



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra #12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:19 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:28 PM

Subject: pra #12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

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

Date: Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Subject: Media hits

To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> "Shupe, Christina"

<[REDACTED]> Rob Wilcox <[REDACTED]>

I thought my colleagues should be aware of these two articles.

See you tomorrow,

Connie

> -----Original Message-----

> From: California Friends of the African American Caucus <[REDACTED]>

> To: earnest5 <[REDACTED]>

> Sent: Tue, Jul 5, 2011 1:15 pm

> Subject: 1:00PM URGENT URGENT BREAKING NEWS:Black Vote Disenfranchised in Pre-Draft

>

> SPECIAL BREAKING NEWS:

> Black Vote Disenfranchised in Pre-Draft

> Maps

>

> Dear 1.7 Million Friends

>

> As millions of Americans put out their flags and fired up the grill to celebrate freedom and democracy over the 4th of July weekend, Commissioner Connie Galambos Malloy of the California Redistricting Commission fired a salvo at African American voters in Los Angeles as she penciled them out of their traditional community districts and hard fought political power.

>

> Malloy, who is from the San Francisco Bay Area, committed her dastardly deeds with stealth and incredible disrespect for African American electoral participation, creating serpentine, meandering and totally nonsensical districts. This was done while most Californians were enjoying their holiday festivities and not paying attention to political intrigue. Was this intentional?

>

> One of the priorities of the 14 member redistricting panel is to draw new maps that are based, in part, on how people define their "community of interest." The Commission is charged with upholding the interests of all of California with greater citizen input than has ever occurred

>

> However, in her hacking up of South Los Angeles, Malloy showed no concern for the interests or inputs of African

Americans, whose courageous historic struggle for voter rights have empowered all ethnic minorities.

>

> Instead, Malloy proposes to gut Black political power from the State Assembly, Senate and Congressional Districts without regard to a unified proposal with ethnic groups.

>

> She has removed Exposition Park, Harvard Park, Vermont Knowles and Vermont Square from legislative districts with historically high African American voting populations in order to group them with the cities of Vernon, Huntington Park and unincorporated Florence-Graham.

>

> This configuration creates Latino majority Assembly and Congressional seats, but leaves African American districts anemic.

>

> In the Senate, she has drawn a district that stretches from Exposition Park to the City of Lakewood in order to create a Latino Majority district.

>

> In the middle of Los Angeles, she took half of Black Los Angeles (east of Arlington Ave, South of the 10 Freeway, North of Century Blvd) and drew it into a district with Vernon, currently represented by the Speaker of the Assembly, a Latino who lives in Downtown LA.

>

> Then, she took the other half of Black Los Angeles and added it in with areas that stretch all the way to Ventura County. How does this honor the traditions of our area?

>

>

> The immediate impact of Malloy's map if adopted would destroy a historical coalition district that has had African American representation since the middle of the 20th Century and dilute African American political power to accommodate something even Latinos did not ask for.

>

> During Sunday's conversation, two Commissioners from the Los Angeles Area (Maria Blanco and M. Andre Parvenu) suggested that the cities of Vernon and Huntington Park be removed and connected with natural communities of interest with south eastern cities such as South Gate and Cudahy.

>

> If she followed the directions of the Commissioners from the Los Angeles area, the line drawn will be in sync with the wishes of many Black and Brown Angelinos who wish to see their political power not only maximized, but also unified.

>

> The consequences of the current pre-draft map are many. One of the most startling is that as a result of divorcing Exposition Park and the Vermont areas from their neighbors, the Crenshaw based Congressional and State Senate Districts must find population elsewhere in West Los Angeles.

>

> In Malloy's skewed vision, West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, West Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Malibu Topanga and Calabasas all the way to the Ventura County border are grouped with everything south of the 10 Freeway, West of Arlington Ave and North of Inglewood.

>

> Despite the Commission's best intentions, as represented in its first draft and the mapping proposals submitted recently by African American, Asian American and Latino citizen groups, African Americans appear to come up short, are neutered politically in their strongest areas and are left with the perception that such plans are not invested in Black Los Angeles thriving.

>

> We have the opportunity to address the misshapen trauma that occurs with the Exposition Park and Vermont Areas by contacting or writing the Commission directly and letting them know we will not stand for this current pre-draft map that disenfranchises the most concentrated Black political voices in the state.

>

> To submit a public comment to the commission, call us toll free at [REDACTED] or send us an e-mail directly to [REDACTED]

>

> Citizens Redistricting Commission

> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A

> Sacramento, CA 95814

> Fax: (916) [REDACTED]

>

> If we do not respond to this threat to our collective power, we cannot complain or rush to sue when the final maps leave Blacks divided, attached to unfriendly neighbors and in search of leadership that will have difficulty responding to our concerns.

>

>

>

>

> The Redistricting Report

>

> 1 recipients

>

> CC: recipientsYou More

>

> Show Details

>

> FROM: Paul Mitchell

>

> TO: [REDACTED]

>

> Message flagged

>

> Tuesday, July 5, 2011 10:40 AM

>

> Message body

>

> Having trouble viewing this email? Read it online.

>

> Tuesday, July 5, 2011

>

>

> Nothing to See Here...

>

> Any good media professional will tell you - if you want to bury a story, release it on the Friday before a holiday weekend.

>

> Either by design or mistake, that's exactly what the Redistricting Commission did. They managed to release dozens of new "visualizations" over the weekend - most of which have been redrawn and can be viewed here with all the partisanship and incumbents.

>

> By holding hours of line-drawing hearings over the holiday weekend they avoided the spotlight from anyone with a family or a social life. Not surprisingly, this screen misses 90% of the redistricting professional demographic, possibly accounting for how the Redistricting Partners maps managed to get over 2,700 visits for the weekend.

>

> The State commission will return to work tomorrow and has daily hearings scheduled until the July 14th second draft release of maps. These maps are expected to be much closer to the final draft, and could face some troubles getting votes that the first drafts avoided. According to an interview with Commissioner Malloy, she believes that "the CRC largely approved the rough drafts because they were exactly that: rough. With the stakes higher, she thought it would be harder for all the commissioners to come to an agreement on all the maps."

>

> The next week should be fun to watch as the commission keeps one eye on creating the perfect second draft maps, and another eye on maintaining the necessary super-majority of votes, 9 of 14 and majorities of Dem, Rep and DTS, necessary to achieve approval.

>

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

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

[Redacted]
[Quoted text hidden]



PastedGraphic-1.tiff
34K



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra #12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:19 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:27 PM

Subject: pra #12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[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

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: PRA #12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:20 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:26 PM

Subject: PRA #12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Shupe, Christina <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 10:52 AM

Subject: Maps from Paul Mitchell

To: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> Bonnie Glaser

<[REDACTED]> "Brown, George H."

<[REDACTED]> "Kahn, Matthew S." <[REDACTED]>

"Scolnick, Kahn A." <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Commissioners <[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool

<[REDACTED]> "Miller, Kirk" <[REDACTED]>

Mr. Mitchell's maps and equivalency files from yesterday have been added to the Public Dropbox and are available for download.

<http://db.tt/RzR8uO5>

--

Christina Shupe

Senior Operations Analyst

Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

[\(916\) \[REDACTED\]](tel:916-223-3333)

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: PRA #12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>
 To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:18 PM

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

From: **Ward, Michael** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:32 PM
 Subject: PRA #12
 To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Blanco, Maria** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Tue, Jun 7, 2011 at 10:46 PM
 Subject: Fwd: From maria Blanco -- Redistricting maps: The devil is in the details
 To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>
 Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]> "Wilcox, Rob" <[REDACTED]>
 <[REDACTED]> "Brown, George H." <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Capitol Weekly** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Tue, Jun 7, 2011 at 10:14 PM
 Subject: From maria Blanco -- Redistricting maps: The devil is in the details
 To: [REDACTED]



[Visit CapitolWeekly.net](#) | [View this article on Capitol Weekly](#) | [Forward to Friends](#)

Dear Maria --

maria Blanco thought you would be interested in [this article from Capitol Weekly](#)

[Home] [View this article on Capitol Weekly] [Forward to Friends]

Redistricting maps: The devil is in the details

By Paul Mitchell | 06/02/11 12:00 AM PST

The Citizens Redistricting Commission will be releasing draft maps on June 10th. This was an early

decision by the commission to create a set of pre- and post-release public input hearings, allowing for abstract community testimony early, then later comment within the context of proposed lines.

This sounds like a great idea, but could also be the first real big mistake for the commission. Prior to the release of maps local activists could engage in an informative debate, but draw a line down Main Street, and the conversation changes – mostly for the worse. What was once cordial and thoughtful, could turn into a brawl.

But unless the commission changes course or deadlocks on the draft maps (a catastrophic error) they will be releasing lines in a week, and here are some of the top things redistricting professionals are looking for:



Releasing drafts and having people believe they are actually drafts will be a real PR challenge. If the governor came on live TV and gave a “first draft” of his Budget press conference a day early, how much could he really change that speech 24 hours later?

Once it is out there, the commission maps will take on a life of their own, and it will be hard for the commission to pull them back and justify changes. This is particularly true because in redistricting, once you change one line you have to change multiple lines. The governor could “find” new money to soften a budget problem, but until the commission can find new people, every shift of 10,000 requires a shift of 10,000 somewhere else on the map.

Republican Consultant Matt Rexroad told the commission he could throw a football 40 yards, just like Payton Manning, but he couldn't do it with 15 angry linemen running at him. The defensive line in redistricting is the VRA, and MALDEF just made this juggernaut larger by presenting the commission with maps that showed 17 majority-minority Assembly districts, an increase from nine in the current lines. Any plan put out by the commission that splits the difference could be a setup for a lawsuit.

Additionally, there are four counties with special Voting Rights rules, and if the commission is going to get federal signoff they will have to be hypersensitive to any reduction of Latino voting power in these seats. In dealing with some of the toughest VRA districts it seems like the easiest path is to just redraw the existing seats, flaws and all.

The body of law behind the VRA was based on protecting African American voting rights – but if the Commission follows the law this year, it is likely they will eliminate an African American State Senate and Congressional seat – both in L.A. The only way to avoid this will be to draw districts that go from urban L.A. out to the beach, as the current Rod Wright senate seat does. With the release of the first maps we will be able to see if this pattern will be repeated by the commission – if they do, prepare yourself for one angry response from the beach communities, and if they do not, expect a loud response from the African American leadership, and some finger pointing to the NAACP that failed to submit a statewide redistricting plan.

It's not just how many cities get cut, but how many big cities, and how many of the squeaky wheels. Among the statewide and regional plans submitted to the commission by organized groups, each divided Sacramento, a couple split Long Beach and Oxnard and one sliced Pasadena in half. If you

live in a city like Pomona or Fremont it doesn't make sense that you would be cut in half, but redistricting reality will clash with common sense, particularly in the congressional districts where population deviations are not allowed.

Ironically, one of the biggest cities wants to be divided. San Francisco has benefited from controlling two senate districts, yet, based on commission criteria, and a lack of VRA issues nearby, the city should be unified. This single change has a significant impact on districts going up through the rest of the Bay Area. On the congressional map, a decision to cross the Bay bridge or not could decide the fate of Democratic members of Congress several districts away.

The commission plan will include state Senate districts, which based on a lower-ranked criteria, should be comprised of two nested Assembly districts. Latino and Asian plans presented to the commission both used nesting sporadically, eschewing the pairing when it was necessary to work around ethnic populations. Nesting adds some predictability to the process, and the commission could come under fire if they don't accomplish this "simple" part of the process.

The Senate plan will also create deferrals, a technical term to describe when people who are planning to vote for their senator in an odd-numbered district in 2012, are put in an even-numbered district. Their odd-numbered senator finishes the term, and they don't get to vote for a new senator until 2014. For two years they don't have a senator. This is a "deferral" and in the MALDEF plan there are 4.7 million people who get deferred. The Commission plan will likely do something similar.

The most common question I get is "will the commission succeed?" The answer is clearly Yes, and No. They will succeed in putting out maps, and their work product should be largely upheld in any lawsuits, but there is no way in the world they will meet voters' expectations when they voted for Proposition 11 and 20.

