



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

pr12 #4

1 message

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:07 AM**
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **C0mm3nt\$** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 8, 2011 at 7:41 PM
Subject: Fw: Equivalency File discussion
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Redistricting Partners: for help with posting public comments.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: Paul Mitchell <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, 8 Jul 2011 18:42:27 -0700
To: [REDACTED] Office, Communications <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Equivalency File discussion

If the commission gave out equivalency files we would get those maps – full PDFs with more information than the commission provides - and have them up same-day, usually within a few hours. And our site maps have received over 100,000 views, so the public is receiving them.

Right now we are recreating the maps ourselves and it takes forever. And we are the only site creating maps from the visualizations. When the rose institute posted visualizations it was from our equivalency files.

Paul Mitchell

Redistricting Partners

On behalf of the NALEO Educational fund, I write to reemphasize our position and respectfully urge the Commission to consider any changes that would further weaken the opportunity for Latino community members to elect their candidates of choice.

We thank you for consideration of our views, and we greatly appreciate your service to our State.

Sincerely,

Astrid Garcia
Director of State Election Policy and Redistricting

NALEO Educational Fund
1122 W. Washington Blvd., 3rd. Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90015

213/ [REDACTED] Ext. 4434

[REDACTED] Fax

www.latinosdrawthelines.org

www.naleo.org

The NALEO Educational Fund is the leading nonprofit organization that facilitates full Latino participation in the American political process, from citizenship to public service.



NALEO Testimony to CRC on July visualizations fin 07-11.pdf

366K



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

pra 12 # 7

4 messages

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:22 PM**
 To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Wed, May 18, 2011 at 7:34 PM
 Subject: Re: .pdf of San Fernando Valley area
 To: Ana Henderson <[REDACTED]>

Ana...thank you so much...looks like the 405 is a "partial" boundary:-)
 Vince

On Wed, May 18, 2011 at 7:17 PM, Ana Henderson <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello Commissioner Barabba,

I hope this email finds you well!

To follow up on your request before the San Marcos hearing, please find the attached .pdf file showing a map of the San Fernando Valley area with a Census Tract level distribution of Latino Voting Age Population.

Take care,
 Ana

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:26 PM**
 To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, May 13, 2011 at 10:50 PM
 Subject: group presentations
 To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]> Angelo Ancheta <[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

Dan...on the 27th you have the Peoples Advocate Group listed with the term Conflicts. What does that mean? Also could we have the Mortgage group...since it is only LA County just present the maps electronically. It would be nice to start working with C2 on the afternoon of the 27th. Angleo and Connie...Chime in...

Vince

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:34 PM**
 To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ancheta, Angelo** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, May 17, 2011 at 6:11 PM
Subject: Re: group presentations
To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>, "Miller, Kirk" <[REDACTED]> Karin Mac Donald
<[REDACTED]>, Lilbert Ontai <[REDACTED]>, Connie Galambos-Malloy
<[REDACTED]>

Dan's idea regarding video presentations is quite interesting. I don't think it will placate everyone, but it does give groups who can't get scheduled an opportunity to provide highlights. I'm deferring once again to Q2 to determine whether this is a manageable solution, but since the maps and reports have to be analyzed anyway, perhaps highlight reels will not be overly burdensome if the numbers are small.

Angelo

On Tue, May 17, 2011 at 3:25 PM, Claypool, Daniel <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Understood and agree. I had an idea earlier, the commission could advise all the groups that miss a slot to present that they could submit their materials for posting and provide a YouTube link where they present their suggestions. (Maximum presentation would be 10 minutes or the maximum length of one YouTube presentation.) We would then link their materials to the YouTube presentation and provide each commissioner and Q2 with the link to the material and the YouTube presentation. Then each commissioner and Q2 could "fit" the presentation in where its possible.

Any thoughts?

On Mon, May 16, 2011 at 1:51 PM, Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dan...given the short time that we have between May 26th and June 10th (and given Karin's plea for more time to complete the work) my position is that we go with the groups currently scheduled for the 24th and 26th and apprise those scheduled for the 27th to submit their materials which will be reviewed before we complete the initial draft. As much as I'm sure all of us want to hear from everyone...our most important responsibility to all citizens is to make sure we have enough time to present a credible first draft set of maps.

Vince

On Mon, May 16, 2011 at 1:15 PM, Claypool, Daniel <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Nothing has been set at this point. However, we have far more "groups" than we have slots to accommodate them. The commission will simply have to determine where the cut off is going to be. If it's only one day in Northridge, then that's it. However, we won't have time beyond that before the first drafts.

Dan

On Sat, May 14, 2011 at 8:30 PM, Miller, Kirk <[REDACTED]> wrote:

seem right. any thoughts?

