

## Diane Hamel

---

**From:** Astrid Garcia [mailto:agarcia@naleo.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2010 5:33 PM  
**To:** Diane Hamel  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Jul 20, 2010

**Importance:** High

Diane thank you for getting this comment to the Applicant Review Panel.

The agenda was not up, but I hope to attend the meeting between 1:30 and 2:30pm tomorrow. I'm not sure if this time frame will align itself with a period for public comment. If it does not, however, please consider this as my submission for public comment.

Submitted via email for July 20, 2010 ARP meeting by Astrid Garcia, NALEO Educational Fund

First, I want to thank the Panel for their thoughtful work as they review each applicant. It was evident in yesterday's public meeting the careful consideration the Panel is giving to each applicant.

I want to raise once again the recommendations put forth in the July 14 joint letter by NALEO Educational Fund, APALC, MALDEF, and the Greenlining Institute. While the Panel is doing a great job, NALEO Educational Fund is concerned that the current decision making process adopted by the Panel maybe rushed.

To address this issue, I would like to bring the Panel's attention to page 4 of our letter. Our first recommendation is that

"Specifically, the list of 120 applicants to be interviewed should not be finalized until the ARP has analyzed the degree to which the list reflects the diversity of the State, as required by section 60848 (f) of the Voters First Act's implementing regulations, which provide that the ARP 'shall also consider whether the composition of the pool of applicants to participate in Phase III of the application process is reflective of the State's diversity.'"

The Panel has already adopted the 40 individuals to be interviewed in the Other category. Perhaps as the ARP continues the process it can decide on the 40 Republicans and 40 Democrats to be "tentatively" invited and postpone a decision of adopting these 80 as the final 120 list once an analysis, as suggested above has been completed.

By stating this, however, I do not want to deemphasize the importance of still considering each subpool as is described in the second recommendation of the letter: "Furthermore, we encourage the ARP to pay attention to the diversity of each subpool, and not just the overall diversity of the remaining 120 applicants. This is particularly true for the Republican and Other Party; at the same time, we caution that the ARP must continue to pay attention to diversity in the Democratic subpool."

Thank you for taking into consideration these recommendations.

**Astrid Garcia**  
Redistricting and State Policy Manager  
NALEO Educational Fund