The state Lottery hasn't solved the education funding problem, and redistricting reform won't create common sense districts that maintain all cities, unify all communities of interest, avoid funny shapes and "gerrymanders" and create competitive elections. It is unlikely that the commission process will meet the voters' expectations, and the only real benefit to an early release is giving the public and media a chance to come to grips with that reality.

[Home] [View this article on Capitol Weekly] [Forward to Friends]

© Capitol Weekly. All Rights Reserved.
This message was sent by direct request from a visitor to capitolweekly.net

 Powered By Activate Direct

□

--

María Blanco, Commissioner

Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

--

Marian M. Johnston





Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: PRA 12

1 message

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:15 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:05 PM

Subject: PRA 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 8:34 AM

Subject: q2 contract - information needed

To: "Villanueva, Raul" <[REDACTED]>

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

<[REDACTED]> "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>

Michelle DiGuilio <[REDACTED]> Ana Henderson

<[REDACTED]> "Ancheta, Angelo"

<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Weber

<[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba

<[REDACTED]> "Ontai, Lilbert"

<[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy

<[REDACTED]> "Parvenu, Andre"

<[REDACTED]> "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

Jeanne Raya <[REDACTED]> "Blanco, Maria"

<[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]>

Stanley Forbes <[REDACTED]> Peter Yao

Dear Raul,

Thank you for continuing to work with Q2 on invoicing and contracting issues. As you know, I have had a lot of questions about state contracting policies, to which I have not been able to find answers. I recently contacted DGS based on your suggestion and asked to be referred to the small business liaison which the State of California makes available to all agencies with budgets above \$100,000 per Government Code, Section 14845-14847. After many emails, it was discovered that there is no small business liaison that is assigned to the CRC, and I was referred back to you.

In order to familiarize myself with the State of California's

contracting rules and regulations, I need to find out where the T&Cs you have been referencing can be found. In a conversation with Commissioner Dai, she asked me why I was not simply using the website link that was provided to me on page 1 of my contract. This surprised me because I did not recall a link or a reference in the contract. Because an electronic copy of the contract was not provided to me, she forwarded one to me. Upon comparing the version she sent to me and the one I have, I realized that the first 4 pages of the electronic version were omitted from the contract copy that was mailed to me (postmarked June 6, 2011) and thus, I never received the information.

I then clicked on the link provided in the electronic copy and found that it is not working.

Would you please provide me with a working location of the contracting rules and regulations that apply to us? I would greatly appreciate it as I anticipate that better informed communication from my end will resolve many of the issues with which I have had to trouble you.

Thank you and best regards,

Karin

--

Marian M. Johnston
[REDACTED]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:16 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Ward, Michael** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:15 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Blanco, Maria** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 3:05 PM

Subject: Re: Alternative Dixon/Fairfield/Lake fix for ADs

To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Novato is not industrial. It is a "bedroom" community very similar to Simi Valley.

Maria

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:59 AM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hey, team--

This is the alternative with the extra step of adding Lake to the North Coast in the ADs. Since this was not included in Chris Bowman's public comments, I think we should discuss as a group when we meet. However, Jaime worked up a quick viz for you to contemplate over the next few days. The advantages of this viz are:

- Lake is with North Coast
- in exchange, Novato is now with Napa district. (Novato is somewhat industrial and similar to American Canyon...connected by 37...although it is more similar to Vallejo, which is no longer in this district. Also breaks the 101 corridor.)
- As in previous viz, Yolo is whole; Dixon with Davis; Fairfield whole

Given that we can save Lake in the SD, it may not be necessary to take this extra step. Pls do not discuss to avoid B-K violation; we can consider during live line-drawing if we want to pursue.

--}cyn

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

From: **jaime clark** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:09 AM

Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations

To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>

so again this is AD the change is between ECC and NAPA both devs are good

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 10:52 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
rohner park and novato with NAPA
petaluma cotati sonoma with MARIN

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 10:10 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
the splits in NAPA/ECC dixon switch

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 9:53 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
hi commissioner dai -
attached is a pdf of what the lake switch would look like for SD
let me know what you think!
jaime

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 9:30 AM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
I take it back; I did send this Saturday. Thoughts on suggestion 1?

--}cyn

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

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 10:35 PM
Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> jaime clark <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy <connie.galambos-malloy@crc.ca.gov>

Hi, there--

Nice job on the San Jose revisions, Tamina! And thanks for doing the Vallejo fix, Jaime.

Keeping in mind that CAPAFR was responding to our 7/13 Norcal AD visualizations, I still think that some of their suggestions are reasonable minor revisions that we can take care of next week, but I wanted you to see them early on so you can advise us if there are any issues.

I spoke briefly to Chris Bowman after his public comment suggestions, which we thought were good ideas. There were:

- For the SDs, he suggested putting Lake into the North Coast district and taking out Cotati and Rohnert Park (not sure I got these details correct--I think there was one more exchange)
- For ADs, he suggested putting both Dixon and Davis in the Napa district to avoid splitting Fairfield
- Also mentioned that the census tract CAPAFR noted for San Francisco/San Mateo move was in Serramonte.

Again this is a heads up, as I'm sure the Commission will want to explore these suggestions next week. I suspect we'll get an updated set of suggestions from CAPAFR and others in time for our Thursday mtg 😊.

Have a nice Sunday,
--}cyn

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:47 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
The changes are very minor changes to a previous visualization.

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:39 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hmm...you should talk us through that b/c the changes seem very minor

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:38 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Ok sounds good. Just to note: I was asked to work off the South Bay Coalition lines and create a hybrid as much as possible between our Monterey and their San Jose, so the CAPAFR lines will undo this change.

Tamina

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:35 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Yes, I'll ask the full commission shortly

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:21 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hi Commissioner,

Did you want to adopt these lines from CAPAFR for ADs?

Tamina

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 2:52 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Tamina--

Note these very reasonable suggestions from CAPAFR. They didn't ask us to fix San Leandro!

--}cyn

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

From: **Eugene Lee** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2011 at 7:58 PM
Subject: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Deanna Kitamura <[REDACTED]> Daniel Ichinose <[REDACTED]>
Joanna Lee <[REDACTED]>

Dea Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission,

On behalf of the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR), the Asian Pacific American Legal Center submits proposed mapping changes to the Commission's Assembly visualizations posted on July 13 and 14. These proposed mapping changes pertain to the Commission's Assembly visualizations for Northern California.

These proposed mapping changes consist of GIS files and an accompanying narrative description of the proposed changes, both of which are attached to this email.

In a few days, we will submit proposed mapping changes to the Commission's Assembly

visualizations for Southern California.

We ask that the Commission give consideration to these proposed mapping changes and transmit them to its line-drawers.

Best regards,
Eugene Lee

Eugene Lee
Voting Rights Project Director

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER
Member of Asian American Center for Advancing Justice

1145 Wilshire Blvd, 2nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

T [REDACTED]
F [REDACTED]

www.apalc.advancingjustice.org



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

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

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

--

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



--

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



--

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



--

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

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

--

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:16 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:54 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Jul 9, 2011 at 11:33 AM

Subject: Re: 2 questions

To: "Ancheta, Angelo" <[REDACTED]>

Thanks for the reply Angelo. I appreciate and respect your thoughts.

On #1, I cannot find anything in the public record (have not watched videos) to date that explains how connie would have been vested to draw lines with Q2 outside of a public meeting. As an issue spot, I want to make sure that if this is ever an issue we have a response or an answer that is solid. I just can't find one at this moment. If you run across anything that would help clear this issue up, please pass it on.

On #2, I don't know what to do now. It seems so late to be having to have a discussion about how to analyze public comment. Prior to bringing this issue of data integrity up in public with the 'partners' site, I have been pushing this with chairs for sometime. Obviously I think there are issues from ALL sorts of angles that pollutes our 'public comment'. But what to do with it at this late point I don't know. Perhaps the best thing is to just raise the issue in open session as coi testimony is cited. I guess we can default to that.

thanks for your thoughtful consideration

Mike

On Sat, Jul 9, 2011 at 10:05 AM, Ancheta, Angelo

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Hi Mike. Sorry, I thought we might chat on Friday, so I didn't reply immediately.

> On #1, that would be probably be somewhere in the compilation of motions. Specifically, I had asked for help on VRA-potential districts with a team, and Connie and Vince were the ones who stepped up to help with the workplan

implementation that Michelle and I had already started.

> On #2, I think that's an important issue, but requires some thought and discussion because it poses the question of how we view the integrity of any of our sources. You recently raised it in the context of Equality California's reliance on Redistricting Partners as their technical consultants, but it could apply to any individual or group that provides data or equivalency files to the commission. Do you have a proposal that you might want to bring forward that addresses the problem? We're still figuring out scheduling on line drawing, so I'm not sure exactly when we'd be getting to regular business next week.

> Angelo

>

> On Thu, Jul 7, 2011 at 9:02 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Hi Angelo,

>> I had 2 questions for you:

>>

>> 1. I reviewed the commissioner assignments document in google docs and see that you and connie were assigned to review sec 5 districts for los angeles. I am wondering if you know when and how (motion?) that decision was made? I remember it being discussed but thought it was a motion...except I can't find it. If it is missing it needs to be found and if not I am curious what direction was given.

>>

>> 2. I had asked Jodie to put an item on this weeks agenda to discuss data integrity or how the commission intends to assess testimony recieved. I know I had asked you to put this on the agenda for next week, but i am unsure if the discussion is useful at this point. Any thoughts? Seeking your opinion regarding this matter. Most particularly I have noticed that we place a lot of emphasis on coi testimony as primary justification for decisions on lines. However, after reviewing the redistricting partners website, I was concerned about the integrity of the maps they are offering. I know the last thing any of us want is to allow our process to be corrupted or unfairly influenced by poisonous fruit. thank for your thoughts.

>>

>> Mike

>

>

> --

>

> Angelo Ancheta

> Commissioner

> California Citizens Redistricting Commission

>

>

>

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:17 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:53 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ontai, Lilbert <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 10:05 AM

Subject: Re: Departing Chair Debriefing

To: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: "Filkins-Webber, Jodie" <[REDACTED]> Angelo

Ancheta <[REDACTED]> Commissioners

<[REDACTED]>

Michelle,

I appreciate your memo. Thank you. However, even for this upcoming session for "bigger/medium" level discussion, mega cities like LA, SD, and SF, where communities next to each other are actually mini cities next each other, streets become the division lines, just as freeways are for rural cities. Unlike other portions of the state, this street level information is important to me and I would imagine for Commissioners Parvenu, as well. We both are intimately aware of citizen formed community plans for these highly dense urban communities and take these issues under consideration when drawing lines.

I realize time is extremely compressed, so such questions at the street-level should be minimized but answered sufficiently. Gil

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 8:54 AM, DiGuilio, Michelle

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

- >
- > Gil:
- > I believe Jodie was referencing the upcoming meetings when Angelo is chair. During these meetings we really must stay on the "bigger/medium" level discussion and to save the street level discussion for the meeting in which you will be chair (during the "live" line drawing sessions). In fact, your meeting as chair is when street level and minor adjustments are the only kind that can be made.
- > Again, for the upcoming meetings on July 13, 14, 15th, we really need to focus on agreement for the higher level changes (such as moving cities around) and once those become agreed upon, we will in a better position for your meetings to fine tune our maps with discussions such as street level adjustments.
- > Thanks for being willing to take everyone's concerns into account while still helping the process move forward.

