

**AGPA01**

---

**From:** Graham Crowe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2010 5:00 PM  
**To:** Voters First Act  
**Subject:** Selection Process for Final Six Commissioners

I have several comments about the selection process itself.

At the end of the December 1st meeting, there was a discussion about whether the final 28 applicants would be interviewed by the eight commissioners. The commissioners decided not to do this because they already had sufficient information available. Chairman Yao then tried to get the commission to come back by December 4th or December 6th. But, due to scheduling conflicts, the first day all commissioners could meet was December 10th. It was decided additional information about the applicants could be requested in writing, if necessary.

On December 10th, the commissioners did not begin discussing individual applicants until 12:40pm and the decision on the slate of six was made by 3pm. During this time, 11 of the 28 commissioners were not mentioned at all. Most of the remaining 17 received less than five minutes of discussion each. There was a certain sense of urgency because there was to be a one-hour public comment period, via e-mail, on the slate of six that was also to have taken place on December 10th. That comment period was ultimately extended after members of the audience said one hour was too short.

At one point, Paul McKaskle was included on the slate, but was taken off for two reasons: (1) concerns about the Central Valley not being represented, and (2) Mr. McKaskle could be offered a position on the staff.

However, on page 117 of Mr. McKaskle's transcript, he stated "I'm not interested in being a lawyer for the Commission. I only want to be one of 14 equal members." Perhaps the commissioners did not see this when they reviewed the materials. Now, Mr. McKaskle has written a letter reiterating his position. This is an example of why conducting brief interviews or at the very least requesting responses in writing could have been useful.

It would have been better to have had at least two full days to discuss the applicants before choosing a slate for the public to comment on. Perhaps the same six would have been chosen at the end of that process, but at least it would have been more thorough. As it stands now, it will be very difficult to make any changes. There should at least be a substantive discussion on December 15 rather than a quick ratification of what has already been decided.

Graham Crowe