

From: Lisa Martinez [mailto:lisamartinez@state.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 6:26 PM
To: Voters First Act; Margarita Fernandez
Subject: LGBT Representation in Applicant Pool ****Violation of §60805 of Regulations****

June 19, 2010
Ms. Mary Camacho
Mr. Nasir Ahmadi
Ms. Kerri Spano

Applicant Review Panel
c/o Bureau of State Audits
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Counsel and Members of the Applicant Review Panel:
I write in regards to the committee's actions reducing the Citizens Redistricting Commission applicant pool to 120 (<http://wedrawthelines.ca.gov/application.html>).

The Voters First Act states the final makeup of the Commission must "reasonably representative of this State's diversity." (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2(c)(1).) Per the State Constitution's mandate for diversity, §60805 of the Regulations state "Appreciation for California's diverse demographics and geography" means all of the following "race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and economic status."

Thus far, sexual orientation has not been mentioned at any meeting as a determinant of diversity, in violation of § 60805 of the Regulations. Based on the supplemental application and supporting documents, we have identified the following members of the LGBT community. **So far, according to publicly available supplemental applicant materials, no member forwarded to the interviewing stage are members of the LGBT community, which compose of 10% to 14% of California's state population.**

Democrats

1. Eric C. Wat (10963), Los Angeles, CA
2. Martha Inez Jimenez (32521), Glendale

Republican

1. Jeffrey Kwong (6467), San Francisco, CA

As Agi Kessler, Chair of the DP/SFV Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley (DP/SFV), an organization representing 25 Democratic clubs in the Los Angeles area, wrote recently to the BSA Regulations Panel,

“it is well known that certain areas of our state have a concentrated population of voters identifying with the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgendered (LGBT) community. These communities may benefit from district lines that preserve their ability to elect representatives responsive to their needs.”

In particular, **it is absolutely troubling that San Francisco Bay Area, which has a population of 256,313 gays and lesbians (according to Gary J. Gates: New Estimates from the American Community Survey, UCLA School of Law, October 2006.) – we only have 1 member of the LGBT community remaining for the San Francisco Bay Area.** The disparities and dramatic under-representation of the LGBT community must be addressed and ***all variables of diversity, including sexual orientation as prescribed by § 60805*** of the Regulations must be adequately met.

Even if you advance all three candidates to the next round, the state’s diverse and vibrant LGBT population will only compose 2.25% of the interview pool – a dramatic disenfranchisement of the state’s LGBT community. I strongly urge you to advance the three remaining LGBT candidates to the next round.

Sincerely,

Lisa Martinez