> Michelle

>

>

>

> On Sun, Jul 10, 2011 at 5:30 PM, Ontai, Libert <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Commissioner Filkin-Webber, thanks for the wrap-up notes. However, on item number #5 (in bold letters), I appreciate your thought on this, but I will entertain any commissioner's desire to look at street level visualizations if it helps a commissioner with decision making. Commissioner Ontai

>>

>>

>>

>> On Sat, Jul 9, 2011 at 8:51 PM, Filkins-Webber, Jodie <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> Over the course of the last few weeks and the flurry of emails this week, Cyn Dia as my former chair - thought it was a good practice to do a chair debriefing -

>>> So just some highlights of issues :

>>> 1. Issue: In light of the lack of PDF versions of options or visualizations next week , CRC having "legion" data for districts will be required for population deviation on all districts, CVAP data on districts where necessary (including LA districts where comparison options are discussed - we dont want to get bogged down next week with commissioners asking what the data is for each option). We need our own data from Q2 in spreadsheet format. According to Karin McDonald, when I chatted with her earlier this evening, " the equivalency files are basically two rows of data: one is a block id and the other one is the 'district' id. so it tells the recipient which block is in what district they [the potential "partners" wishing to obtain the equivalency files] then merge the data they have to it (i.e. the census data and in case of redistricting partners and other organizations, political data or whatever else they have on the block level)."

>>> - If you decide to work with any "partners" (as they have been described - and I dont agree that anyone is in "partnership" with the CRC for map drawing other than Q2 and GDC) - we have to be extremely cautious as they all have plenty of advertisements on their websites, manipulation of the link references ("EXCLUSIVE CRC FILES - SEE PARTISAN DATA HERE."), and comparison of partisan data with our files for analysis, etc. Please follow up with Karin about the Statewide Database- so we do not have to get into this issue with other "partners" and websites. We do not have time to get involved in this potential risk.

>>> 2. You saw Connie's email to Kirk, you and I, regarding the COMP district - nothing more need be said, except that such may need to be done in open session - or such will not be justified.

>>> 3. GDC needs to look at COVNO (the Covina CD district at 47.99%) -Mr. Brown has not commented on this district.

>>> 4. Status of Barreto contract execution and contract augmentation. (Please call me to discuss this issue- too much to address in email here)

>>> 5. NO COMMISSIONER SHOULD ASK FOR STREET LEVEL DETAIL next week if the equivalency files are available to everyone. Thus, no emails to Q2 and no need to drill down - if we can do it next weekend in our own studies and then ask for clarification the following week and possible minor adjustments at that level.

>>> 6. Reminder, next week to commissioners, we may have to "vote" on options, districts, etc., so have the voting standard available for direction.

>>> Ok, that is all for now (and I am sure you already know all of this, but felt such was my obligation to convey again as departing chair) -- finally going to eat, and sleep.

>>>

>>> Jodie Filkins Webber

>>> Commissioner

>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>> "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

>>

>>

>>

>> --

>> Gil Ontai, Commissioner

>> California Citizens Redistricting Commission

>> "Fair Representation -- Democracy at Work"

>> www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

>> (916) [REDACTED]

>>
>>
>
>
>
> --

> Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
> California Citizens Redistricting Commission
> "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
> www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
> (866) [REDACTED]

--
Gil Ontai, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation -- Democracy at Work"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>
To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:17 PM

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

From: **Ward, Michael** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:17 PM
Subject: pra 12
To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Blanco, Maria** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 2:53 PM
Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Not sure how some commissioners may feel about Dixon and Davis with Napa.

Maria

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:27 AM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Pls see alternative based on Chris Bowman's public comment. Both Norcal teams requested this viz for changing the ADs. Advantages are:

- Yolo is whole
- Dixon is with close neighboring city, Davis
- Fairfield is whole!!!

Pls advise ASAP if you have any objection to this. There is one more step if we want to put Lake county with the North Coast in the ADs too, which involves moving Novato in with Napa. We can see this next week if we want.

--}cyn

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

From: **jaime clark** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:20 AM
Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

fairfield whole! 🌊🌊🌊🌊
and lake still with napa

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

--}cyn

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner

California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov



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

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

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

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

--
Cynthia Dai, 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

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:54 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:50 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, May 20, 2011 at 9:18 AM

Subject: per conversation yesterday: notes from kirk miller attached

To: [REDACTED]

hello commissioner ward,

thanks for talking to me yesterday about the concern that legal staff approached you with regarding having to take 'minutes' during the meetings. i have attached the notes i received from mr miller from the los angeles wrap-up for your reference. i will be at the meetings today, starting at 1pm and i am available to talk to you if you would like more information.

best regards,

karin mac donald

[Quoted text hidden]

**CRC Wrap Up May 5 kirk miller.doc**

30K

Region Four Wrap-Up

1. Try to draw a “hard line” around Orange County.
2. Try to keep Asian communities whole
3. Try to keep Inglewood, Lenex, and Hawthorne together
4. If additional population is needed, consider going north rather than east.
5. Consider combining beach cities north to Marina Del Ray
6. Long Beach area generally–
 - a. Consider the 110 and 710 freeways as geographic boundaries as they relate to the Latino population
 - b. Try to maintain the Asian COI in Palos Verdes
 - c. Place the LA and Long Beach ports in separate districts
7. Los Angeles
 - a. Start the process with neighborhoods rather than freeways
 - b. Keep downtown neighborhoods together
 - c. Consider Section 2 issues and try to keep Asian American and Latino populations together
 - d. Try to keep Griffith Park, Holly Wood Hills and Universal City together.

San Gabriel Valley

1. Communities take precedence over county lines
2. Glendale, Burbank & Pasadena to be kept together
3. Sunland should be kept with San Fernando Valley communities
4. Need to keep Asian and Latino populations together to the extent possible
5. Try to keep the foothill area intact
6. South Pasadena more aligned with Alhambra than other communities
7. Regardless of county lines, keep Pomona, Montclair, Ontario and Chino together,
8. Adjust as necessary for Asian communities in Brea and Pomona
9. City of Industry—may need to split
10. The San Gabriel River forms a community of interest boundary to consider

San Fernando Valley

1. The 405 Freeway divides east and west in this area
2. Consider neighborhood council boundaries
3. Include Porter Ranch and Santa Clarita
4. Ventura/San Fernando
 - a. Consider Latino community of interest and population in Santa Paula
 - b. Group Fillmore, Oxnard, Port Hueneme. El Rio and Camarillo in East Ventura County; do not group with Santa Clarita
 - c. Also consider Topanga, Malibu and Westwood as part of East Ventura group, however, Westwood can also work in West San Fernando Valley

Santa Clarita Valley and High Desert Region

1. Do not cross into Eastern Ventura County
2. Group Simi Valley and Santa Clarita
3. Group Stevenson Ranch and Port Ranch
4. Palm Dale and Lancaster should be kept together; Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley should be kept together.
5. Consider recommendations of the Board of Trade, especially as to assembly districts.
6. Try to keep school districts intact when drawing assembly districts
7. Keep Lancaster and Palm Dale, in the same senate district and try to include Victor Valley



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:55 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:48 PM

Subject: pra12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 12:30 PM

Subject: Fwd: Quick question regarding regional wrap up

To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]> "Miller, Kirk"

<[REDACTED]> "Wilcox, Rob" <[REDACTED]>

"Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners,

Upon request, I agree it seems appropriate to forward you the conversation I had with Karin regarding the Main Theme Wrap-UP to put my public remarks in context. My comments were not designed to be impugning or attacking in any way. It was a very important issue because rossmoor is seperated from its COI linked cities in some maps.

And the last thing we can afford is for the final report to list justification that is invalid. I had assumed that a correction was coming, but felt that it needed to be made and any others that existed in other regions that we might be aware of be made prior to reviewing the state for the final "working" time. Thank you for fare consideration of my comments and concerns.

Mike

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

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2011 at 9:49 PM

Subject: Re: Quick question regarding regional wrap up

To: "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

hi commissioner ward

here's one comment. we looked at two others and it appears that they were misinterpreted by our input specialists - they were not written clearly/difficult to understand and they in fact, did NOT want rossmore with long beach. i am waiting for the search to be completed and will let you know if i find more.

Comment that supports Rossmoor with Long Beach:

Comment from Robert Kaplan: it is about three quarters through this aggregated pdf: public_comment_3orange_20110617.pdf
Subject: Public Comment: 3 - Orange
From: Robert Kaplan <
Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2011 18:22:32 +0000
To:
From: Robert Kaplan <
Subject: Congressional districts
Message Body:

I live in Rossmoor, an unincorporated part of Orange County adjacent to Long Beach.
Thank you for drafting the proposed congressional district including eastern Long Beach and western Orange County. This is a natural reconfiguration that acknowledges the close connections between these communities and corrects the obvious gerrymandering of Congressman Royce's district.

On Fri, Jul 15, 2011 at 11:09 AM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>
> Karin,
> I know you are busy, and I am sorry to ask for bonnie's help. But per our earlier discussion regarding rossmoor testimony, it appears they have been cut out in the listed visualizations again. So to properly evaluate how responsive this is to coi, I would appreciate bonnie forwarding me the 5 messages linking rossmoor to long beach. I have searched for them again using multiple key words and I can only find comments linking rossmoor to OC. Could bonnie please get me that information for consideration. thank you!

>
> On Tue, Jul 12, 2011 at 10:51 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>
>> glad we could help :)

>>
>> On Tue, Jul 12, 2011 at 10:42 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>
>>> thank you soooo much! I appreciate you including the number of times it was mentioned. I really did search and could not find them. But now I can at least weigh how prevelant that sentiment is. Thank you!

>>>
>>> Regards,

>>>
>>> Mike

>>>
>>> On Tue, Jul 12, 2011 at 10:34 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>>
>>>> hello commissioner ward,
>>>> here is the info you asked for:
>>>> In the database there are 5 comments stating the Rossmoor with Long Beach theme. We tried to include all themes that were echoed multiple times. It is certainly true that contradictory testimony is more prevalent. The comments are available by searching the Excel database we sent (Cntrl F works well) and they are from the teens of June.

>>>> please let us know if you need assistance finding these comments.

>>>> best,
>>>> karin

>>>>
>>>> On Tue, Jul 12, 2011 at 8:05 PM, MacDonald, Karin <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>>>
>>>>> hello commissioner ward,
>>>>> my apologies for the late reply to your message. q2 actually does not use the crc.ca.gov email accounts. those

were only set up for travel purposes. pls use [REDACTED] to get messages to me faster. i will forward this on to the public input team and see if i can get a quick response for you.

>>>> best,

>>>>

>>>> karin

>>>>

>>>> On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 5:15 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> Goodafternoon Q2!

>>>>>

>>>>> I just had a quick question about the regional wrap up dated 6.30.11 "southern california public input wrap up: main themes". I have been working hard to try and find more options for OC and have been reviewing the public input record trying to meet as much as I can. On the wrap up I listed above, in the Region 3 section, the written comments lists "keep rossmoor with long beach" (second bullet from the bottom) as a main theme. In my matrix of public comment, I have this listed based on the wrap up sheet, but I can not actually find any public comment to list under it. in other words, I can't find any public comment saying it...which means I am not looking in the right place. I know you are busy, but as team leader for OC I am trying to organize this info. If you would not mind forwarding me the public comments that support that theme I would greatly appreciate it. I can then weigh it properly against the contrary public input. Have a great day and thanks for your assistance!

>>>>>

>>>>> C. Ward

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:55 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:48 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Jul 19, 2011 at 11:58 AM

Subject: Re: Senate OC question

To: Alex Woods <[REDACTED]> Karin Mac Donald

<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Webber

<[REDACTED]> "Miller, Kirk"

<[REDACTED]>

Thank you Alex for being so responsive on the phone. I just wanted to cover you by making my request in writing. As a commissioner and team lead for orange county, I am meeting with an orange county leadership group to explain the population issues that are affecting orange county. Knowing this meeting was coming as requested by Rob Wilcox, the crc communications director, I requested last week that OC visualizations be forwarded to me as they are completed by your team. I understand that they have been completed. Therefore, I again formally request that the OC visualizations be forwarded to me via email at your earliest convenience. Thanks.

Mike

On Tue, Jul 19, 2011 at 10:40 AM, Alex Woods <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>
> Hi Commissioner Ward,
> My apologies for not including you on the previous email. We had deadline of 4pm yesterday to merge our plans so I needed to complete the senate before then, and I knew Jodie was available for direction immediately as I had been previously been working with here on issues in Region II.
> I have followed the direction she gave me (which she cc'ed you on) for the visualization that will be presented on Friday at live line-drawing. I will also have the visualization of what you looked at available for discussion if you would like to bring up the rotation that you emailed me.
> Thank you for your help. Please let me know if you have any questions.