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, May 14, 2011 at 3:40 PM
Subject: Re: group presentations
To: "Ancheta, Angelo" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>, "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>, Connie Galambos-Malloy

< [REDACTED] Kirk Miller
< [REDACTED] Ana Henderson < [REDACTED]

i am very concerned now: why are there groups scheduled for the 27th at all?!? the 27th is line drawing direction day and i asked for the 28th to be added for this purpose as well because we will need the first part of the 27th for the wrap up and there are considerable discussions that need to take place re vra issues.

the organized groups, last i heard, were scheduled for the 24th and 26th! we are already dealing with a near impossible timeline. frankly speaking, i can not guarantee draft maps if we can not finish directions on the 27th and the 28th as this is already pushing the calendar another day further with the addition of saturday, which is another day when we're not drawing!

please let me know what is going on.

thanks

.
karin

On Sat, May 14, 2011 at 9:39 AM, Ancheta, Angelo

< [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> FYI -- I spoke to Ana last night about the time needed for Q2 to provide the last regional wrap up and to get in the first line drawing session so they'll have enough direction over the three days when we don't meet with them. She's checking with Karin. I think we should work around the "last wrap up/first directions" block of time to determine what we should leave for groups on the 27th.

>

> On Sat, May 14, 2011 at 7:33 AM, Claypool, Daniel < [REDACTED] wrote:

>>

>> Christina will have to "decode" the "conflicts" statement. She's handling all arrangements.

>>

>> Christina?

>>

>> On Fri, May 13, 2011 at 10:50 PM, Barabba, Vincent < [REDACTED] wrote:

>>>

>>> Dan...on the 27th you have the Peoples Advocate Group listed with the term Conflicts. What does that mean? Also could we have the Mortgage group...since it is only LA County just present the maps electronically. It would be nice to start working with C2 on the afternoon of the 27th. Angelo and Connie...Chime in...

>>>

>>> Vince

>>

>>

>> --

>> Daniel M. Claypool

>> Executive Director

>> Citizens Redistricting Commission

>> Tel: [REDACTED]

>> "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

>

>

>

> --

>

> Angelo Ancheta

> Commissioner

> California Citizens Redistricting Commission

>
>
>

--

Kirk E. Miller
Chief Counsel
Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA. 95814
[redacted] (o)
[\[redacted\] \(916\) \[redacted\]](tel:(916)[redacted])

--

Daniel M. Claypool
Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: [redacted]
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

--

Daniel M. Claypool
Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: [redacted]
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

--

Angelo Ancheta
Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

Barabba, Vincent <[redacted]> Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:36 PM
To: Lonn Leitch <[redacted]> Marian Johnston <[redacted]>

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Blanco, Maria** <[redacted]>

Date: Tue, Apr 26, 2011 at 3:29 PM

Subject: Re: Warren Institute Redistricting Brief

To: "Galambos-Malloy, Connie" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED] "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]> Commissioners

<[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]>

Rob Wilcox <[REDACTED]>

Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

The Warren Institute publication is Blue and Gold and a short 8 pages. It was linked but you can also find it on the Warren Institute's website.

Maria

On Tue, Apr 26, 2011 at 11:33 AM, Galambos-Malloy, Connie <[REDACTED]> wrote:

We definitely received [Redistricting Law 2010](#), which is also a partially red book...but I was referring to the [Citizen's Guide to Redistricting](#), which is also red and the one I intended to pick up.

Connie

On Tue, Apr 26, 2011 at 11:29 AM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Is this the red book? I have one and I think we received it from Justin Levy

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Galambos-Malloy, Connie" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 26 Apr 2011 11:12:23 -0700

To: Dai, Cynthia<[REDACTED]>

Cc: Commissioners<[REDACTED]>

Wilcox<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Warren Institute Redistricting Brief

Daniel Claypool<[REDACTED]>

Rob

Kirk Miller<[REDACTED]>

Greetings all:

I am happy to track down copies of the Brennan Center publication (it is quite a large document to print), on behalf of the Commission from the TAC while in Los Angeles.

I am estimating I will pick up 12 copies for Commissioners (all, minus Cynthia and Vince); along with any copies that Dan would like me to pick up on behalf of staff.

Please let me know if you would NOT like me to pick you up a copy.

Connie

On Fri, Apr 22, 2011 at 5:18 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hey, team--

Some weekend reading for you! Yesterday, I took the opportunity to check out the Berkeley Technical Assistance Center while meeting with Q2. They had extra copies of the Citizens' Guide to Redistricting put out by the Brennan Center. Here is a link to the soft copy, but I suggest you visit your local TAC and pick up a hard copy: http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/a_citizens_guide_to_redistricting_2010_edition/

Also, pls find attached a link to a brief on Race and Redistricting put out by Gilda Daniels and the Earl Warren Institute. Dan/Rob, we may want to link to these resources on our website.

