

Dear Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission and Executive Director Claypool,

I am writing to address a letter you received on March 16, 2010 from Mr. Ron Nehring, Chairman of the California Republican Party, expressing concern with my potential involvement to provide technical services to the Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC).

Among his concerns is that I am somehow associated with the Democratic Party. Similar concerns were raised by members of the Los Angeles Republican Party and apparently in various blogs. I would not be surprised if similar concerns were raised in the coming days by those trying to influence the selection process. This is entirely appropriate as Proposition 11 was designed to create a transparent and open process. I addressed those concerns in my letter of February 14th which I invite the Commission to review (http://www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov/downloads/public-comments-201102/public_comment_20110214_macdonald.pdf). To repeat, I have been registered Decline to State since May 12, 2005. I have never been a member of any Democratic organization. I have never been paid by any Democratic candidate or organization. Put simply, I am not a Democrat! The political issue I am most passionate about is access for people with dogs to public lands, which I believe to be a non-partisan issue.

Mr. Nehring attempts to associate Professor Bruce Cain with Q2's proposal. I will reiterate that Professor Cain is no longer a resident of California, has had no part in the consulting services provided by Q2 to the CRC to date, and will have no role or financial stake in any services provided by Q2 going forward. Professor Cain has submitted a letter independently verifying these facts. I would also note with some irony that Mr. Nehring describes me as a "protégé" of Professor Cain when Ken Miller, the current head of the Rose Institute and member of their proposal, had his PhD work supervised by Professor Cain and co-authored several articles with him.

Mr. Nehring also cites an article by Dan Walters that describes the Statewide Database as, "a resource that began life as a Democratic Party's redistricting information bank." With due respect to Mr. Walters, his description is both inaccurate and misleading. The Statewide Database was in fact created by a bipartisan legislative vote with the intent of taking the politics out of the process of creating the redistricting database. I was in no way involved with the production of redistricting data when that function was done by the Legislature. Indeed, during the 1981 and 1991 redistrictings I was a citizen of another country. and I was not in the U.S. during either process. My work at the SWDB began in 1994. In the same article, Mr. Walters praises the work of Paul McKaskle but he neglects to mention that Prof. McKaskle was one of the original members of the Statewide Database's Board of Directors. Another original board member was former Republican minority leader of the California State Assembly Bob Naylor.

To address concerns like those raised by Mr. Nehring we have provided all the information requested by the IFB's Conflict and Impartiality Statement, including information on our past donors and clients.

Mr. Nehring also expresses his belief that Q2 Data & Research does not have the necessary skills to successfully meet the commission's needs. This will obviously be an issue for the

Commission to consider in evaluating our application and I welcome that scrutiny. I believe our proposal fully meets the requirements of the IFP including the general, administrative and scope of work requirements. As you well know, we have decades of experience creating the nation's only statewide, non-partisan redistricting database, have worked with award-winning independent redistricting commissions in San Diego and San Francisco and our Voting Rights Act Implementation Coordinator has been involved in statewide redistricting litigation.

Mr. Nehring's specific concern is a perceived lack of statewide experience. In response I will highlight that, as shown in my resume, I have designed, implemented and managed two statewide academic redistricting projects in California that required the creation of multiple different statewide redistricting scenarios. These projects studied competition and nesting respectively as redistricting criteria, along with traditional redistricting criteria interactions as they pertain to California's geography, as well as how the different uses of mappers impacted how lines were configured. These were completely transparent projects that were extensively peer reviewed, and received national recognition. Several members of Q2's team also worked on these projects.

This research directly impacted the configuration of Q's proposal. Our research into mapper effects found that plans that utilized less part-time staff, more experienced staff and required fewer hand-offs between staff minimized errors and maximized quality. Therefore, we deliberately avoided including any undergraduate students in our proposal to protect against the kind of problems Mr. Nehring describes in his letter. Indeed, every member of our team minimally has a Bachelor of Arts degree, and our team includes two JDs, a PhD, an M.A. and three team members are working on their PhDs. Despite Mr. Nehring's insinuation, Q2's proposal provides the biographies and resumes of all management, supervisory and key personnel that would work on the contract.

Mr. Nehring's fundamental argument is that the Commission should hire a bipartisan staff, namely a Democrat and a Republican. I freely admit those are services I cannot provide as I am neither a Democrat nor a Republican. Q2 can and is offering the commission nonpartisan services as you confront the difficult challenge of reconfiguring California's electoral districts.

Best regards,

Karin Mac Donald
Q2 Data & Research, LLC