> Best regards,

> Alex Woods

> On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 10:43 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Alex,

>>

>> I was forwarded this visualization as I am team lead for Orange County. Please include me in your distribution of items relating to orange county. After reviewing the visualization for senate OC, I had a few suggestions that might help:

>>

>> 1. everything in the chfull district (blue) south of fullerton, place in the wtsa (green) district.

>>

>> 2. Replace population in chfull cutting and adding as much of central anaheim as needed (from 91 south until desired population met)

>>

>> 3. Remove huntington beach from irvtst and make whole in wtsa

>>

>> 4. Replace population in irvtst by taking required population out of north/east santa ana and adding it to irvtst

>>

>> 5. Do not split fullerton

>> Please call me with any questions regarding this or any other OC issues. I am happy to help anyway I can. If there is any issues with these changes, please notify me so we can continue to perfect OC districts anytime day or night.

>>

>> Regards,

>>

>> Mike Ward

>> (714) [REDACTED]

>> On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 3:15 PM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> Upon my review, it appears the easiest way to adjust population will be b/w wtsa and chfull. I recall additional coi testimony that linked north central anaheim to southern portions of fullerton.

>>>

>>> I recommend this population adjustment for review by the crc on friday. The only other manner to resolved would require greater city split and rotation of population among all oc districts which may result in inconsistent coi links.

>>> Thanks

>>> Jodie

>>>

>>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>>>

>>>

>>> From: Alex Woods <[REDACTED]>

>>> Date: Mon, 18 Jul 2011 14:24:58 -0700

>>> To: Filkins-Webber, Jodie <[REDACTED]>

>>> Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

>>> Subject: Senate OC question

>>> Hi Commissioner Filkins-Webber,

>>> I am running into a problem with the Senate districts in Orange county. The swap of La Habra for Buena Park with Los Angeles coupled with the reneast of Orange County creates some issues. I have attached a PDF for your reference. FYI in this visualization, I have also followed Comissioner DiGuilio's direction to move Costa Mesa into the Irvine district and swap that with part of the city of Huntington Beach.

>>> Any guidance on this would be greatly appreciated. Is the swap of Buena Park and La Habra something the Commission would want to reconsider in light of this visualization? Otherwise, please let me know how you would balance the population between the districts? I am trying to complete this by this afternoon (around 4pm). I apologize for the late notice of this email.

>>> Feel free to call me if you have any questions [REDACTED] Thank you for help.

>>> Best regards,

>>> Alex

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:55 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:47 PM

Subject: pra12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Alex Woods <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 3:29 PM

Subject: Re: request for population counts

To: "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]> Karin Mac

Donald <[REDACTED]>

Hi,

Attached is the Congressional split reports. Towards the end, there are splits listed by districts, which will be more helpful.

Thanks,

Alex

On Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 3:18 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>
> Hi Alex,
>
> I need to determine some of the population counts for some of the cities we cut in OC. Could you kindly forward me the population residing in the following places:
>
> Congressional south ca:
> 1) The # of people in the city of Orange remaining in SNORN district.
> 2) The # of people in the city of garden grove in the LBPRT district
> 3) The #of people in the city of westminister in the LBPRT district
> 4) The # of people in the city of buena park in the LHYL district
> 5) the # of people in the part of Anaheim Hills in the STHOC district
>
> I have looked for this info, but do not see it available elsewhere. If it is, just direct me there and I will find it myself.
Thank you!!!
>
> C. Ward

[Quoted text hidden]



20110719_q2_congressional_state_city_splits.xls

123K

Plan: 20110718_q2_congress_state
Plan Type:

Administrator:
User:

Communities of Interest - City

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

City	District
Anaheim	LHBYL
Anaheim	SNORN
Anaheim	STHOC
Antioch	COCO
Antioch	SNJOA
Auburn	FTHLL
Auburn	MTCAP
Bakersfield	KINGS
Bakersfield	KR
Bellflower	DOWNTOW
Bellflower	DWWTR
Buena Park	LBPRT
Buena Park	LHBYL
Burbank	SFVWC
Burbank	SGMFH
Chino	LHBYL
Chino	ONTPM
Chula Vista	CHNCS
Chula Vista	IMSAN
Claremont	COVNA
Claremont	SGVP
Clovis	FRSNO
Clovis	MRCED
Danville	COCO
Danville	FRENE
Duarte	COVNA
Duarte	SGVP
East Palo Alto	SNMAT
East Palo Alto	SNMSC
El Cajon	CHNCS
El Cajon	NESAN
Fairfield	NEBAY
Fairfield	YUBA
Fontana	ONTPM
Fontana	SB
Fremont	FRENE
Fremont	SANJO
Fresno	FRSNO
Fresno	MRCED
Garden Grove	LBPRT
Garden Grove	SNORN
Garden Grove	WSTCST
Industry	COVNA
Industry	LHBYL
Inglewood	IGWSG
Inglewood	IGWSGF

La Verne	COVNA
La Verne	SGVP
Lakewood	DWWTR
Lakewood	LBPRT
Lancaster	AVSCV
Lancaster	KR
Long Beach	COMP
Long Beach	LBPRT
Los Angeles	AVSCV
Los Angeles	COMP
Los Angeles	DOWNTOW
Los Angeles	ELABH
Los Angeles	IGWSG
Los Angeles	IGWSGF
Los Angeles	SFVET
Los Angeles	SFVWC
Los Angeles	SGMFH
Los Angeles	WLADT
Martinez	COCO
Martinez	NEBAY
Menlo Park	SNMAT
Menlo Park	SNMSC
Mission Viejo	CSTSN
Mission Viejo	STHOC
Monrovia	COVNA
Monrovia	SGVP
Newark	FRENE
Newark	SANJO
Oakland	FRENE
Oakland	OKLND
Orange	SNORN
Orange	STHOC
Pasadena	SGMFH
Pasadena	SGVP
Petaluma	NEBAY
Petaluma	NOCST
Redlands	INMSB
Redlands	SB
Redwood City	SNMAT
Redwood City	SNMSC
Rialto	ONTPM
Rialto	SB
Rosemead	DWWTR
Rosemead	SGVP
San Buenaventura (Ventura)	EVENT
San Buenaventura (Ventura)	SLOSB
San Diego	CHNCS
San Diego	CSTSN
San Diego	IMSAN
San Diego	MMRHB
San Dimas	COVNA
San Dimas	SGVP
San Francisco	SF
San Francisco	SNMAT
San Jose	SANJO

San Jose	SNACL
San Jose	SNMSC
San Leandro	FRENE
San Leandro	OKLND
San Ramon	COCO
San Ramon	FRENE
Santa Ana	SNORN
Santa Ana	WSTCST
Santa Clara	SANJO
Santa Clara	SNACL
Santa Clara	SNMSC
Santa Cruz	MONT
Santa Cruz	SNMSC
Saratoga	SNACL
Saratoga	SNMSC
Simi Valley	AVSCV
Simi Valley	EVENT
Sunnyvale	SANJO
Sunnyvale	SNMSC
Temecula	NESAN
Temecula	PRS
Torrance	IGWSG
Torrance	WLADT
Upland	SB
Upland	SGVP
Westminster	LBPRT
Westminster	WSTCST

Citys -- listed by District

District AVSCV

Lancaster (part)
 Los Angeles (part)
 Simi Valley (part)

District AVSCV Totals

District CHNCS

Chula Vista (part)
 El Cajon (part)
 San Diego (part)

District CHNCS Totals

District COCO

Antioch (part)
 Danville (part)
 Martinez (part)
 San Ramon (part)

District COCO Totals

District COMP

Long Beach (part)
 Los Angeles (part)

District COMP Totals

District COVNA

Claremont (part)
Duarte (part)
Industry (part)
La Verne (part)
Monrovia (part)
San Dimas (part)

District COVNA Totals

District CSTSN

Mission Viejo (part)
San Diego (part)

District CSTSN Totals

District DOWNTOWN

Bellflower (part)
Los Angeles (part)

District DOWNTOWN Totals

District DWWTR

Bellflower (part)
Lakewood (part)
Rosemead (part)

District DWWTR Totals

District ELABH

Los Angeles (part)

District ELABH Totals

District EVENT

San Buenaventura (Ventura) (part)
Simi Valley (part)

District EVENT Totals

District FRENE

Danville (part)
Fremont (part)
Newark (part)
Oakland (part)
San Leandro (part)
San Ramon (part)

District FRENE Totals

District FRSNO

Clovis (part)
Fresno (part)

District FRSNO Totals

District FTHLL

Auburn (part)

District FTHLL Totals

District IGWSG

Inglewood (part)

Los Angeles (part)

Torrance (part)

District IGWSG Totals

District IGWSGF

Inglewood (part)

Los Angeles (part)

District IGWSGF Totals

District IMSAN

Chula Vista (part)

San Diego (part)

District IMSAN Totals

District INMSB

Redlands (part)

District INMSB Totals

District KINGS

Bakersfield (part)

District KINGS Totals

District KR

Bakersfield (part)

Lancaster (part)

District KR Totals

District LBPRT

Buena Park (part)

Garden Grove (part)

Lakewood (part)

Long Beach (part)

Westminster (part)

District LBPRT Totals

District LHBYL

Anaheim (part)

Buena Park (part)

Chino (part)

Industry (part)

District LHBYL Totals

District MMRHB

San Diego (part)

District MMRHB Totals

District MONT

Santa Cruz (part)

District MONT Totals

District MRCED

Clovis (part)

Fresno (part)

District MRCED Totals

District MTCAP

Auburn (part)

District MTCAP Totals

District NEBAY

Fairfield (part)

Martinez (part)

Petaluma (part)

District NEBAY Totals

District NESAN

El Cajon (part)

Temecula (part)

District NESAN Totals

District NOCST

Petaluma (part)

District NOCST Totals

District OKLND

Oakland (part)

San Leandro (part)

District OKLND Totals

District ONTPM

Chino (part)

Fontana (part)

Rialto (part)

District ONTPM Totals

District PRS

Temecula (part)

District PRS Totals

District SANJO

Fremont (part)

Newark (part)

San Jose (part)

Santa Clara (part)

Sunnyvale (part)

District SANJO Totals

District SB

Fontana (part)

Redlands (part)

Rialto (part)

Upland (part)

District SB Totals

District SF

San Francisco (part)

District SF Totals

District SFVET

Los Angeles (part)

District SFVET Totals

District SFVWC

Burbank (part)

Los Angeles (part)

District SFVWC Totals

District SGMFH

Burbank (part)

Los Angeles (part)

Pasadena (part)

District SGMFH Totals

District SGVP

Claremont (part)

Duarte (part)

La Verne (part)

Monrovia (part)

Pasadena (part)

Rosemead (part)

San Dimas (part)

Upland (part)

District SGVP Totals

District SLOSB

San Buenaventura (Ventura) (part)

District SLOSB Totals

District SNACL

San Jose (part)

Santa Clara (part)

Saratoga (part)

District SNACL Totals

District SNJOA

Antioch (part)

District SNJOA Totals

District SNMAT

East Palo Alto (part)

Menlo Park (part)

Redwood City (part)

San Francisco (part)

District SNMAT Totals

District SNMSC

East Palo Alto (part)

Menlo Park (part)

Redwood City (part)

San Jose (part)

Santa Clara (part)

Santa Cruz (part)

Saratoga (part)

Sunnyvale (part)

District SNMSC Totals

District SNORN

Anaheim (part)

Garden Grove (part)

Orange (part)

Santa Ana (part)

District SNORN Totals

District STHOC

Anaheim (part)

Mission Viejo (part)

Orange (part)

District STHOC Totals

District WLADT

Los Angeles (part)

Torrance (part)

District WLADT Totals

District WSTCST

Garden Grove (part)

Santa Ana (part)

Westminster (part)

District WSTCST Totals

District YUBA

Fairfield (part)