--}cyn

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ana Henderson** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Apr 22, 2011 at 5:06 PM

Subject: Fwd: Warren Institute Redistricting Brief

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioner Dai,

Attached please find the Warren Institute's recently published issue brief regarding the judicially acceptable consideration of race in redistricting. This issue brief describes both Voting Rights Act and Constitutional requirements and restraints of the consideration of race in redistricting. Please feel free to share it.

In addition, I can provide hard copies of the document if you would like. Please let me know if you require further information or assistance.

Take care,
Ana

> --
> Ana Henderson
> Director of Opportunity & Inclusion
> Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law & Social Policy University of California, Berkeley School of Law
>

--

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

María Blanco, Commissioner
Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

pra 12 #4

1 message

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:06 AM**
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ancheta, Angelo** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 7:03 PM
Subject: Re: proposed change to MONT
To: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

It sounds like there would have to be two city splits (Gilroy + an SNMSC city) in the proposed configuration. I would guess that opposition to the proposal would focus on how a two-city split would be justified when the current visualization has a one-city split (Santa Cruz).

Angelo

On Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 5:11 PM, Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Angelo (and Karin)...here is Tamina's initial observations...I'm right in the middle of getting ready to go to my meeting. Would you take a look at the effects this has in Santa Clara and San Jose...If it is tolerable...I would like to go forward.

Hi Commissioner Barabba,

Here are my thoughts on the submission affecting Santa Cruz and Gilroy in the MONT district:

- 1) The MONT configuration which was submitted does meet the benchmark when balanced (the submitter neglected to balance the Congressional districts to +1/-1)
- 2) The repercussions of this change (as submitted) would be to alter the following districts:

SNACL: underpopulated by 3,265
SANJO: underpopulated by 1,554
SNMSC: overpopulated by 4,817

Because the submitter failed to balance these districts, the deviations are improper. SNACL, SANJO, and SNMSC can be balanced between each other without affecting any other districts, but it would require some decisions:

- a) To balance SNMSC, a city must be split because the submitter's lines go right up to the city borders. Therefore SNMSC must split Santa Clara, Cupertino, or Saratoga.
- b) After that split is made for SNMSC, the split in San Jose will be moved to accommodate the balancing needed for SANJO and SNACL.

The change itself would not be very difficult to do if this is what is decided upon.
Let me know what you think, or if this is confusing. I would be happy to explain it further.

Thanks, sorry this took so long!

Tamina

On Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 11:24 AM, Vincent P Barabba <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Tamina...thanks for checking it out...
Vince

From: Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]>
To: Vincent P Barabba <[REDACTED]> Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Fri, July 22, 2011 11:14:00 AM

Subject: Fwd: Santa Cruz Whole MONT Congressional District

Good Morning Commissioner Barabba,
Let me look into this and I will get back to you as soon as possible!

Thanks,
Tamina

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Comment2, Public <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Jul 21, 2011 at 6:37 PM
Subject: Fwd: Santa Cruz Whole MONT Congressional District
To: Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin MacDonald <[REDACTED]>

Tamina...At today's business meeting someone from Santa Cruz submitted alternative maps that keeps all of Santa Cruz as well as CSCU whole within the Congressional District -- it was developed by Redistricting Partners and it is attached to this file. They did this by splitting Gilroy keeping the most latino portion in the CD and picking up the rest of Santa Cruz. They also have made the required changes to Santa Clara (you'll need to see that those changes don't cause more problems). The Name of the person who put the change together is Nik Bonovich and his phone number is [REDACTED]. I hope your feel this request can be considered as a "minor" change...but let me know if this become too much of an effort. I checked with Michelle and she indicated it would be appropriate for me to contact you. My mobile number is [REDACTED].

Vince

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Nik Bonovich <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jul 20, 2011 at 9:24 PM
Subject: Santa Cruz Whole MONT Congressional District
To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Paul Mitchell <[REDACTED]> Chris Chaffee <[REDACTED]>

Please see the attached maps of Congressional Districts that make the City of Santa Cruz whole in MONT, make Sunnyvale and Santa Clara whole in SNMSC, decrease the split of San Jose from three to two districts (SNACL & SANJO) and increase the Asian CVAP in SANJO from 40% to 41%.

Thank you,
Nik Bonovich
Redistricting Partners

--

Angelo Ancheta
Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission



Orange County.pdf
2631K

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:15 AM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Galambos-Malloy, Connie** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 6:46 PM
Subject: Re: MALDEF Statewide Congress Concerns and Recommendations
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Provided to Mr. Brown.

