

TO: Citizens Redistricting Commission

FROM: Karin Mac Donald
Manager, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

DATE: March 18, 2011

RE: Clarification in Response to IFB 001

Attachment 4 of the IFB requests information on the activities of any entity that Q2 has provided services to that has supported, donated money to, raised money for candidate for public office, taken a position on a ballot initiative or sought to influence the redistricting process. Our bid fully disclosed the nature of the work Q2 did for the entities listed below. However we provide this additional information about the activities of the entities themselves relating to work with candidates, ballot initiatives and attempts to influence the redistricting process.

We noted that Q2 has provided paid services for The Bureau of State Audits (BSA). As the Commission is aware, BSA was charged with key roles in the commission selection process. While preparing our application we did not consider this an attempt to influence the redistricting process but rather an attempt to comply with state law.

We also noted that Q2 has provided paid services for The Advancement Project. As the Commission is aware from their testimony at your meeting on February 27th, The Advancement Project is working on preparing several resources to facilitate public interaction with the Commission. While preparing our application we did not consider this an attempt to influence the redistricting process but rather an attempt to provide public redistricting resources.

We further noted that Q2 has provided paid services for the School of Law at University of California, Davis (UCD) and George Mason University (GMU). Both UCD and GMU have conducted academic research on redistricting such as that conducted by Q2. In addition George Mason University does maintain an academic website on redistricting, GMU faculty have done presentations on the redistricting process and worked on developing online redistricting software. In the case of both organizations, while preparing our application we did not consider these attempts to influence the redistricting process as they are academic research and an attempt to provide public redistricting resources.

Finally, we noted that Q2 has provided paid services for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law. The disclosure should have instead noted that we provided paid services for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area. Further, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area has worked on litigation under the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) challenging jurisdictions using at-large voting systems to switch to district voting systems. While preparing our application we did not consider this an attempt to influence the redistricting process. Although such actions may lead to the need for redistricting, they do not consist of attempts to influence the actual redistricting process.

In preparing our application we found a 2003 donation attributed to the “Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights/Equal Justice Society, A Project of LCCR” opposing Proposition 54 (prohibiting use of racial data) which we believed was made by the national organization which Q2 has not provided services to. We have subsequently learned that it appears to have been made by the San Francisco organization. Q2 had no involvement in this activity or donation but wished to disclose our former client’s possible work to oppose a ballot initiative.

To avoid any confusion we wish to disclose the work of these organizations. In no way was it our intent to provide false or misleading statements. Thank you for your time and attention.