District YUBA Totals

Summary Statistics

Number of City not split	423
Number of City split	57
Number of City split in two	51
Number of City split in three	4
Number of City split in four	1
Number of City split in five	0
Number of City split in six	0
Number of City split in seven	0
Number of City split in eight	0
Number of City split in nine	0
Number of City split in ten	1
Total number of splits	128

1:44 PM

POP	%
16,399	4.9
280,057	###
39,809	###
30,551	###
71,821	###
13,330	100
0	0.0
83,623	###
263,860	###
35,647	###
40,969	###
19,384	###
61,146	###
23,714	###
79,626	###
621	0.8
77,362	###
128,980	###
114,936	###
27,196	###
7,730	###
95,631	100
0	0.0
40,220	###
1,819	4.3
19,106	###
2,215	###
28,004	###
151	0.5
47,426	###
52,052	###
27,691	###
77,630	###
173,905	###
22,164	###
76,641	###
137,448	###
207,122	###
287,543	###
102,332	###
47,901	###
20,650	###
198	###
21	9.6
109,387	###
286	0.3

20,447	###
10,616	###
62,413	###
17,635	###
86,827	###
69,806	###
83,417	###
378,840	###
14,619	0.4
166,230	4.4
157,774	4.2
676,820	###
207,415	5.5
645,205	###
678,674	###
671,476	###
345,117	9.1
229,291	6.0
16,136	###
19,688	###
5,975	###
26,051	###
3,017	3.2
90,288	###
14,490	###
22,100	###
629	1.5
41,944	###
2	0.0
390,722	###
80,132	###
56,284	###
11,031	8.0
126,091	###
2	0.0
57,939	###
50	0.1
68,697	###
35,684	###
41,131	###
40,131	###
59,040	###
16,100	###
37,664	###
98,451	###
7,982	7.5
350,396	###
15,192	1.2
305,844	###
635,970	###
27,884	###
5,487	###
702,905	###
102,330	###
380,712	###

549,887	###
15,343	1.6
47	0.1
84,903	###
15	0.0
72,133	###
284,820	###
39,708	###
30,279	###
16	0.0
86,173	###
26,459	###
33,487	###
165	0.6
29,761	###
114,233	###
10,004	8.1
19,245	###
120,836	###
80,387	###
19,710	###
104,095	###
41,343	###
44,222	###
29,510	###
54,261	###
35,440	###

	<i>POP</i>	%
	86,827	55.4
	14,619	0.4
	114,233	91.9
	#####	

	<i>POP</i>	%
	128,980	52.9
	47,426	47.7
	350,396	26.8
	#####	

	<i>POP</i>	%
	30,551	29.8
	40,220	95.7
	16,136	45.0
	15	0.0
	#####	

	<i>POP</i>	%
	83,417	18.0
	166,230	4.4

#####

	POP	%
27,196	77.9	
19,106	89.6	
198	90.4	
20,447	65.8	
14,490	39.6	
27,884	83.6	

#####

	POP	%
3,017	3.2	
15,192	1.2	

#####

	POP	%
35,647	46.5	
157,774	4.2	

#####

	POP	%
40,969	53.5	
62,413	78.0	
16,100	29.9	

#####

	POP	%
676,820	17.8	

#####

	POP	%
98,451	92.5	
10,004	8.1	

#####

	POP	%
1,819	4.3	
76,641	35.8	
629	1.5	
2	0.0	
47	0.1	
72,133	100.0	

#####

	POP	%
95,631	100	
207,122	41.9	

#####

	POP	%
--	-----	---

13,330 100

#####

POP %

109,387 99.7

207,415 5.5

104,095 71.6

#####

POP %

286 0.3

645,205 17.0

#####

POP %

114,936 47.1

305,844 23.4

#####

POP %

50 0.1

#####

POP %

83,623 24.1

#####

POP %

263,860 75.9

69,806 44.6

#####

POP %

19,384 24.1

102,332 59.9

17,635 22.0

378,840 82.0

54,261 60.5

#####

POP %

16,399 4.9

61,146 75.9

621 0.8

21 9.6

#####

POP %

635,970 48.6

#####

	POP	%
	26,459	44.1
#####		
	0	0.0
	287,543	58.1
#####		
	0	0.0
#####		
	27,691	26.3
	19,688	55.0
	2	0.0
#####		
	52,052	52.3
	80,387	80.3
#####		
	57,939	100.0
#####		
	390,722	100.0
	84,903	99.9
#####		
	77,362	99.2
	173,905	88.7
	40,131	40.5
#####		
	19,710	19.7
#####		
	137,448	64.2
	41,944	98.5
	380,712	40.2

30,279 26.0

19,245 13.7

#####

POP %

22,164 11.3

68,697 99.9

59,040 59.5

44,222 60.0

#####

POP %

702,905 87.3

#####

POP %

678,674 17.9

#####

POP %

23,714 22.9

671,476 17.7

#####

POP %

79,626 77.1

345,117 9.1

11,031 8.0

#####

POP %

7,730 22.1

2,215 10.4

10,616 34.2

22,100 60.4

126,091 92.0

37,664 70.1

5,487 16.4

29,510 40.0

#####

POP %

7,982 7.5

#####

POP %

549,887 58.1

16 0.0

165 0.6

#####

POP %
71,821 70.2
#####

POP %
28,004 99.5
5,975 18.7
35,684 46.5
102,330 12.7
#####

POP %
151 0.5
26,051 81.3
41,131 53.5
15,343 1.6
86,173 74.0
33,487 55.9
29,761 99.4
120,836 86.3
#####

POP %
280,057 83.3
47,901 28.0
80,132 58.7
284,820 87.8
#####

POP %
39,809 11.8
90,288 96.8
56,284 41.3
#####

POP %
229,291 6.0
41,343 28.4
#####

POP %
20,650 12.1
39,708 12.2
35,440 39.5
#####

POP %
77,630 73.7
#####



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>
 To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:56 PM

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:43 PM
 Subject: pra12
 To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Blanco, Maria <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, May 6, 2011 at 8:29 AM
 Subject: Special Masters
 To: Andre Parvenu <[REDACTED]> Angelo Ancheta
 <[REDACTED]> "Blanco, Maria"
 <[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy
 <[REDACTED]> "Dai, Cynthia"
 <[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]>
 Gil Ontai <[REDACTED]> Jeanne Raya
 <[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Weber
 <[REDACTED]> Michelle DiGuilio
 <[REDACTED]> Mike Ward <[REDACTED]>
 Peter Yao <[REDACTED]> Stan Forbes
 <[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba
 <[REDACTED]>

Fellow Commissioners,

Several commissioners asked me about the 1991 Special Masters Plan we have heard about in our hearings. Here is a link to the Special Masters materials.

<http://igs.berkeley.edu/library/research/quickhelp/policy/government/Redistricting/reap90index.html>

--

María Blanco, Commissioner

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

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:57 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:42 PM

Subject: pra12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, May 26, 2011 at 10:13 AM

Subject: Re: Transcript Process Update

To: "Claypool, Daniel" <[REDACTED]>

Dan, no prob man. I was simply trying to avoid needing to discuss this in a meeting as I too see it as resolved. Bottom line, we are understaffed, underequipped and overworked. You as staff nor us as commissioners can be on top of it all, at all times. I applaud your ability to prioritize the many complex challenges and consistently excel on the ones that matter most. I just didn't want to respond to these types of emails without consulting you. This is past, lets move forward. Thanks Dan!!!

On Thu, May 26, 2011 at 9:33 AM, Claypool, Daniel

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

>
> Thanks Mike. I believe that this is an isolated incident that should have been handled with a phone call or a brief discussion as was decided in Santa Ana. The fact is, it wasn't a matter of considering the worth of bringing it to the attention of the commission as much as the timing that was involved. Between the fourteen day noticing period, the office move, and the lack of anyone even noticing that the transcripts hadn't been posted except for David Salavery (sp?) and one lady from Salinas, we simply had bigger issues that we were dealing with. In addition, the business meetings have been very abbreviated (as they should be at this point) leaving little time to discuss all topics. Finally, we had already moved to putting the stenographers back into the meetings before you came to check in with us. What I would prefer is an open discussion in the F & A Advisory Committee presentation allowing an explanation of what occurred and then full commission suggestions on how to improve communication. As staff, we'll note the suggestions and put them into play to the best of our abilities.

>
> Between you and I, we resolve issues every day that are equally perplexing. For instance, we were promised a copier from our last office and then the offer was rescinded the day of the move. We had to scramble for days using Fed Ex and our scanner/print function until we located a copier. This just scrambled our business functions for about a week. Should this be the subject of a report regarding operations? I don't think so, you guys have bigger things to deal with. We receive phone calls from irate citizens daily demanding to know why the document they just send us isn't posted up..... We could report the numbers of phone calls and the level of intensity but its not going to make your job easier and it won't get the documents posted up any quicker. We're working the posting end of the process to the limit given the number of staff and the redaction capabilities that we have. All in all, this is just the grind of staff work. So it's disconcerting for us to have everything go off without a hitch, venues, videography, budgets, etc., and

then have the sense that the commission thinks that we have a major problem when only two people have commented.....

>

> Off my soap box and on to the Senate Hearing. Let me know how this turns out.

>

> Dan Claypool

>

> On Wed, May 25, 2011 at 10:51 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Dan, please only reply to me on this. What would be your preferred response. Thanks!

>>

>> ----- Forwarded message -----

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

>> Date: Wed, May 25, 2011 at 10:12 PM

>> Subject: Re: Transcript Process Update

>> To: "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

>>

>>

>> Great work Mike, thanks for taking this task on. I have been very concerned that staff did not consider this worth bringing to our attention earlier on. What is your sense on how we can most effectively work with Mr. Claypool and his staff to ensure we have a better sense of how things are moving on the "Administration" end of "F&A"?

>> Connie

>>

>> On Wed, May 25, 2011 at 12:14 PM, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> Goodmorning,

>>> As you recall, after much discussion regarding the lack of timeliness of transcript posting, I volunteered to visit the new offices and review the current transcription and posting procedures with the relevant staff members. The following information was gleaned: (day = business day)

>>>

>>> 1) Through April 8, transcription was completed by a live transcriptionist leading to certified transcripts completed within a short 3 day turnaround. Transcripts were then available to public online within another 1 to 2 days. Total = max 5 day turnaround. Cost \$2500 each CRC meeting day.

>>>

>>> 2) Due to budget constraints, the commission agreed to discontinue live transcription service in lieu of sending out the live video recording of meetings for uncertified transcription. This required a new contract to be approved through DGS to outsource our transcription needs to a non-live transcriptionist. Attached is an email from Raul who outlines the history of completing these contracts. It appears that contracts were mis-routed at the DGS level which eventually ended up with staff having to re-create the contracts (see attached email). The meeting dates involved are as follows: April 27, 28 and May 1, 5, 6, 12, 14. I have been assured that these contracts are now in place (as of this week) and the vendor is working with Christina to ensure the 7 awaiting meetings are in a digital format the vendor can use. Cost: \$900 each CRC meeting day.

>>>

>>> 3) As of 5/21/11, the Executive Director instructed staff to revisit the transcript process and after examination determined it was in the commissions best interest to return to a live transcriptionist present at CRC business and line drawing meetings. So beginning immediately, transcription services have been returned to what they were prior to the April 8 transcript posting which is currently online. This is expected to remedy contracting and formatting delays of the past and allow the quickest possible turn-around time for transcript posting.

>>>

>>> 4) I was further asked to determine what expenses we have paid out and that are pending regarding transcription, input and facility costs. In regards to input costs, many bills are still outstanding and it is clear that over the next few weeks we will see any perceived surplus in regards to input and facility costs diminish. In regards to transcript costs, as of monday's meeting, all transcript costs have been paid and reflected in the budget through April 8. However no costs since that point have been paid out as the contracts have just been finalized by DGS. This is expected to be a significant cost and drain on our budget, however the E.D. is confident that the budget has been carefully scrutinized and can handle returning to live transcription given its importance in creating timely transparency for the public.

>>>

>>>

>>> 5) As of this email, I am still awaiting an update as to when the above listed 7 meeting transcripts will be posted. I expect this information to be forthcoming by northridge. Total cost will be reflected in the budget when the expense is incurred, however that total is not yet exact.