Connie

On Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 6:39 PM, Steven Ochoa <[REDACTED]> wrote:
July 23, 2011

Via electronic mail
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Statewide Congress Concerns and Recommendations

Dear Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

On behalf of MALDEF, I highlight the following concerns and re-submit the following districts from the MALDEF Updated Congressional plan from June 28, 2011 as recommendations for the statewide Congressional plan.

1. Central Valley - An additional Section 2 District is possible

The MALDEF Updated Congressional plan resubmitted the same Congressional districts from MALDEF's 5/26 plan for the Central Valley, proposing an additional Section 2 Congressional district in the Central Valley. Furthermore, the proposal maintains the Section 5 requirements for both Kings County and Merced County.,. The CCRC 6/10 Draft, and all visualizations to date, ignore the creation of an additional 50% LCVAP district in the Central Valley.

2. Central Coast

The MALDEF Updated 6/28 Congressional plan created an additional Latino opportunity district, mirroring the significant community of interest testimony to link East San Jose to the Salinas area for the State Senate level. This configuration follows the existing split of the benchmark State Assembly and State Senate districts for Monterey County, drawn by Court Special Masters. MALDEF Updated 6/28 CD 17 contains eastern Monterey County, including Salinas, Castroville, Aromas, Pajaro, Las Lomas, Wastsonville, Interlaken, Morgan Hill, San Martin, Gilroy, and the traditionally Latino community of East San Jose. These closely related communities create an effective district with 45.2% LCVAP and 45.2% Latino registration.

3. Los Angeles County

The revisions made to MALDEF Congressional Plan presented to the Commission on June 28, 2011 in Los Angeles

County were made with significant input from our Unity Map drawing partners, the African-American Redistricting Collaborative (AARC) and the Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC). Los Angeles County presents a complex challenge Los Angeles County in balancing the voting rights of Latinos, African Americans and Asian Americans. The Updated MALDEF plan includes input from all three communities and achieves the goal of protecting their opportunities for fair representation. MALDEF strongly urges the CCRC to adopt the Southern California MALDEF Updated Congressional map as a solution to compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act for the Latino community, trying to preserve the effective number of districts for the African-American community, and preserving a new Asian-American community effective district in the San Gabriel Valley.

4. Inland Empire - An additional Section 2 District is possible

MALDEF believes an additional Section 2 district in the Inland Empire can be crafted, as demonstrated by Updated MALDEF Congressional District 43. Currently in CCRC visualizations, significant Latino populations in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties reside in districts where they would not have an opportunity to elect candidates of choice. San Bernardino Latinos presently in a Section 2 district where they can elect a Congressman of their choice and are now shifted out and placed in CCRC visualization CD SB. In Riverside, Latino community members in particular have been frustrated by the current benchmark district configurations which have not allowed them to elect any candidates of choice. MALDEF Updated 6/28 CD 43 and 44 would comply with Section 2 and add a new Latino opportunity district in the region. Other community members have also requested a similarly shaped Latino opportunity district.

Sincerely,
Steven A. Ochoa
National Redistricting Coordinator
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:16 AM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Galambos-Malloy, Connie <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 5:48 PM
Subject: Re: MALDEF Statewide Senate Concerns and Recommendations
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

This information has been provided to George Brown for consideration.

Connie

On Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 5:22 PM, Steven Ochoa <[REDACTED]> wrote:

July 23, 2011

Via electronic mail
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Statewide Senate Concerns and Recommendations

Dear Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

On behalf of MALDEF, I highlight the following concerns and re-submit the following districts from the MALDEF Updated Senate plan submitted on June 28, 2011 (with Southern California Unity Plan Districts) as recommendations for the statewide Senate plan.

1. Central Valley, Central Coast, and East San Jose

The Central Valley and Central Coast Senate plan is one of the most complicated areas to redistrict while trying to comply with both Section 2 and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and respecting various large-in-area communities of interest. Further complicating the issue is current benchmark SD 12, which combines Section 5 covered jurisdictions Merced County and part of Monterey County by crossing the mountains.

The CCRC in both its 6/10 draft and current visualizations leave eastern Monterey County linked to Merced County, crossing the mountains. The primary difference between CCRC 6/10 SD MERCED and CCRC current visualization SD MERCED is that the former uses East San Jose to bridge the two counties and the later uses western Fresno County as a bridge. Neither CCRC iteration results in Section 5 retrogression for Merced and Monterey Counties; however, they go counter to the vast public testimony the CCRC received about these communities preferring not to be linked across the mountains. The CCRC does maintain a Section 2 District containing the Section 5 covered Kings County in both its 6/10 draft and current visualization, avoiding retrogression for Kings County voters.

