side --(three-minute timer alarms) -- they come right on down.

We have to figure out what to do about that. I just know you have a hard job, and a very short period of time of time do it, and we look forward to hearing from you. Thank you very much.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Council Member Brewer. Our next speaker is Aya Keefe.

MS. KEEFE: Thank you Chairman Romano and members of the Commission for holding this important hearing today. I hope my friend Liz is wrong, in that you are not too bored to hear my testimony, and the rest of the testimony you have to heard tonight.

My name is Aya Keefe and I am vice president of the Barack Obama Democratic Club of Upper Manhattan. We are an independent, multi-ethnic force for progressive politics in the up and coming neighborhoods of Washington Heights, West Harlem, Hamilton Heights and Inwood.

Our membership covers the 71st Assembly District, Part A, which is contained almost entirely within the current lines of City Council District 7. I am here to recommend District 7 remains intact to better our political community. District 7 should be extended south to 110th Street, which is not right now, but continue to
include Hudson Heights, Hamilton Heights and Morningside Heights.

Over the past three years, our club worked with members of this community to create a coherent, unified voice and to hold our representatives accountable, to us, on the issues we are concerned about. As Council Member Jackson said, during this year, the members of our club learned that these communities share many of the same interests and are well-suited to advocate on their behalf.

For example, many of the big landlords are building throughout this neighborhood, and tenants must deal with housing availability and living conditions. Our neighborhoods have shared environmental agendas, when it comes to our parks and to the Hudson River, and each of those neighborhoods has dealt with some expansion of Columbia University in the past, and would greatly benefit from dealing with the university, in the future, as one unit.

Finally, this neighborhood is mostly in the same school district. This is District 6 and it gives us the opportunity to continue fighting together to improve our schools. Our club has been working hard to get residents of Upper Manhattan involved in the democratic process, and I am sure most people here, in the room, know that is a hard thing to do. We would like to see the districts simplified, so that it's easier for us to identify the districts they are in and, also, know who represents them.

District 7 makes the various districts better-aligned with each other. The majority of residents, of District 7, are also State District 31st and Assembly District 71st. They are also mostly, as I mentioned, part of School District 7. It's straightforward. It's simple. We like it that way and we would like to keep it that way.

In conclusion, I believe that District 7, which includes Western Washington Heights, West Harlem, Hamilton Heights and Morningside Heights, will best represent the interests of our community and continue to allow us to fight for social issues we are concerned about together. Thank you so much. Have a good night.

MR. ROMANO: Our next speaker is Bob Botfeld.

MR. BOTFELD: My name is Bob Botfeld and I am a democratic district leader, from the Upper West Side, in the area, roughly, from 96th to 110th Street. I am also a 42-year resident of the Upper West Side, and I am here to speak about Council Districts 8 and 9, and to repeat and to voice, again, the request that the Upper West Side be represented by a single district.

And I am talking about a district from 110th Street going to 125 th Street. This is the natural district. As Council Member Brewer has spoken of, the district is a natural district. Everyone knows what the Upper West Side is. It is the area roughly west of Eighth Avenue and west of Central Park.

And it is an absolutely magical community.
It is a shopping district. Every other local district, planning district, looks at the Upper West Side in a north/south way. It is a shopping district. The community board districts are both north and south. School districts are north and south. The old judicial districts are north and south. West End Avenue, as you can remember, as the old lawyers know the old traditional districts, represent the old community courts. So they represent nine local communities.

The library districts are north and south. The recreation districts are north and south. Everything, every local assembly district is north and south. Every single local, city planning is north and south, except the Council districts.

And we had have been represented by two Council members. This is a community that knows each other. They have the same interests and they have worked together. It's not just a community in name only. And the last ten years, the community has come to together, across the two Council districts, and worked on common zoning issues.

In 2007, there was the Upper West Side Retail Zoning, that crossed the 8th and 9th Council Districts, and this was driven entirely by community members. In the last four months, there was, as Gale Brewer mentioned, there was the Upper Retail Zoning, which, again, the upper north/south way, the community got together and worked to preserve their shopping district.

Recently, there was the school districts working together. P.S. 163 and P.S. 145, they are two blocks away, in two different Council
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districts, but they, hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of their parents, and children, turned out to preserve the community schools.

Again, this was, again, across two Council districts, but, again, another indication of the Upper West Side folks working together.

I ask you, very strongly, to look at the Upper West Side, and make a Council District that represents -- that matches all of the other single-planning districts, that the city and local communities have. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Mr. Botfeld.
Is Ross Wallenstein here?
Keesha Gaskin?
We appear to have called upon everyone, who preregistered and registered this evening. We have no other speakers, with hearing cards, that have been filled out.

If there is anyone, who wants to address the Commission this evening, I ask you to indicate if you are interested in talking to us by approaching one of the staff people.
(Continued on next page.)

It appears then that all speakers, who wish to be heard, have spoken, and we will adjourn this hearing until our next hearing next week, on Monday.

Thank you very much.
(Whereupon, at 7:46 p.m., the above matter was concluded.)

I, JOSHUA B. EDWARDS, RPR, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify that the above is a correct transcription of my stenographic notes.
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