>>>

>>> 6) The newly re-vamped transcript procedure will guarantee transcripts are posted within 6 business days following the relevant meeting.

>>>

>>> Please contact me with any questions,

>>>

>>> Mike Ward

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> ----- Forwarded message -----

>>> From: Villanueva, Raul <[REDACTED]>

>>> Date: Mon, May 23, 2011 at 6:47 PM

>>> Subject: Timeframes for Transcription Services

>>> To: Michael Ward <[REDACTED]>

>>> Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> "Shupe, Christina" <[REDACTED]>

>>>

>>>

>>> April 19 contracts developed and submitted

>>> April 20 initial review and approval from DGS; contracts out for signature

>>> April 26 signed contracts to DGS

>>>

>>> May 6 Find out contracts are missing

>>> May 10 confirmed contracts cannot be located

>>>

>>> May 16-17 move office

>>>

>>> May 19 signed contracts turned in to DGS for disbursement to CRC, vendor and State Controller

>>>

>>> May 20 Long Beach and LA to vendor

>>>

>>> Current Status:

>>> Waiting for vendor to confirm they can use same format as CRC uses for website. Should hear back from them 5/24.

>>>

>>> Some DVDs/CDs still pending from other venues. Christina to provide update on changes to status.

>>> CRC waiting to hear back from vendor re: do we need to reformat files or send as is.

>>>

>>> --

>>> Raul Villanueva

>>> Business Manager

>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A

>>> Sacramento, CA 95814

[REDACTED]

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>> --

>> Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner

>> California Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>

>> "Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
>> www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
>> (916) [REDACTED]
>>
>
>
>
> --
> Daniel M. Claypool
> Executive Director
> Citizens Redistricting Commission
> Tel: [REDACTED]
> "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: Pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:15 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:55 PM

Subject: Pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[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

--

Marian M. Johnston





Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:57 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:42 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Blanco, Maria <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, May 31, 2011 at 6:32 PM

Subject: Re: Ethics training

To: "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

Will bring with me tomorrow!

On 5/31/11, Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Hi gang, if you are getting this email it is because no "certificate of
> completion" proving your completion of the ethics training is on file with
> staff. That puts your training status in delinquent. You may have
> completed the training already, but if you have not printed, signed and
> turned into staff the "certificate of completion" at the end of the online
> training module then there is no proof of compliance. Please turn this
> certificate into staff by the end of this week, preferably prior to the F&A
> subcommittee meeting so we can take this item off the agenda for good.
> Please email Christina with any questions or assistance in completing.

>

> Safe Travels,

>

> Mike

>

--

Sent from my mobile device

María Blanco, Commissioner

Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines. <<http://www.wedrawthelines.com>>ca.gov

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:57 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:41 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, Jun 16, 2011 at 2:17 PM

Subject: inline reviewer

To: Jodie Filkins-Webber <[REDACTED]> Maria

Blanco <[REDACTED]> "Miller, Kirk"

<[REDACTED]>

Chair and Vice chair,

I did not want to take time from the meeting, but may I request that we add an agenda item that defines and creates an operating procedure for the inline reviewer. It would be nice if we could do that prior to hiring the inline reviewer. It might make a difference on who we plan to hire if we know exactly what we are hiring them for. I feel that this position remains undefined fully, and certainly no rules for application or utilization have been determined. I think these items are relevant to selecting an individual to provide this service, whatever it is finally determined to be. Thanks for your consideration.

C. Ward

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:57 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:40 PM

Subject: pra12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Jul 3, 2011 at 9:30 AM

Subject: Re: Procedure for Relaying Team information to Q2

To: "Filkins-Webber, Jodie" <[REDACTED]>

As soon to be chair, can I please request that an agenda item be placed on the business agenda to address this issue. I can not seem to find a single location (similar to our 'resolutions' list) where anyone can go and see exactly what directions/presumptions Q2 is using to draw any given visualization or map! This is problematic not just from the transparency point, but largely because if a commissioner misses a day or an hour they have no way to understand what direction any given county's direction. If i am incorrect and such a listing/database is available, please let me know. But if it is not, we are really doing the process a disservice. Thanks

On Sat, Jul 2, 2011 at 11:42 PM, Filkins-Webber, Jodie

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> This may address some of your concerns as I think this is the procedure that is being followed by only some commissioners.

> Jodie

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: Blanco, Maria <[REDACTED]>

> Date: Sat, Jun 25, 2011 at 10:51 AM

> Subject: Procedure for Relaying Team information to Q2

> To: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]> Christina Shupe

<[REDACTED]> "Sargis, Janece" <[REDACTED]> Commissioners

>

>

> Just to clarify the assignment, each Commissioner pair should forward to Christina Shupe the following information for their region ASAP so Q2 can get started on options for the full Commission to consider:

>

> Issues identified by the public (both verbal and written testimony) with our 1st draft Congressional districts (as per yesterday's exercise in Stockton)

- > Potential solutions/population exchanges that may address them (based on public testimony and team's idea as to how to incorporate that testimony)
- > Ideally, underlying the team's suggestions will note assumptions about our current districts, COIs maintained, COIs split AND what assumptions the public has indicated we can relax/change (e.g. the public has often stated that they are willing to divide a city or county)
- > Finally, if you have comments based on input outside of your assigned region, please forward this as well to Christina and she will include that in a master document which will be forwarded to Q2.
- > In summary, what should Q2 to try to fix or change as per post draft map input.
- >
- > With this information, Q2 should have enough broad direction to create some compatible options for us to consider at the next few line-drawing sessions so we can work more efficiently in the limited time we have together. A reminder that this is not an opportunity for Commissioners to lobby for their personal favorites, but to put multiple options in front the full Commission because some less-preferred options for one region may work better for other regions.
- > Christina/Dan: I will discuss this with you today to clarify the new assignment
- >
- > Maria
- > --
- >
- > María Blanco, Commissioner
- >
- > Citizens Redistricting Commission
- > "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
- > www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > --
- > Jodie Filkins Webber
- > Commissioner
- > Citizens Redistricting Commission
- > "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:15 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 3:57 PM

Subject: pra12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Miller, Kirk <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Subject: Polarized Voting Expert

To: Andre Parvenu <[REDACTED]> Angelo Ancheta

<[REDACTED]> "Blanco, Maria"

<[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy

<[REDACTED]> Cynthia Dai

<[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]>

Gil Ontai <[REDACTED]> Jeanne Raya

<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Webber

<[REDACTED]> Michael Ward

<[REDACTED]> Michelle DiGuilio

<[REDACTED]> Stanley Forbes

<[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba

<[REDACTED]> "Yao, Peter" <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners:

Attached is the resume of an expert the Legal Advisory Committee will recommend tomorrow, subject to our ability to work out satisfactory financial arrangements for his work.

In addition, set forth below is his response to our questions and his review of the conflict policy for consultants. This matter will be reviewed as part of tomorrow's regular agenda. Kirk

Conflict Response:

I'm providing this e-mail summary in response to the conflict and impartiality form provided to me for review. Let me know if something here isn't clear, or if you need additional detail.

I can say with absolute certainty that I have not undertaken any of the items on the first page. That is, I have not been elected, appointed, or been a candidate for federal or state office; nor have I ever served as an officer, employee or paid consultant for a political party or campaign. I have never been a registered lobbyist. I have never been a paid staff or consultant to for any elected official, nor

have I ever contributed \$2000 or more to any campaign of any kind. And I have no personal or family relationships that are a conflict with making a redistricting decision.

As an academic, I have regularly received grants or fellowship awards to conduct independent scholarly research, and I have received some limited funding from other groups over the years to conduct independent research studies. For example:

* In June 2007 I was awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation to undertake the first-ever Latino oversample, and Spanish-translation of the American National Election Study; an on-going national academic public opinion study funded by the NSF and overseen by Stanford University and the University of Michigan

* In April 2010 I was awarded a grant from the Social Science Research Council to conduct research related to the attitudes and opinions of American Muslims, to provide some empirical data on a topic on which very little actual research exists

* From 2002 - 2009, I received funding from the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association to conduct an independent population, demographic and voting analysis of Latinos in Los Angeles County in regards to the LA County Board of Supervisors districts. This included created numerous tables documenting the growth in Latino voter registration throughout the county, and also conducting analysis of racially polarized voting, for and against Latino candidates in Los Angeles, which resulted in research reports for the LACCEA, and also in an academic publication, of a book chapter in a 2007 book about the Voting Rights Act. My only role was to conduct an independent study based on the data, and at no time did I engage in any advocacy work for LACCEA.

* In 2007 I received a grant from the Brennan Center for Justice to conduct a study of access to photo identification in the state of Indiana, which resulted in a research report for the Brennan Center, and also an academic publication of our results in the journal PS: Political Science & Politics in 2009

* In May 2010, I received funding from the Asian Pacific American Legal Center to conduct an analysis of racially polarized voting, for and against, Asian American candidates. The scope of my research study was limited to just assessing the degree or RPV in the status quo 49th Assembly District, and my only role was to conduct an independent study based on the data, and at no time did I engage in any advocacy work for APALC.

* In 2007 I received funding from the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund to conduct an analysis of racially polarized voting, for and against Latino candidates, in the city of Whittier. My study served only as a preliminary research report delivered to MALDEF, and at no time did I engage in any advocacy work for MALDEF.

* In Jan-Mar 2010 I conducted a population analysis, and racial block voting analysis, of San Mateo County, CA for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, and the law firm Arnold & Porter in regards to a possible lawsuit against the County Board of Supervisors districts. My research consisted of examining Asian and Latino population growth and settlement patterns in census tracts in San Mateo County, as well as conducting an analysis of voting patterns for and against Asian as well as Latino candidates for office. My research was an independent study, which resulted in two briefings to summarize my research findings. At no time did I engage in any advocacy work, but rather compiled data and provided my independent assessment of population and voting patterns.

If appointed as an independent expert with the CRC, at no time will I

receive, or pursue any additional grants or funds to conduct research on any matter related to redistricting in the state of California, or on behalf of any group which has an interest before the CRC. My only focus would be on the interest of the CRC.

Best,
Prof. Matt Barreto

--

Kirk E. Miller
Chief Counsel
Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA. 95814

 (o)
[\(916\) 812-1234](tel:(916)812-1234)

[Quoted text hidden]



Barreto.CV.consult.pdf

70K



Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:13 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonn" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:13 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Blanco, Maria <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:52 PM

Subject: Fwd: Vallejo redistricting.

To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Public Comment3 <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:31 PM

Subject: Fwd: Vallejo redistricting.

To: Connie Galambos-Malloy <[REDACTED]> Maria

Blanco <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Judy Irvin <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Jun 27, 2011 at 11:58 AM

Subject: Re: Vallejo redistricting.

To: [REDACTED]

For many, many years Vallejo has been politically hamstrung by a complete lack of representation. Our city is supposedly represented by a confusing number of people in gerrymandered districts for the benefit of those whose loyalty lies elsewhere. The elected representatives need Vallejo's Democratic votes to win in the conservative agricultural districts. But after the elections, they forget about us. Consequently, Vallejo is a backwater used as a dumping ground for regional poverty and for the economic benefit of those who live elsewhere. Partial examples:

1. Mike Thompson authored special legislation to allow a Redevelopment Area on Mare Island for economic reasons alone with no mention of the National Historic Landmark or National Register status.

The NHL is equal in importance to the San Francisco Presidio. The BRAC Master Plan and subsequent plans by Lennar involved massive demolition and new construction despite the grave concerns voiced by the National Park Service including a report to Congress listing Mare Island as a Threatened Landmark. I, personally, met with staff of several elected officials who were uninterested in Mare Island. George Miller has lobbied successfully for National Parks in both Richmond (Rosie the Riveter) and Concord; but he has no interest in historic treasures on Mare Island such as a Chapel with the largest collection of Tiffany windows this side of the Mississippi. Ultimately, the dispute was resolved when the National Trust for Historic Preservation mounted a legal challenge. Nancy Pelosi's nephew worked for Lennar.