MALDEF's June 28 Updated Senate Plan provides an alternative on how to deal with the Section 2 and Section 5 issues, better respect community of interest testimony, and result in more geographically respectful shapes by preserving the mountain range.

MALDEF Updated 6/28 SD SJMONT pairs the East San Jose area with the eastern Monterey County region, avoiding crossing the mountains into the Central Valley and generating numbers that do not retrogress Monterey County Latino voters. This configuration respects testimony heard from numerous community members in East San Jose to be paired south and grants the requests from Central Coast residents not to cross over the mountains.

MALDEF Updated 6/28 SD FRESMERC pairs western Fresno County with Madera City, Merced County, and western Stanislaus County. It avoids crossing the mountains into the Central Coast or East San Jose and generates numbers that do not retrogress Merced County. This configuration makes a more reasonable Central Valley district, avoids the need to send Merced County into Stockton, and preserves space to maintain a Section 2 Senate District for Kings County/West Tulare/Bakersfield, as visualized by MALDEF Updated 6/28 SD KINGBAK, which also avoids retrogressing the opportunity for Kings County Latino voters to elect a candidate of their choice.

2. Inland Empire

MALDEF believes an additional Section 2 district in the Inland Empire can be crafted, as visualized by Unity Senate District SBRIV. Currently, significant Latino populations in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties reside in districts where they would not have an opportunity to elect candidates of choice. San Bernardino Latinos are presently in a Section 2 district where they can elect a Senator of their choice, and are now shifted out. Riverside Latino community members in particular have been frustrated by the current benchmark district configurations not allowing them to elect candidates of choice.

Following the Unity Senate plan, by placing the Pomona and East San Gabriel Valleys together, you can create space to create two Section 2 districts in the region, and respect the Asian American communities in the West San Gabriel Valley by creating an Asian effective Senate District by linking them to the Diamond Bar areas.

3. Orange County

MALDEF has serious concerns with the direction the CCRC is taking concerning Senate District "WSTNA" in central Orange County. We agree the Senate District does not have the opportunity to reach the Section 2 threshold level of 50% Latino CVAP, however a district option has been presented to the CCRC with the Unity Senate District OCSA that is both respectful of the Latino and Asian communities. The Unity option would not eliminate a district that has elected a Latino candidate of choice; being bounded by a series of community of interests you have identified for both the Congressional and Assembly level visualizations. The Unity district OCSA is at 37% LCVAP, a significant difference in Latino voter effectiveness from the 25% LCVAP your deliberations are leaning towards.

Further, the Unity configuration offered you an option that respected the Asian communities with Unity SD ORNOC in Orange County and Unity SD LASGV in Los Angeles County.

4. San Diego/Imperial/Coachella

As currently visualized, the CCRC SD ISAND is below 50% Latino CVAP. The Unity SD SAMIMP demonstrated a Section 2 district can be created, while at the same time protecting the Asian and African-American communities of interest in the National City/Encanto areas of San Diego by linking the Coachella Valley to the district. This is the only manner MALDEF can determine to maintain a Section 2 Senate District in the area. It is also a "blending" of the visualized districts AD SSAND and AD COACH, further following CCRC criteria.

Sincerely,
Steven A. Ochoa
National Redistricting Coordinator
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:17 AM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Galambos-Malloy, Connie <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 5:46 PM
Subject: Re: MALDEF Statewide Assembly Concerns and Recommendations
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

This information has been provided to George Brown for review.

Connie

On Sat, Jul 23, 2011 at 5:25 PM, Steven Ochoa <[REDACTED]> wrote:
July 23, 2011

Via electronic mail
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Statewide Assembly Concerns and Recommendations

Dear Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

On behalf of MALDEF, I highlight the following concerns and re-submit the following districts from the Unity plan submitted on June 28, 2011 as recommendations for the statewide Assembly plan.

1. Central Valley - An additional Section 2 District is possible

The Unity 6/28 Assembly plan proposes an additional Section 2 Assembly district in the Central Valley. Furthermore, the proposal maintains the Section 5 requirements for both the Kings County and Merced County respective Assembly Districts, avoiding retrogression. The CCRC 6/10 Draft, and all visualizations to date, ignore the creation of this additional 50% LCVAP district in the Central Valley in the Bakersfield/southwest Tulare County region. The commission has received public comment from communities in Bakersfield and western Tulare County supporting the Unity configurations.

