

PITTSYLVANIA COUNTY 2021 REDISTRICTING PUBLIC COMMENT FEEDBACK TO DATE

Nov. 1 - 19, 2021

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Jodi	Via	jodicarter83@gmail.com	24566	Dan River	I am supportive of either Plan B or Plan C for the redistricting. I'm currently in the Dan River district but would love to be part of the Banister district, as it's the district I work in and frequent more often.	Plan B
Carl	Davis	carlmichael85@gmail.com	24586-3845	Dan River	Plan B does not appear to gerrymander the count/district the worst.	Plan B
Curtis	England	England4.wvu@gmail.com	24563	Staunton River	Plan B makes the most sense to me. Not sure a Vote counts for anything in Virginia anymore anyways.	Plan B
Kathryn	Wilton	romeokat@gmail.com	24557	Banister	I would prefer either Plan B or C; Plan A is similar to what we currently have and is a disgusting example of gerrymandering. Please keep redistricting simple and sensible: go with either Plan B or C.	Plan B
Lisa	Jones	ljones4711@gmail.com	24054	Tunstall	I prefer plan C	Plan C
David	Wilton	dave@stricklers.org	24557	Banister	Plan B or C would be fine. Plan A, I should submit to Wikipedia as the definition of gerrymandering.	Plan C
Joshua	Austin	Joshua.austint@gmail.com	24073	Banister	All of these proposed maps are rattled with gerrymandering and should be redrawn.	
Danielle	Feeney	Danielley2831@hotmail.com	24540	Tunstall	B and C are clear gerrymandering. Plan A serves so purpose. Districts should be left how they are currently.	Plan A
Jennifer	Arnn	elliottjenny1009@gmail.com	24540	Westover	Please keep districts as close to they are currently, with only minor changes. Thank you all	Plan A

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Elizabeth	Boswell	Meand3ajs@yahoo.com	24139	Callands-Gretna	Plan B is more suitable due to my particular area. Plan A puts my address on the line with Stanton river in which I do not want. I see confusion with plan A also in the long run as the area may increase in population.	Plan B
Richard	Donnelly	robinridge2@gmail.com		Callands-Gretna	I support Plan B.	Plan B
Rhonda	McFalls	Mcfallsx6@comcast.net	24540	Westover	My children attend Dan River High school and therefore I should have a say as to who serves on the board. It is not about equality of the districts. You should be able to vote on matters that concern your area. Anything less takes away my 19th amendment rights. I vote for no plan currently suggested as none of them allow me to vote in the currently school district my children attend.	

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Brenda	Williams	bmwilcox@yahoo.com	24586	Dan River	If all districts currently outlined have been accurately polled for number of residences all 3 of the proposed districts should qualify. Maybe I'm not seeing the bigger picture. Plan A seems to be the plan that is least affected by the changes based on current poll area's. One needs to keep in mind how sections of all the current areas have a residence count that will quickly change with the land development in some of those districts that are underway or planned in the near future. I suppose my question would be when where the residence's counted for the proposed new area's ans does these numbers include current new construction or planned construction of new residences?	Plan A
Brian	McFalls	Mcfallsx5@gmail.com	24540	Westover	I don't understand how my kids attend Dan River schools yet I vote for Westover district. I don't agree with any of the options presented. Maybe you should redistrict according to the schools that you have already assigned/districted. That way those that have children attending those schools can vote for a representative in their actual district. It's not rocket science.	
Seth	Scarce	seth.scarce@pittgov.org	24540	Chatham-Blairs	Plan B	Plan B
Janice	Inman	Janiceinman1@icloud.com	24540	Chatham-Blairs	Plan A	Plan A
Christina	Scarce	cke02071992@hotmail.com	24540	Tunstall	.	Plan B
Tricia	Waller	vols10ec@hotmail.com	24565	Banister	N/A	Plan B
Natalie	Hudgins	ngoakes@gmail.com	24540	Chatham-Blairs	N/A	Plan B

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Tammy	Yeatts	tammy.slugger@gmail.com	24527	Chatham-Blairs	Only Plan A leaves us in the Chatham-Blairs district . That is where we want to stay. I have talked to people in the Banister district and they have to travel a long ways to vote. If you are planning on changing the districts like this you need to open more polling places if not it seems like you don't want people to vote because you are putting residents out by making them travel even further to vote. Thank you	Plan A
Joseph	Merricks	merricksj76@comcast.net	24540	Chatham-Blairs	We would prefer to stay in the Chatham-Blair's district mainly because we have more in common with the people of this district than the Westover district.	Plan A
Nikkia	Fitzgerald	nikkiarenea83@yahoo.com	24531-3502	Banister	.	Plan A
Robin	Rowland	squabrowland@gmail.com	24557	Staunton River	I think Plan C has the clearest lines.	Plan C
Audrey	Myers	luvneyesnay65@yahoo.com	24557	Staunton River	I feel plan B or C puts me back where I belong and clears up the boundary lines. I was Callands-Gretna for years until the last redistricting. I was then switched, but right across the road stayed Callands-Gretna. I live only 3.8 miles from Gretna but 12.3 miles to where I have to vote.	Plan C