2. Vallejo's older neighborhoods, including two National Register Districts, originally evolved to house the shipyard workers. Many of the larger victorian homes were chopped up into apartments during WWI. As the shipyard geared down, the homes became rentals purchased by out-of town-owners to shelter their incomes and transitioned in the subsidized housing market. Now poverty and social problems are disproportionately concentrated in Vallejo.

a. A former SF social worker now living in Vallejo tells me he was directed to give Section 8 vouchers to SF clients with instructions to take them to Vallejo.

b. Napa State hospital staff says they release patients to Vallejo.

c. San Quentin sent a bus load of parolees sheduled for release to Marin County to a Vallejo motel after an outcry in Marin.

d. and many more....

In sum, Vallejo's lack of political representation has resulted in an urban containment zone of poverty and social problems. The drop in median home values that underpins the tax base and has partially caused Vallejo's bankruptcy is the direct result of middle class families leaving because of the reduction in livability.

I understand that Napa and Marin Counties have decided that the ABAG affordable housing numbers don't apply to them. I lived in Napa during one round of the County General Plan updates and was horrified to find that the plan called for eliminating farmworker housing in the vineyards to maintain the tourist ambience and dumping it into the urbanized areas of Napa City and American Canyon increasing traffic and pushing poverty down the road. Now Napa County is lobbying you to make sure the poverty is pushed even further down the road to Vallejo.

Most of the North Bay is agricultural and is more closely associated with other agricultural counties such as Yolo. American Canyon and Napa City have long been urbanized areas directly associated with Mare Island. Historically, a trolley ran through Napa City in the early 1900's to take Mare Island workers to Vallejo and many Napa City 1950's housing tracts openly advertised that they did not allow blacks to appeal to racist Mare Island workers. In addition, Kaiser operated a shipyard in south Napa City as well as one in Vallejo.

I support a redistricting plan that will provide balance and give Vallejo some very needed representation. An urban/industrial city cannot be effectively represented by those with loyalties to agricultural interests and wealthy backers. Historically, Mare Island was the employment center of a region that extended into Napa and

Sonoma Counties. That should define your redistricting efforts.

Thank you,

Judy Irvin
Historical Architect and Vallejo resident.

--

María Blanco, Commissioner

Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:14 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:06 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:27 PM

Subject: Re: q2 contract - information needed

To: "Villanueva, Raul" <[REDACTED]>

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

<[REDACTED]> "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>

Michelle DiGuilio <[REDACTED]> Ana Henderson

<[REDACTED]> "Ancheta, Angelo"

<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Weber

<[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba

<[REDACTED]> "Ontai, Lilbert"

<[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy

<[REDACTED]> "Parvenu, Andre"

<[REDACTED]> "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

Jeanne Raya <[REDACTED]> "Blanco, Maria"

<[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]>

Stanley Forbes <[REDACTED]> Peter Yao

<[REDACTED]>

dear raul,
 thank you for clarifying some of these issues. i am ccing the crc
 because i was asked to. i am certainly not interested in blasting
 anyone! since you prefer to handle this more privately, i will gladly
 do so after i clarify a couple of items in your email referring to the
 last part:

The June travel invoice was submitted without documentation. Lauren
 of Q2 was contacted and she is getting us the documentation.

LAUREN SUBMITTED A DRAFT TO LISA TO MAKE SURE THE FORMATTING WAS OK.
 SHE HAS NOT SUBMITTED THE TRAVEL INVOICE AND IN FACT THERE ARE CHANGES
 BEING MADE TO IT.

The invoice for time working with the attorney was submitted without
 detail or documentation. You and I went over what was needed to

invoice when we met on 7/29.

THIS WAS A DRAFT YOU ASKED ME TO SEND TO YOU. THIS IS NOT A FINAL INVOICE. THIS WAS MADE CLEAR WHEN WE MET AND WE HAVE NOT YET SENT AN INVOICE.

We have services invoiced through June 30 which have been reviewed and submitted for payment. Service invoices for July and August have not been received. Travel invoices for July and August have not been received.

THIS IS CORRECT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE WILL SUBMIT AUGUST IN SEPTEMBER. THE REASON FOR WHY I AM LOOKING FOR CLARIFICATION ABOUT CONTRACTING IS SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THESE INVOICES. I NEED CLARIFICATION PRIOR TO SUBMISSION.

thank you very much, again! from hereon out i am only ccing director claypool and commissioner dai unless told otherwise. i hope that meets your request?

best,

.

karin

- Show quoted text -

On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:10 PM, Villanueva, Raul

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Please note, while I welcome questions and discussion with you, I will not be taking further part in these large email blasts. I believe discussion in this type of forum potentially violates Bagley-Keene, in addition to not contributing to resolution of issues.

> Thank you,

>

> Raul

>

> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 2:21 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 2:21 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> hello raul,

>>> thank you for your quick response. the contract that was sent to me had the crc return address on the envelope. there is one signed, stamped page that says: standard contract, (this is your STD 213) it then attaches exhibit 1, the scope of work, etc.

>>> attached is the one that commissioner dai forwarded me. the first 4 pages are what i did not receive.

>>

>>

>> Of the four "missing pages": Page 1 is a cover letter. This is not a material part of the contract. Pages 2-3 (STD 215) are internal docs for Finance and Controller's Office. This is not a material part of the contract and is generally not sent to the contractor. Page 4 is the STD 213 which you signed as Q2s representative and which is similar to the STD 213 submitted as part of Q2s bid.

>>

>> page 1 reads:

>>>

>>> You will note that in the new format of the Standard Agreement (STD 213), a copy of the General Terms and

Conditions (GTC) is not provided. The GTC are available on the Internet at www.dgs.ca.gov/contracts and may be downloaded and printed for your files.

>>>

>>> this link does not work. can you provide me with a location? i'm going in a circular motion: the link is dead - i don't know what i'm supposed to know! i don't know if i have what they obviously want me to refer to and i did not get the reference when i received a copy of my contract in june.

>>>

>>> The general terms and conditions you refer to are spelled out in the IFB and are the same ones that Q2 responded to and included as part of the bid, as I mentioned earlier. They may also be found at <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/ols/home.aspx> click on "Standard Contract Language". They are GTC 610.

>>>

>>> any enlightenment you can provide is appreciated.

>>

>> The general terms and conditions were spelled out as part of the IFB and Q2 included them (spelled out) as part of its bid. Both documents acknowledge these as the general terms and conditions to be incorporated into the contract and are also referenced in the STD213 signed by Q2, which I believe you received. I am hopeful that you will read all three documents and compare them with the information on DGS' website, thus resolving whatever issues may have arisen.

>>

>>

>>>

>>> regarding further invoices: i believe the june travel invoice is forthcoming this week - i believe that is what you are referring to. i have not sent anything for july, that is correct.

>>

>> The June travel invoice was submitted without documentation. Lauren of Q2 was contacted and she is getting us the documentation.

>>

>>

>>

>> The invoice for time working with the attorney was submitted without detail or documentation. You and I went over what was needed to invoice when we met on 7/29.

>>

>>

>>

>> We have services invoiced through June 30 which have been reviewed and submitted for payment. Service invoices for July and August have not been received. Travel invoices for July and August have not been received.

>>

>>

>> karin

>>

>>

>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 11:16 AM, Villanueva, Raul <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> Good morning Karin:

>>>

>>> The hard copy contracts are disbursed by DGS. DGS does not send out e-copies of contracts. I also do not send e-copies of the contract in lieu of the hard copy. I would appreciate it if you would forward to me what you were sent so I can be sure of what you are looking at. I would also appreciate your identifying what pages you believe are missing from the hardcopy sent to you by DGS.

>>>

>>> In regards to the "T&Cs": I believe you may be referring to the State's General Terms and Conditions?

>>>

>>> The State's General Terms & Conditions were spelled out in the original IFB (Exhibit C, pg, 38-42). As part of the bid process, bidders were required to submit a signed Standard form 213 (STD213) signifying that the bidder agreed to comply with the terms and conditions of the scope of work, the budget detail and payment provisions, the General Terms and Conditions and (for your contract) the conflict and impartiality statements requested by the commission. Q2 complied with these bid requirements. Volume 4 of Q2s bid response contains the General Terms and Conditions, followed by the STD 213 with your signature.

>>>

>>> In addition, Volume 2 of Q2s bid response contains Q2s signed declaration agreeing to abide by the State's Contractor Certification Clauses - which were also included as part of the IFB (Attachment 8, pg. 30-33).

>>>

>>> If you are not referring to the State's General Terms and Conditions or the State's Contractor Certification Clauses, please let me know to what you are referring to as "T&C" that I might better assist you.

>>> I understand that State contracting requirements may be complex at times. I have taken prior issues you had questions about to DGS Legal for their review and consideration and then provided you their feedback. I am happy to do so again in the future.

>>>

>>> Finally, I urge you to continue submitting invoices for Q2's travel and services. The state cannot pay Q2 otherwise, nor can we evaluate any of Q2s claims without the invoices, service details, and documentation.

>>>

>>> It was good to see you Friday 7/29 and work together to bring 2 more invoices in for payment. My staff and I are available to provide similar assistance to you. Just let me know and we will make ourselves available.

>>> Thank you,

>>>

>>> Raul

>>>

>>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 8:34 AM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Dear Raul,

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thank you for continuing to work with Q2 on invoicing and contracting issues. As you know, I have had a lot of questions about state contracting policies, to which I have not been able to find answers. I recently contacted DGS based on your suggestion and asked to be referred to the small business liaison which the State of California makes available to all agencies with budgets above \$100,000 per Government Code, Section 14845-14847. After many emails, it was discovered that there is no small business liaison that is assigned to the CRC, and I was referred back to you.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> In order to familiarize myself with the State of California's contracting rules and regulations, I need to find out where the T&Cs you have been referencing can be found. In a conversation with Commissioner Dai, she asked me why I was not simply using the website link that was provided to me on page 1 of my contract. This surprised me because I did not recall a link or a reference in the contract. Because an electronic copy of the contract was not provided to me, she forwarded one to me. Upon comparing the version she sent to me and the one I have, I realized that the first 4 pages of the electronic version were omitted from the contract copy that was mailed to me (postmarked June 6, 2011) and thus, I never received the information.

>>>>

>>>> I then clicked on the link provided in the electronic copy and found that it is not working.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Would you please provide me with a working location of the contracting rules and regulations that apply to us? I would greatly appreciate it as I anticipate that better informed communication from my end will resolve many of the issues with which I have had to trouble you.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thank you and best regards,

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Karin
>>>
>>>
>>> --
>>> Raul Villanueva
>>> Business Manager
>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission
>>> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A
>>> Sacramento, CA 95814
>>> [\(916\) 651--5703](tel:9166515703)
>>
>
>
>
> --
> Raul Villanueva
> Business Manager
> Citizens Redistricting Commission
> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A
> Sacramento, CA 95814
> [\(916\) 651--5703](tel:9166515703)

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: pra 12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:14 PM

To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:06 PM

Subject: pra 12

To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:27 PM

Subject: Re: q2 contract - information needed

To: "Villanueva, Raul" <[REDACTED]>

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

<[REDACTED]> "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>

Michelle DiGuilio <[REDACTED]> Ana Henderson

<[REDACTED]> "Ancheta, Angelo"

<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Weber

<[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba

<[REDACTED]> "Ontai, Lilbert"

<[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy

<[REDACTED]> "Parvenu, Andre"

<[REDACTED]> "Ward, Michael" <[REDACTED]>

Jeanne Raya <[REDACTED]> "Blanco, Maria"

<[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]>

Stanley Forbes <[REDACTED]> Peter Yao

<[REDACTED]>

dear raul,
 thank you for clarifying some of these issues. i am ccing the crc
 because i was asked to. i am certainly not interested in blasting
 anyone! since you prefer to handle this more privately, i will gladly
 do so after i clarify a couple of items in your email referring to the
 last part:

The June travel invoice was submitted without documentation. Lauren
 of Q2 was contacted and she is getting us the documentation.