2. East San Jose

The Commission should take care to avoid splitting the Latino community of interest in East San Jose. The CCRC has received numerous testimony from both Latino and Asian community members in support of district configurations similar to the MALDEF 5/26 AD 23 and Unity 6/28 AD SJEVG districts. From information gathered from east San Jose workshops, MALDEF recommends CCRC visualization AD SANJO move the northern boundary from McKee Road to Marbury Road and including all of Alum Rock and East Foothills Census Designated Places.

3. Central Coast

CCRC visualizations have complied with Section 5 of the VRA with its AD MONT district; however, MALDEF makes the following recommended edits to the visualization:

- Add the small communities of Pajaro, Castroville, and Las Lomas to AD MONT, as there was community desires to include those small farming towns with Salinas and Watsonville.

4. Inland Empire - An additional Section 2 District is possible.

The CCRC 6/10 draft draws two Section 2 Latino districts in western San Bernardino County, following the benchmark; however, it does not create a new Section 2 Latino-majority district in Riverside County, nor does the CCRC create a Latino opportunity district in any visualization.

The Unity 6/28 plan creates a Section 2 Latino opportunity district primarily in Riverside county and going into San Bernardino County.

Sincerely,
Steven A. Ochoa
National Redistricting Coordinator
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:24 AM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Steven Ochoa** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2011 at 2:55 PM
Subject: Regarding MALDEF Congressional Plan, Submitted on June 28, 2011
To: [REDACTED]

July 14, 2011

Via electronic mail

California Citizens Redistricting Commission

901 P Street, Suite 154-A

Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: MALDEF Congressional Plan, Submitted on June 28, 2011

Dear Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

On behalf of MALDEF, we submit the following explanation of changes from the May 26, 2011 MALDEF Congressional plan to the revised June 28, 2011 MALDEF Congressional Plan.

The revised MALDEF Congressional Plan presented to the Commission on June 28, 2011 is an update from the original May 26 plan. The revisions were made with significant input from our Unity Map drawing partners, including the African-American Redistricting Collaborative (AARC) and the Asian

Pacific American Legal Center (APALC).^[1] The revised MALDEF Congressional Plan also includes additional community input provided during a second round of community workshops conducted June 12 to June 22. Furthermore, considerable time was spent on Southern California, and South Los Angeles County which is a highly complex area for voting rights, as this body has also experienced. The Southern California and South Los Angeles County region requires balancing many important needs, including compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act for the Latino community, trying to preserve the effective number of districts for the African-American community, and preserving a new Asian-

American community effective district in the San Gabriel Valley.

It is important to note that while significant input was taken to create this enhanced Congressional product, there is no official endorsement from AARC, APALC, and CAPAFR of the Revised MALDEF Congressional Plan submitted on June 28, 2011.

Finally, we acknowledge Gibson-Dunn's correct interpretation of Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act (VRA) and its recommendation that the Commission create "several Latino-majority districts in Los Angeles County" based on its preliminary analysis inferring racially polarized voting among Latino voters.

MALDEF respectfully urges the Commission to utilize the Revised MALDEF Congressional Plan as a reasonable solution that respects Latino voting rights as well as African-American and Asian-American effectiveness on the Congressional level. ^[2] The Revised MALDEF Congressional plan is an option that respects all of California's communities and accurately reflects California's latest demographics.

We thank the Commission for consideration of our views. Please do not hesitate to contact at [REDACTED] or by phone at [REDACTED] [ext 130](#) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Ochoa

National Redistricting Coordinator

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

Steven A. Ochoa

National Redistricting Coordinator

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Office: [REDACTED] [ext 130](#)

Fax: [REDACTED]

[1] APALC giving input on behalf of CAPAFR

Steven A. Ochoa

National Redistricting Coordinator

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Office: [REDACTED] [ext 130](#)

Fax: [REDACTED]

2 attachments

 **MALDEF_Updated_Senate_Latino_Demographics_06282011_CORRECTED.pdf**
34K

 **06282011_MALDEF_SD_CA_Statewide.pdf**
12919K

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:36 AM**
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Office, Communications** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Mar 8, 2011 at 12:28 PM

Subject: Public Comment - Joint Letter

To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Rob Wilcox <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners,

This public comment was submitted this morning and will be posted by this afternoon. I wanted to make sure you had a chance to review it.

