

RE: BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE SELECTION OF MR. MCKASKLE AS ONE OF THE LAST SIX COMMISSIONERS AND PROPOSAL TO HOLD THE FIRST ROUND OF PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY AND NORTHERN CALIFORNIA TO ENSURE THEIR CITIZEN'S VOICES ARE HEARD BY ALL COMMISSIONERS

Dear Commissioners,

I write to urge you to carefully consider the budgetary implications of the choices you will make with regards to selection of the remaining six commissioners. When I addressed your last meeting I emphasized the fact that the Commission is seriously under funded and will be understaffed. I mentioned that if you adjust the \$3 million that Arizona spent redistricting ten years ago for inflation and population, then redistricting in California should cost approximately \$24 million this year, and 411 public meetings should be held to obtain the same level of public input.

Unfortunately, you will only have a tiny fraction of those resources available to you. In fact, you will have less money than Arizona did ten years ago because their commissioners did not receive per diem payments. The Legislature has given you a budget of only \$3 million, of which \$500,000 has already been spent by the State Auditor's office on the selection process. (Actually, far more was spent but the excess costs were generously absorbed by the State Auditor out of her own department's budget, not yours.)

Of the \$2.5 million that remains in your budget, more than \$600,000 will be allocated to your per diem costs based on the 145 work days between January 1, 2011 and your deadline of August 15, 2011. Additionally, the four staff positions currently being advertised will cost more than \$550,000 when you add in the cost of benefit packages, even if you hire at the lowest end of the salary ranges advertised. (If you hire at the high end, you can add another \$50,000+ to staffing costs with benefits.)

Accordingly, as you make your decision regarding the selection of the final six commissioners you have only approximately \$1.3 million available to you to complete the entire redistricting process.

That amount must be stretched to somehow cover office and equipment rental, auditing and accounting services, information technology, website development and maintenance, extensive travel and public meeting expenses (including language translations and webcasts), all outside consultants needed and an extensive public outreach campaign. To put it in perspective, the State Auditor spent \$1.3M (the same amount remaining in your entire budget) just on public outreach to recruit applicants for the commission (a reasonable amount for a statewide campaign of this scope).

Purely from a budgetary perspective I urge you to reconsider Mr. McKaskle for one of the remaining six seats on the commission. This is a very difficult recommendation to make given the limited number of candidates you are allowed to consider when seeking representation of the vast and important Central Valley region and the various other very legitimate concerns raised regarding diversity during your deliberations. However, the reality is that you will not be able to hire a consultant with Mr. McKaskle's unique skill set without seriously impacting an already anemic budget that must cover redistricting of the entire state.

If Mr. McKaskle serves as a commissioner you will be gaining extensive and critically important expertise in redistricting at the bargain price of only \$300 per diem (with no added benefits cost). Although you will still likely have to hire outside redistricting consultants, the number of hours they will have to put in will be greatly reduced by Mr. McKaskle's efforts. Additionally, you would likely get more value out of your outside consultants with Mr. McKaskle as a commissioner helping to define their scope of work and acting as a check and balance to make sure that they are faithfully executing the wishes of the commissioners.

I recognize that replacing Ms. DiGuilio-Matz with Mr. McKaskle on the final slate will raise significant and legitimate concerns regarding the lack of a current resident of the Central Valley on the commission. I share these concerns; however, I believe that they can be effectively addressed in other ways without serious budget implications.

If Mr. McKaskle is selected I would propose that the commission simultaneously commit to hold its first rounds of public meetings in the Central Valley and in Northern California (which also does not have a direct representative on the commission). Holding the first meetings in these regions would ensure that all commissioners are acutely focused on the needs of these citizens upfront having heard their concerns in their own words before any substantive work on redistricting even begins.

There would be no additional expense associated with prioritizing the timing of the meetings in these regions which would be held somewhere in the course of the process anyway. There are also added intangible benefits to holding the first meetings in the least populated areas of the state.

- The meetings will be easier to publicize through earned media in these smaller media markets.
- Smaller meetings are easier to produce for newly hired staff.
- Front loading the most difficult travel at the beginning of the process when energy levels are highest will assure that the commissioners are acutely focused public comments received from the citizens who do not have one of their residents on the commission.

In closing, please remember that as the Citizens Redistricting Commission you need both diversity of citizen representation and relevant redistricting expertise to accomplish your mission. Unfortunately, given your serious budget constraints you can't afford to buy the latter in service of the former.

Sincerely,

Heather Peters

REDISTRICTING EXPENSES IN ARIZONA VS. CALIFORNIA

2000-01 Arizona Redistricting Expense = \$3M (\$3.81M adjusted for inflation)

Related litigation expense in Arizona = \$10M (\$12.7M adjusted for inflation)

CALIFORNIA PROJECTIONS BASED ONLY ON ARIZONA REDISTRICTING EXPENSES ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION & POULATION:*
(no litigation costs included)

	ARIZONA EXPERIENCE	CALIFORNIA PROJECTIONS
Expense per person**	\$0.74	\$ 27,351,631
# of public meetings	57 (1 per 90,011 people)	411

OTHER FACTORS THAT WILL AFFECT CALIFORNIA'S REDISTRICTING EXPENSE:

COMMISSION STRUCTURE

# Commissioners	5	14
Per Diem	\$0	\$300

(Per Commissioner up to \$4,200/per day in CA)

DISTRICTS DRAWN

	38	178
Expense per district**	\$100,263.16	\$17,846,842

LANGUAGE DIVERSITY

Whites and Hispanics	88.1%	78.7%
Asian	2.6%	12.7%

(According to the 2000 census 2,709,179 people representing 8.5% of California's population speak an Asian or Pacific Island language at home. Nine such languages were spoken widely enough to be tabulated individually.)

- Sources:**
- AZ redistricting expenses & # of meetings: Per testimony of Steve Lynn before Committee on 11/30/10
 - Inflation calculator: http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm
 - AZ Population: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/04000.html>
 - CA Population: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html>
 - CA Languages: http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?-geo_id=04000US06&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP16&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U

* Per census - CA population in 2009 (36,961,664) was 7.2 times larger than Arizona's population in 2000 (5,130,632).

** Includes only redistricting expenses adjusted for inflation, not litigation costs.

CALIFORNIA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 3,000,000.00

ALREADY COMMITTED:

Already spent by Auditor establishing
Commission \$ (500,000.00)
Per Diem (145 working days in 2011) \$ (609,000.00)
Executive Director* \$ (177,866.67)
Counsel* \$ (177,866.67)
Communications Officer* \$ (139,483.33)
Administrative Assistant* \$ (73,333.33)

AVAILABLE BALANCE: \$ 1,322,450.00

STILL NEEDED:

Office space	?	
Equipment	?	
Auditing	?	
Accounting	?	
IT/Website	?	
Outreach**	?	(**Auditor spent \$1.3M on outreach just to recruit Commission)
Travel	?	
Meeting expense	?	
Outside consultants	?	

*Based on low end of salary advertised plus benefits. Of total shown, 72% = salary and 28% = benefits.

(Paying high end of all salary ranges advertised would add \$56,600 to the total.)