LAUREN SUBMITTED A DRAFT TO LISA TO MAKE SURE THE FORMATTING WAS OK.
 SHE HAS NOT SUBMITTED THE TRAVEL INVOICE AND IN FACT THERE ARE CHANGES
 BEING MADE TO IT.

The invoice for time working with the attorney was submitted without
 detail or documentation. You and I went over what was needed to

invoice when we met on 7/29.

THIS WAS A DRAFT YOU ASKED ME TO SEND TO YOU. THIS IS NOT A FINAL INVOICE. THIS WAS MADE CLEAR WHEN WE MET AND WE HAVE NOT YET SENT AN INVOICE.

We have services invoiced through June 30 which have been reviewed and submitted for payment. Service invoices for July and August have not been received. Travel invoices for July and August have not been received.

THIS IS CORRECT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE WILL SUBMIT AUGUST IN SEPTEMBER. THE REASON FOR WHY I AM LOOKING FOR CLARIFICATION ABOUT CONTRACTING IS SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THESE INVOICES. I NEED CLARIFICATION PRIOR TO SUBMISSION.

thank you very much, again! from hereon out i am only ccing director claypool and commissioner dai unless told otherwise. i hope that meets your request?

best,

.

karin

- Show quoted text -

On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:10 PM, Villanueva, Raul

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Please note, while I welcome questions and discussion with you, I will not be taking further part in these large email blasts. I believe discussion in this type of forum potentially violates Bagley-Keene, in addition to not contributing to resolution of issues.

> Thank you,

>

> Raul

>

> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 2:21 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 2:21 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> hello raul,

>>> thank you for your quick response. the contract that was sent to me had the crc return address on the envelope. there is one signed, stamped page that says: standard contract, (this is your STD 213) it then attaches exhibit 1, the scope of work, etc.

>>> attached is the one that commissioner dai forwarded me. the first 4 pages are what i did not receive.

>>

>>

>> Of the four "missing pages": Page 1 is a cover letter. This is not a material part of the contract. Pages 2-3 (STD 215) are internal docs for Finance and Controller's Office. This is not a material part of the contract and is generally not sent to the contractor. Page 4 is the STD 213 which you signed as Q2s representative and which is similar to the STD 213 submitted as part of Q2s bid.

>>

>> page 1 reads:

>>>

>>> You will note that in the new format of the Standard Agreement (STD 213), a copy of the General Terms and

Conditions (GTC) is not provided. The GTC are available on the Internet at www.dgs.ca.gov/contracts and may be downloaded and printed for your files.

>>>

>>> this link does not work. can you provide me with a location? i'm going in a circular motion: the link is dead - i don't know what i'm supposed to know! i don't know if i have what they obviously want me to refer to and i did not get the reference when i received a copy of my contract in june.

>>>

>>> The general terms and conditions you refer to are spelled out in the IFB and are the same ones that Q2 responded to and included as part of the bid, as I mentioned earlier. They may also be found at <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/ols/home.aspx> click on "Standard Contract Language". They are GTC 610.

>>>

>>> any enlightenment you can provide is appreciated.

>>

>> The general terms and conditions were spelled out as part of the IFB and Q2 included them (spelled out) as part of its bid. Both documents acknowledge these as the general terms and conditions to be incorporated into the contract and are also referenced in the STD213 signed by Q2, which I believe you received. I am hopeful that you will read all three documents and compare them with the information on DGS' website, thus resolving whatever issues may have arisen.

>>

>>

>>>

>>> regarding further invoices: i believe the june travel invoice is forthcoming this week - i believe that is what you are referring to. i have not sent anything for july, that is correct.

>>

>> The June travel invoice was submitted without documentation. Lauren of Q2 was contacted and she is getting us the documentation.

>>

>>

>>

>> The invoice for time working with the attorney was submitted without detail or documentation. You and I went over what was needed to invoice when we met on 7/29.

>>

>>

>>

>> We have services invoiced through June 30 which have been reviewed and submitted for payment. Service invoices for July and August have not been received. Travel invoices for July and August have not been received.

>>

>>

>> karin

>>

>>

>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 11:16 AM, Villanueva, Raul <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> Good morning Karin:

>>>

>>> The hard copy contracts are disbursed by DGS. DGS does not send out e-copies of contracts. I also do not send e-copies of the contract in lieu of the hard copy. I would appreciate it if you would forward to me what you were sent so I can be sure of what you are looking at. I would also appreciate your identifying what pages you believe are missing from the hardcopy sent to you by DGS.

>>>

>>> In regards to the "T&Cs": I believe you may be referring to the State's General Terms and Conditions?

>>>

>>> The State's General Terms & Conditions were spelled out in the original IFB (Exhibit C, pg, 38-42). As part of the bid process, bidders were required to submit a signed Standard form 213 (STD213) signifying that the bidder agreed to comply with the terms and conditions of the scope of work, the budget detail and payment provisions, the General Terms and Conditions and (for your contract) the conflict and impartiality statements requested by the commission. Q2 complied with these bid requirements. Volume 4 of Q2s bid response contains the General Terms and Conditions, followed by the STD 213 with your signature.

>>>

>>> In addition, Volume 2 of Q2s bid response contains Q2s signed declaration agreeing to abide by the State's Contractor Certification Clauses - which were also included as part of the IFB (Attachment 8, pg. 30-33).

>>>

>>> If you are not referring to the State's General Terms and Conditions or the State's Contractor Certification Clauses, please let me know to what you are referring to as "T&C" that I might better assist you.

>>> I understand that State contracting requirements may be complex at times. I have taken prior issues you had questions about to DGS Legal for their review and consideration and then provided you their feedback. I am happy to do so again in the future.

>>>

>>> Finally, I urge you to continue submitting invoices for Q2's travel and services. The state cannot pay Q2 otherwise, nor can we evaluate any of Q2s claims without the invoices, service details, and documentation.

>>>

>>> It was good to see you Friday 7/29 and work together to bring 2 more invoices in for payment. My staff and I are available to provide similar assistance to you. Just let me know and we will make ourselves available.

>>> Thank you,

>>>

>>> Raul

>>>

>>> On Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 8:34 AM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Dear Raul,

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thank you for continuing to work with Q2 on invoicing and contracting issues. As you know, I have had a lot of questions about state contracting policies, to which I have not been able to find answers. I recently contacted DGS based on your suggestion and asked to be referred to the small business liaison which the State of California makes available to all agencies with budgets above \$100,000 per Government Code, Section 14845-14847. After many emails, it was discovered that there is no small business liaison that is assigned to the CRC, and I was referred back to you.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> In order to familiarize myself with the State of California's contracting rules and regulations, I need to find out where the T&Cs you have been referencing can be found. In a conversation with Commissioner Dai, she asked me why I was not simply using the website link that was provided to me on page 1 of my contract. This surprised me because I did not recall a link or a reference in the contract. Because an electronic copy of the contract was not provided to me, she forwarded one to me. Upon comparing the version she sent to me and the one I have, I realized that the first 4 pages of the electronic version were omitted from the contract copy that was mailed to me (postmarked June 6, 2011) and thus, I never received the information.

>>>>

>>>> I then clicked on the link provided in the electronic copy and found that it is not working.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Would you please provide me with a working location of the contracting rules and regulations that apply to us? I would greatly appreciate it as I anticipate that better informed communication from my end will resolve many of the issues with which I have had to trouble you.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thank you and best regards,

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Karin
>>>
>>>
>>> --
>>> Raul Villanueva
>>> Business Manager
>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission
>>> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A
>>> Sacramento, CA 95814
>>> [REDACTED]
>>
>
>
>
> --
> Raul Villanueva
> Business Manager
> Citizens Redistricting Commission
> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A
> Sacramento, CA 95814
> [REDACTED]

[Quoted text hidden]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

Fwd: prop12

Johnston, Marian <[REDACTED]>
 To: "Leitch, Lonni" <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:16 PM

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

From: **Ward, Michael** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 4:16 PM
 Subject: prop12
 To: "Johnston, Marian" <[REDACTED]>

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

From: **Blanco, Maria** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 2:53 PM
 Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
 To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
 Cc: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>

Not sure how some commissioners may feel about Dixon and Davis with Napa.

Maria

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:27 AM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Pls see alternative based on Chris Bowman's public comment. Both Norcal teams requested this viz for changing the ADs. Advantages are:

- Yolo is whole
- Dixon is with close neighboring city, Davis
- Fairfield is whole!!!

Pls advise ASAP if you have any objection to this. There is one more step if we want to put Lake county with the North Coast in the ADs too, which involves moving Novato in with Napa. We can see this next week if we want.

--}cyn

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

From: **jaime clark** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:20 AM
 Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
 To: "Dai, Cynthia" <[REDACTED]>
 Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>

fairfield whole! 🙌🙌🙌🙌
 and lake still with napa

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 11:09 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
 | so again this is AD the chagne is between ECC and NAPA both devs are good

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 10:52 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
rohner park and novato with NAPA
petaluma cotati sonoma with MARIN

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 10:10 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
the splits in NAPA/ECC dixon switch

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 9:53 AM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:
hi commissioner dai -
attached is a pdf of what the lake switch would look like for SD
let me know what you think!
jaime

On Mon, Jul 18, 2011 at 9:30 AM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
I take it back; I did send this Saturday. Thoughts on suggestion 1?

--}cyn

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

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 10:35 PM
Subject: Re: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> jaime clark <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED]

Hi, there--

Nice job on the San Jose revisions, Tamina! And thanks for doing the Vallejo fix, Jaime.

Keeping in mind that CAPAFR was responding to our 7/13 Norcal AD visualizations, I still think that some of their suggestions are reasonable minor revisions that we can take care of next week, but I wanted you to see them early so you can advise us if there are any issues.

I spoke briefly to Chris Bowman after his public comment suggestions, which we thought were good ideas. There were:

- For the SDs, he suggested putting Lake into the North Coast district and taking out Cotati and Rohnert Park (not sure I got these details correct--I think there was one more exchange)
- For ADs, he suggested putting both Dixon and Davis in the Napa district to avoid splitting Fairfield
- Also mentioned that the census tract CAPAFR noted for San Francisco/San Mateo move was in Serramonte.

Again this is a heads up, as I'm sure the Commission will want to explore these suggestions next week. I suspect we'll get an updated set of suggestions from CAPAFR and others in time for our Thursday mtg 😊.

Have a nice Sunday,
--}cyn

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:47 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
The changes are very minor changes to a previous visualization.

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:39 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hmm...you should talk us through that b/c the changes seem very minor

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:38 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Ok sounds good. Just to note: I was asked to work off the South Bay Coalition lines and create a hybrid as much as possible between our Monterey and their San Jose, so the CAPAFR lines will undo this change.

Tamina

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:35 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Yes, I'll ask the full commission shortly

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 4:21 PM, Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hi Commissioner,

Did you want to adopt these lines from CAPAFR for ADs?

Tamina

On Sat, Jul 16, 2011 at 2:52 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Tamina--

Note these very reasonable suggestions from CAPAFR. They didn't ask us to fix San Leandro!

--}cyn

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

From: **Eugene Lee** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2011 at 7:58 PM
Subject: CAPAFR proposed changes to NorCal Assembly visualizations
To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Deanna Kitamura <[REDACTED]> Daniel Ichinose <[REDACTED]>
Joanna Lee <[REDACTED]>

Dea Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission,

On behalf of the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR), the Asian Pacific American Legal Center submits proposed mapping changes to the Commission's Assembly visualizations posted on July 13 and 14. These proposed mapping changes pertain to the Commission's Assembly visualizations for Northern California.

These proposed mapping changes consist of GIS files and an accompanying narrative description of the proposed changes, both of which are attached to this email.

In a few days, we will submit proposed mapping changes to the Commission's Assembly visualizations for Southern California.

We ask that the Commission give consideration to these proposed mapping changes and transmit them to its line-drawers.

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



**ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN
LEGAL CENTER**

MEMBER OF
ASIAN AMERICAN CENTER
FOR ADVANCING JUSTICE

--

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

[REDACTED]

--

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

[REDACTED]

--

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

[REDACTED]

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

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

--
Cynthia Dai, 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

--
Marian M. Johnston
[REDACTED]