Christina

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Eugene Lee** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Mar 8, 2011 at 11:18 AM

Subject: Public comment re: Commission's mapping timeline

Dear Honorable Commissioners and Commission Staff,

Please find attached a letter providing public comment on the Citizens Redistricting Commission's mapping timeline. The letter is submitted by the following organizations:

- The Advancement Project
- African American Redistricting Collaborative
- **Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC)**
- California Common Cause

- California Forward
- California League of Conservation Voters
- California State National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE)
- The Greenlining Institute
- League of Women Voters of California
- Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Best regards,
Eugene Lee

Eugene Lee

Voting Rights Project Director

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER

Member of Asian American Center for Advancing Justice

[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90017

T [REDACTED]
F [REDACTED]

www.apalc.advancingjustice.org
[apalc-logo-vertical.gif](#)



Joint Ltr to Commission re map release Mar 8 2011.pdf

20K



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

PRA 12-#4

1 message

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 11:02 AM**
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Claypool, Daniel** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Aug 4, 2011 at 2:23 PM
Subject: Re: copies of final maps
To: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]> "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]> Cynthia Dai <[REDACTED]>

We just had a meeting about this..... No wonder Rob's ears were burning. In our meeting with the Secretary of State, we said that we would provide one hard copy of the statewide maps followed by individual copies of each district. We also said that they would get a copy of the report that accompanied the maps. In addition, we promised a data disk with the same information. Our current plan is to ask John Kim or Paul Mitchell to provide the pdf's for each map and the statewide map. In exchange, we'll run their maps on our website with a thank you from the commission for their services.

What we plan on providing in hard copy is: a cover letter signed by all the commissioners, four statewide maps, an individual pdf of each district, and a copy of our report. We will also provide the same information on flash drive and include the pdf files, kmz files, cdf files, dbf files, and shp files. We were going to suggest 50 hard copies and 30 flash drives. The SoS would get five copies and three drives, each commissioner would get a hard copy and a drive, the BSA would get five copies and three drives, each member of the Legislative Leadership would get three copies and a drive, and we would provide a copy to McGeorge and Northridge with a proclamation thanking them for their extraordinary services on behalf of the commission. The remaining 20 copies and 6 drives would be held as back ups.

The cost is in the budget. I believe that each of you as earned a free copy.

Comments on the plan?

On Thu, Aug 4, 2011 at 12:25 PM, DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Dan:

The Technical Advisory Comm. made an inquiry to Commissioners for those interested in copies of final maps. A number of Commissioners stated a desire to have copies for themselves. At this point, we have not (and don't anticipate) asking Q2 to spend the time to create screen shots for each of the districts. It's not in the Commission's best interest to use Q2's time to do so, especially when we're focusing on the report needs of the final narrative report.

Therefore, I'm assuming we have 2 issues to address: where to get districts to print and the cost of printing. In terms of printing district maps, I believe the following are available options:

- (1) print copies from third party sites such as Redistricting Partners or Meridian Pacific.
- (2) print copies from the SWDB by creating "screen shots" of each district on a computer

In terms of cost, do you have an estimate for how much a set of copies would cost per commissioner? The idea is that, if in the CRC budget, copies can be made for Commissioners. But if not, and if staff has the time, we could offer to make a set of copies if a Commissioner is willing to reimburse the CRC for the cost of printing.

What are your thoughts on this? Any recommendations on Commissioners footing the bill, especially since they will be provided a copy of the final narrative report?

Thanks,
Michelle

--

Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Daniel M. Claypool
Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: [REDACTED]
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

PRA 12

2 messages

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 10:46 AM**
 To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Wed, Aug 17, 2011 at 8:57 AM
 Subject: Fwd: final final document attached
 To: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]>

Forwarded conversation

Subject: **Fwd: final final document attached**

 From: **Claypool, Daniel** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 8:56 AM
 To: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]> Cynthia Dai <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller
 <[REDACTED]>

Karin assures me that this is the final version with a slight modification over the one sent yesterday.

I'm working with Kirk on the location for tomorrow meeting before our meeting with Karin and the VRA attorney. Three possibilities: Kirk's house in Piedmont, a coffee house close to Karin's offices or Q2's conference room.

Dan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Karin Mac Donald** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Tue, Apr 19, 2011 at 5:35 PM
 Subject: final final document attached
 To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>

dan - i'm sorry. my cold is getting the better of me. some of the track changes did not delete as i had anticipated they would. pls forward this to commissioners dai and barabba.

muchas gracias

.
 karin

--

Daniel M. Claypool
 Executive Director
 Citizens Redistricting Commission

Tel: [REDACTED]
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 9:08 AM

To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

I have a preference for a BARTable location. My understanding is that Q2 (or should we say Q Squared?) is on the UC Berkeley campus? If we were to do Kirk's house, I'd need a pick-up from BART.

--}cyn

--
Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](http://www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov)
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 9:22 AM

To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Cynthia Dai <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

How about meeting at Q2 offices and walking to nearby coffee house...if not bringing coffee to Q2 conference room. Since the topic is likely to be complex...we should try to keep getting together simple:-)

Vince

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 10:15 AM
To: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

Can we clarify exactly where Q2's offices are?