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Robert	Gilbert	gilbertthg@aol.com	24531	Banister	<p>I urge your consideration of Plan A, but with some modifications to increase the percentage of minorities. As Plan A now stands, the Black population only account for approx. 50.3 percent, down from the approx. 55 percent of the plan adopted in 2011. During the last redistricting in 2011, a representative group from the Black community met with the map drawers and was able to work to maintain a plan that better mirrored the "Voting Age population within the Black community and other mitigating factors that affect Black voters. I would urge that you allow such a representative group be allowed to meet with your map drawers to take another look for ways to make this happen again.</p> <p>The Banister District was created after the 1990 census for the distinct purpose of achieving one out of seven districts that would allow a level playing field to give minorities a fair chance to win, not to guarantee winning, but to give a fair chance to be elected. As history has proven, there was little cross-over voting when Black candidates ran for election. During the ensuing election, Mr. William Pritchett was narrowly elected in</p>	Plan A

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Brenda	Bowman	bbowman300@embarqmail.com	24549	Chatham-Blairs	When you click on the 3 individual plans in the PDF format, the 7 districts are identified by color and the color key at the bottom of the page identifies the color districts by numbers. Most citizens do not know their district number. They only know it by name. I would suggest that the color key at the bottom of the page also identify the name of the district by the number. This would be more user-friendly for the average citizen making it easier to see exactly how the proposals affect their address. Thank you for your consideration.	
Lisa	Campbell	hummers1963@gmail.com	24557	Banister	I prefer plan B	Plan B
Roy	Ford	r16ford@hotmail.com	24541	Westover	I favor plan A because it offers the best opportunity to maintain a minority member on the Board. It may also have the best chance to avoid being challenged by the Justice Department.	Plan A

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Charles	Angier	cangier@rsnet.org	24161	Chatham-Blairs	<p>As I viewed the work session of Nov. 16, I was surprised at the level of mandates and restrictions placed upon the localities by the state. I would suggest that everyone should view the Nov. 16 work session and download the census and demographic information on the redistricting page before charges of gerrymandering are made.</p> <p>Plan A is the only one of the three that maintains a "majority-minority" district in Banister, thus the perceived gerrymandering.</p> <p>The other 2 plans make Banister as well as the other 6 districts more reflective of the overall county ethnic profile.</p> <p>Plan B splits Chatham into 3 districts and is almost as convoluted as Plan A.</p> <p>Plan C, though it does not define a majority-minority district, leaves Chatham intact, is the least convoluted and most contiguous.</p>	Plan C

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Kelsie	Myers	kelsie.myers@pittgov.org	24557	Staunton River	I feel Plan B better captures the areas with the boundary lines and cleans the map up without a lot of confusion. I used to be in the Callands-Gretna District, and across the road from me is still Callands-Gretna. I am much closer to Gretna (only 2.8 miles) than I am to the precinct where I vote (12 miles). Also, most of my business (grocery, restaurants) is conducted in the Gretna area.	Plan B

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Jason	Ball	jason.ball_va@yahoo.com	24531	Callands-Gretna	<p>Looking closely at the proposed maps, in my opinion proposal B is the best option for 2 critical reasons.</p> <p>First, it groups the districts best in groups of like-minded neighbors in defined boundaries which is the primary reason of the redistricting. Chatham is actually in the Chatham-Blairs district as opposed to option C. Callands is in its districts as an entity, as well as Westover and etc.</p> <p>Secondarily, there is less gerrymandering, or the appearance thereof in Option B. The NAACP mistakenly supported option A for better racial power in elections, which ironically is the definition of both gerrymandering and racism. In their request at the BOS meeting, they acknowledged that the minorities are in less population and more spread out in the population than in previous censuses. Fortunately, their dispersion into the rest of the community is the success of decades of integration. That success should not be hidden and deleted with narrow and long ethnically drawn boundaries that divides neighborhoods.</p>	Plan B
William	Shelhorse	James.shelhorse@gmail.com	24540	Chatham-Blairs	<p>Hello I prefer plan B for redistricting. Mount Hermon shouldn't be included with Brosville like A or Chatham like C.</p>	Plan B
Howard	Crump	hscrump31@yahoo.com	24586	Dan River	Plan A	Plan A
Timothy	Rollison	Theel50@yahoo.com	24563	Staunton River	I support Plan A for the redistricting	Plan A

First Name	Last Name	Email Address	Zip Code	Current District	Feedback	Preferred Plan
Jennifer	Ketchum	jlketchum@chatmosscable.com	24541	Westover	<p>I have been in the Westover District since moving to my home in 1994 and am completely satisfied with remaining in the Westover district. I prefer Plan B but could be ok with Plan A if necessary. However, I am totally against Plan C for many reasons. I don't like that Westover district would shrink by going with Plan C and have no interest in becoming in the Tunstall district. I voted for our Supervisor Ron Scarce and have been completely satisfied with everything he is doing to help our Westover district and want to remain living under his knowledge, helpfulness, and dedication of service.</p> <p>Thanks in advance for keeping Horseshoe Rd in the Westover district!!</p>	Plan B
Patricia	Bolton		24541	Westover	<p>I want to stay in the Westover District !! We like the closest fire department!</p>	Plan B
Tim	Cassell	tpcassell@comcast.net	24541	Westover	Leave us alone. I pick B.	Plan B
Lynn	Newman	lnewman57@gmail.com	24541	Westover	Plan B	Plan B

