

Sunny Andrews

From: Barbara Paget
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2009 3:02 PM
To: Sunny Andrews
Subject: Prop 11 Citizens' Redistricting Commission Update

From: Peter Knight [
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 11:45 AM
To: Barbara Paget
Subject: Re: Prop 11 Citizens' Redistricting Commission Update

Having read the Section 8251-8253, I have following comments.

Overall, the applicant pool should be larger, say 100: 35 + 35 + 30; no persons should be eliminated by politicians and no persons "chosen" by anyone. We are trying here to get a panel that is INDEPENDENT of politicians, and the political "old-boy" network - that's what the Prop. promised.

1. Applicant review Panel

a) 3 is too few, make it 5 with a quorum requirement for decision of 4 and a vote of 3 needed for any decision.

b) requiring panel members to be registered auditors is silly nepotism, I'm certain that many lawyers, accountants and physicists are quite well educated and able to make sound judgments; replace this with the requirement that members have at least 10 years CA residency, English fluency, no felony convictions, and have an advanced degree in any discipline.

c) all the voting provisions that say there have to be n from largest party, n from second etc are recipes for stagnation and indecision (since one block can effectively veto any proposal). So, except as required by the statute that passed, these should be eliminated and replaced with simple majorities

2. Applicant Pool

a) All the requirements for the applicant pool except registered party membership are vague and impossible to assess with any impartiality (relevant analytical skills, ability to be impartial, and appreciation for California's diverse demographics and geography). Replace this with 10 years CA residency, English fluency, no felony convictions, some level of education, and some impartiality test based on a written examination.

b) Unless it's in the legislation, I propose you strike all the provisions allowing politicians to arbitrarily remove 8 names from each pool of 20. This appears to defeat the entire purpose of the Prop.

c) It is not clear what is the purpose of the second panel of 6 members (after the main panel of 8). Are these paid members? Do they vote on anything? If not, what are they for; I recommend these are dropped.

d) The process for selecting this 2nd panel if there is to be such a thing and they have any purpose (i.e. n from largest party, n from second etc) is a recipe for indecision and back-room deal-making. So, except as required by the statute that passed, this should be eliminated and replaced with simple majorities.

e) I also challenge the validity of the diversity requirements (racial, ethnic, geographic, and gender diversity); why not age? If the panel is to have 14 "full" members, why not select them according to the same process that the first 8 were selected? Qualified people selected by random drawing - that's what the Prop. promised.

Regards,
Peter Knight