On another note, I just finished going through the final document, which I think explains the situation much better than verbally presented in Merced. After our discussion with Q2, I think it would be helpful to share this document with the full Commission.

For tomorrow's discussion, it would be very helpful for Q2 to distinguish between what they describe as "scenario maps" which they recommend against vs. "direction on identified decision points" which they say is required. The objection stated in Merced among some members of the Commission, I believe, was precisely about said "decision points", which those members believe it is the job of the Commission to identify.

My personal thinking as stated in open session is that scenario maps, for example the 3 options identified for the North, would be very helpful for us to see in order for individual members to formulate their opinions to provide said direction. Such scenario maps might also help the public, particularly in the affected regions, understand what is really

feasible despite their wishes in abstraction. Ideally, this might help the Commission, in concert with the public, come to some consensus by the time we actually must draw the lines.

Of course, I understand that this may only be possible in the North 🙄!

--}cyn

From: **Miller, Kirk** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 10:21 AM
To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]> "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>

Good analysis. In comparison, identifying the Q2 address should be manageable. I can pick you up if you take BART. If so, exit at the MacArthur station, as it is on the way to their offices. Kirk

--

Kirk E. Miller
Chief Counsel
Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA. 95814
[REDACTED] (o)

[\[REDACTED\] \(916\) \[REDACTED\]](tel:(916)[REDACTED])

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 10:21 AM
To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

What Karin described as a third option (1 coastal and 2 east/west) is what would likely be the outcome (hybrid) of reviewing the first two options. In essence we would be looking at the advantages and disadvantages of the first two options and what she has suggested is a possible outcome of that type of review by the commissioners.

Vince

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 10:24 AM
To: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

I actually think the 3rd option has been identified already by (loud) public comment after hearing the Commission discuss the other two options! Thus the demand for a North Coast hearing.

--}cyn

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 10:28 AM
To: "Miller, Kirk" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]> "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>

Great. If we're meeting at 10am, I can arrive at 9:48am or 9:57am at MacArthur.

--}cyn

From: **Claypool, Daniel** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Apr 20, 2011 at 12:32 PM
To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Miller, Kirk" <[REDACTED]> "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>

Meeting time and place: 10:00 a.m. at the Claremont Hotel in the restaurant to the left of the entrance. If there are any questions, contact Kirk or myself.



line drawing memo final final.pdf

64K

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Mon, Aug 22, 2011 at 10:48 AM**
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barabba, Vincent** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Aug 17, 2011 at 8:56 AM
Subject: Fwd: Citizens Redistricting Commission
To: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]>

Forwarded conversation

Subject: **Fwd: Citizens Redistricting Commission**

From: **Office, Communications** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Mar 17, 2011 at 8:46 PM
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Karen** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Mar 17, 2011 at 12:07 PM
Subject: Citizens Redistricting Commission
To: [REDACTED]

Good Afternoon,

Please find attached a letter of support for Karin MacDonald as technical assistant to the Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Sincerely,

Karen

Karen Heumann

[REDACTED] (cell)

"Everyone can be great because everyone can serve." Martin Luther King, Jr.

From: **Office, Communications** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Mar 18, 2011 at 11:11 AM
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]>

FYI - this will be posted on the web.

To Whom It May Concern:

This email is in strong support of the bid of Q2 for a contract with the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I have had the occasion to work with Q2 Principal Karin MacDonald and her associate Bonnie Glaser on many occasions and in several capacities since 2005.

I was immediately impressed with their professionalism, thoroughness and depth-of-knowledge about the election process in California and the United States. I have routinely sought Karin's advice on matters related to elections and value her opinions highly. She can be relied on to quickly respond and is able to give valuable advice on complex matters in a way that is easy to understand and explain to others.

In my 10-year career in the elections field, I have had the privilege of working, as either a staff member or consultant, for two of the largest election jurisdictions in the nation, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission and more than a dozen other jurisdictions and election-related organizations. I have come to know that Karin's reputation among election officials in the United States is that she is an extremely qualified researcher and project manager. She is widely regarded as non-partisan and impartial. I have had the pleasure of seeing her speak at several election conferences and meeting and I can attest that she is an extremely compelling presenter.

Her knowledge of many aspects of the election process--redistricting in particular--is unparalleled. She is widely regarded as one of the foremost academic experts in the field.

In summary, I could not support Q2 more strongly in their bid. I would be very pleased to discuss this if you have any questions. I can be reached on my mobile phone at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,
Daniel M. Murphy
Election Consultant

[REDACTED]
Long Beach, California 90813



Citizens Redistricting Commission.docx
23K