Comment on Redistricting Plans A, B, and C and on Data for Current Districts

I appreciate the opportunity to comment. Thank you. As I wrote in an email to Pittsylvania County Assistant Administrator Dave Arnold on November 5th, *“Without racial ethnic data for the prison population, we cannot know the racial ethnic make-up of the prison-adjusted population of the current or proposed voting districts. The tables for ‘Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %’ are wrong. To suggest they are accurate - or even helpful - is misleading.”*

The data provided in the *Census 2020 Data Report for Pittsylvania County* by ARCBridge Consulting and Training is incomplete. There is no “racial ethnic” data for the prison population. The four pages with data for *Current Districts, Plan A, Plan B, and Plan C* each show racial ethnic data for the districts *before* people are added or removed for the prison adjustment. The number of people in the racial/ethnic categories in each district add up to the district population total, *not* the prison-adjusted figure. If percentages for each racial/ethnic category were calculated as a percentage of the total population, the percentages would add up to 100%. Instead, the data in the tables titled *“Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %”* are calculated using the *“Prison-Adjusted”* population total for each district. As a consequence, the percentages for each district add up to either more or less than 100%, depending on whether the prison adjustment added or subtracted people from the district. To suggest that these percentages provide useful information is wrong.

It may be helpful to consider this simplified example:

Suppose you have 10 pieces of fruit. 5 are apples. 5 are oranges.

Apples, as a percentage of the total, equal 5 divided by 10, which equals 50%.

Oranges, as a percentage of the total, equal 5 divided by 10, which equals 50%.

Suppose you then “adjust” the total by taking away one piece of fruit.

You now have 9 pieces of fruit.

What is the new percentage of apples and oranges?

If you don’t know whether the fruit taken away was an apple or an orange, you can’t know the new percentage of apples and oranges.

If you were to use the type of calculation we see in the *Census 2020 Data Report for Pittsylvania County*, you would erroneously divide 5 by 9 and get 55.55% for apples and 55.55% for oranges ... the wrong answer.

(You have the same problem if you add a piece of unknown fruit: 5 divided by 11 gives 45.45% apples and 45.45% oranges ... again, the wrong answer.)

Now consider data for *Current Districts* in the ARCBridge report.

As an example, look at District 3, the current Banister District:

The *“Total”* population of the current Banister District is 8,282.

The Non-Hispanic White population is 3,679. The percentage Non-Hispanic White is 3,679 divided by 8,282, which equals 44.42%.

Current election district: Chatham-Blairs

Date submitted: November 11, 2021

The Non-Hispanic Black population is 4,164. The percentage Non-Hispanic Black is 4,164 divided by 8,282, which equals 50.28%.

The other categories, which include Hispanic, "2+ Race" (mixed race), and others, total 439.

The percentage "Other" is 439 divided by 8,282, which equals 5.30%.

The three percentages total 100%. (44.42% + 50.28% + 5.30% = 100%)

The "Prison-Adjusted" population of the current Banister District is 7,621. The table titled "Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %" inexplicably uses this number to calculate percentages. This table is meaningless.

Non-Hispanic White: 3,679 divided by 7,621 = 48.27%

Non-Hispanic Black: 4,169 divided by 7,621 = 54.70%

Other: 439 divided by 7,621 = 5.76%

Total: 108.73%

The difference between the Total population (8,282) and the Prison-Adjusted population (7,621) is 661 people. The Census 2020 Data Report for Pittsylvania County does not identify the race/ethnicity of these people. **We cannot calculate the "Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %" for the current Banister District or for any other district.**

This same mistake is made in all the current districts and in all districts in the three proposed redistricting plans – Plan A, Plan B, and Plan C. The tables for 'Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %' are wrong. To suggest they are accurate - or even helpful - is misleading.

So, what should the Pittsylvania County Administration and Board of Supervisors do?

Acknowledge that there has been a big mistake. Don't pretend that *ARCBridge's Census and Demographic Analysis* is meaningful. Such pretense only makes the error worse.

1. Inform the public that you do not know the racial and ethnic percentages for the proposed or current prison-adjusted voting districts.

IF racial and ethnic data is available for people who are incarcerated,

2. Ask *ARCBridge* to revise the data tables in their *Census and Demographic Analysis* and resubmit their report.
3. Publicize the revised report (with accurate racial/ethnic percentages) and extend the comment period.

IF racial and ethnic data is **not** available for people who are incarcerated,

4. Remove the data tables titled "Racial Ethnic Composition of Each District %" from the *Census and Demographic Analysis* available at the Pittsylvania County Administration Building and on the County's website.
5. Publicize the corrected redistricting analysis (omitting racial/ethnic percentages) and extend the public comment period.