

From: **LAWSON_BRIAN** [REDACTED]
Date: Sat, Feb 5, 2011 at 8:51 PM
Subject: public comment for Feb. 10 meeting on 1991 Special Masters Report
To: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov
Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear California Redistricting Commission Members:

Please consider the attached public comment for the February 10, 2011 meeting of the commission.

Thank you,

-- Brian

Prepared February 5, 2011 for Commission meeting February 10, 2011

TO: California Redistricting Commission Members

FROM: Brian Lawson

RE: **1991 Masters Report**

The handout for the February 10, 2011 meeting on the 1991 Masters Report is extremely valuable. It would be a shame if poor formatting hinders commissioners from reading the report. Luckily the report has been archived by the Institute for Governmental Studies at UC Berkeley in an easy to read format on the web. The table of contents for the report, with clickable links for each section is available at

<http://igs.berkeley.edu/library/research/quickhelp/policy/redistricting/reapp90-report/final-toc.html>

(also, included on the second page of this document)

There are three parts of the report which I believe you would find particularly useful. The entire report and the additional material available are worth reading.

- 1) **II-B Voting Rights Act** This section does a good job of describing why section 2 of the voting rights act (creation of minority-majority districts) is a more contentious part of the VRA than the section 5 pre-clearance process. Keep in mind there has been 20 years of Supreme Court case law since this section was written.
- 2) **IV The Process Used In Drawing Plans** This section may be useful in giving you one idea of how the process of drawing districts for these different maps was approached. Not that you would necessarily want to do it this way, but it is an example of the general approach.
- 3) **III Why We Reject Other Plans** This section may be useful in giving you some idea of how the Special Masters took ideas from some plans, while ultimately defending their own plan.

Finally, I would encourage you, after reading over this report, if you have questions, to take advantage of Mr. McKaskle's experience with this subject by asking him to share that experience with you in whatever way he would be willing to participate.

I submitted a previous public comment in which I suggested that he had extensive knowledge he could share with you and I still feel that is the case. In that public comment I mentioned that I thought perhaps he would have "too much" experience and would end up guiding the commission. Given the strong personalities on the commission I am sorry I made that suggestion. I hope if you have the opportunity to select a replacement commissioner that you will make him your first choice. I have not met Mr. McKaskle and do not know him personally.

Table of Contents

- I. [INTRODUCTION](#)
 - A. [Procedural History](#)
 - B. [Conclusions and Recommendations](#)
- II. [REVIEW OF CRITERIA](#)
 - A. [Introduction](#)
 - B. [Voting Rights Act](#)
 - 1. [Overview](#)
 - 2. [Guidelines in *Thornburg v. Gingles*](#)
 - a. [Geographic Compactness](#)
 - b. [Size of Minority Group](#)
 - c. [Political Cohesiveness; Multiple Minorities](#)
 - d. [Minority Influence Claims](#)
 - C. [Population Equality](#)
 - 1. [State Legislative Districts](#)
 - 2. [Congressional Districts](#)
 - D. [The State Constitution, *Reinecke*, and the Voting Rights Act](#)
 - 1. [State Constitutional Requirements](#)
 - a. [Contiguity](#)
 - b. [Geographical Integrity](#)
 - 2. [The *Reinecke* IV Requirements](#)
 - 3. [Interrelationships Between Article XXI and *Reinecke* IV Criteria](#)
 - a. [Population Equality](#)
 - b. [Contiguity, Geographic Integrity, Community of Interest and Compactness](#)
 - c. [City and County Boundaries and Community of Interest](#)
 - 4. [Interrelationships Between State Criteria and the Voting Rights Act](#)
 - E. [Combining Assembly Districts to Form Senate Districts](#)
- III. [WHY WE REJECT OTHER PLANS](#)
- IV. [THE PROCESS USED IN DRAWING PLANS](#)
- V. [PLANS RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION](#)
 - A. [Assembly Plan](#)
 - 1. [In General](#)
 - 2. [North Coastal Region Districts](#)
 - 3. [North Interior Region Districts](#)
 - 4. [Southern California Region Districts](#)
 - B. [Senate Plan](#)
 - 1. [In General](#)
 - 2. [North Coastal Region Districts](#)
 - 3. [North Interior Region Districts](#)
 - 4. [Southern California Region Districts](#)
 - C. [Congressional Plan](#)
 - 1. [In General](#)
 - 2. [North Coastal Region Districts](#)
 - 3. [North Interior Region Districts](#)
 - 4. [Southern California Region Districts](#)
 - D. [State Board of Equalization Plan](#)
- VI. [OTHER CONSIDERATIONS](#)
 - A. ["Political Fairness" and Incumbent Status](#)
 - B. [Final Disposition of Materials](#)

[\[Endnotes\]](#)

Additional Material Available at IGS not posted on the web: [Box 1](#) | [Box 2](#) | [Box 3](#) | [Box 4](#) | [Box 5](#)
The outline of material in each of these boxes gives some sense of the timeline followed in 1991.