

**Subject:** REDISTRICTING

**From:** Kurt Anslinger <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 25 May 2011 18:56:59 -0700 (PDT)

**To:** [REDACTED]

Re: REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING 5/23/11, SAN JOSE

Over the years the politicians have made a mess out of redistricting by gerrymandering to keep themselves in office and we now have lifetime politicians. Now we have an opportunity to do it right.

After I attended the public input Hearing on Redistricting in San Jose I came away with one clear message: THEY ARE TRYING TO DIVIDE US.

The majority of the talking points were how to keep the people here from other countries together. Have we not learned this will not work? It has not worked in the past-- remember CHINA TOWN, JAPAN TOWN, LITTLE ITALY, GERMAN TOWN,-- immigrants were put there to band together. This only leads to the other side of the tracks type of thinking with their own laws and codes of conduct. It will form pockets of people using their own language. It will put one group against the other. We may never get the thing that makes us a great nation which is the blending of all of us together. REMEMBER we are all AMERICANS. If you look on your calendar you will see we celebrate many cultures. WE ALL ENJOY CHINESE NEW YEAR, ST. PATRICK'S DAY, CINCO DE MAYO, COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBERFEST. WE CELEBRATE CHRISTMAS, EASTER, LABOR DAY, MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY, PRESIDENT'S DAY, MEMORIAL DAY, LABOR DAY and many more. WE ALL GET TOGETHER AND EVERYONE CELEBRATES IN A BIG WAY "INDEPENDENCE DAY". That says it all. Redistricting lines should make it so we all have to work together and remember as Martin Luther King stated people "*will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character*". Make lines that cut across as straight lines as possible only shifting because of natural barriers. The Federal Voting Rights Act does not give the commission the right to guarantee a group to be solely represented. We all must have equal opportunity, that is the AMERICAN WAY.

Kurt B. Anslinger

Los Gatos

**Subject:** Technical glitches for Assembly Plan submitted by the California Conservative Action Group

**From:** Chris Bowman <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 25 May 2011 11:30:03 -0700

**To:** Tamina Alon <[REDACTED]>

**CC:** [REDACTED]

Dear Tamina:

I spoke with your staff this morning with the hope I could get hold of you or Karin. He suggested that I email you as well as cc the staff of the Commission. Please forward this email to Karin, and if you can resolve the glitches by yourself, please let me know. Thanks.

As may be aware, Monday, the day of submitting plans for the Commission's website, became increasingly chaotic at your Telegraph office, as we approached the 5:00 pm. deadline. Part of the problem is that we did a last day amendment to our Plan 3A which affected 11 of the 16 Assembly districts in that plan, which took nearly four hours to complete.

Beyond the issues of where to send the Plan and in what format -- apparently, some of the files needed to be reformatted (I'm not the expert in those areas, trust me) There were technical glitches along the way, which we didn't discover until we prepared the hard copy packets of maps, stats, and narrative to the Commission Tuesday morning prior to our presentation at Laney College, e.g., there were no district numbers included for our Plan 3A1 for the 11th, 15th, and 17th districts on our small scale, medium, large scale maps, the label for the 17th and 23rd ADs both appear in the district for the 23rd AD, and the P2 and P4 spread sheet for Plan 3A1 didn't organize the districts in numeric order.

Additionally, because we didn't have time to do pdf images of our 5th, 6th, 12th, 13th, and 19th ADs on our Plan 3A1, but they had been made for Plan 3A and the districts had remained the same between the two versions of the Plans, we submitted the map file for Plan 3A as well as for Plan 3A1 so that we there were accurate maps covering all 16 districts. Unfortunately, because the maps and the data conflict for the two plans in 11 of the 16 districts, we're concerned that there might have been some confusion.

The bottom line is that Plan 3A1 is the plan that we finally submitted and presented before the Commission and 3A represents an early plan which was applicable only until Noon on Monday so it should be disregarded in its totality. 3A1 needs to be corrected so that there are image maps for the five Assembly Districts which weren't done, the missing ID numbers for the districts need to be added and corrected in the 23rd AD, the demographic stats needs to be organized in numeric order of the districts, and the block equivalency file must be only for Plan 3A1, not Plan 3A.

Please advise if I need to come to the Q2 center to make these changes, or whether that can be done internally, and if there is any additional confusion that needs to be clarified, or questions that you might have, please feel free to contact me at your convenience at [REDACTED] or via email at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Christopher L. Bowman

**Subject:** re-districting

**From:** "Sabine Swallow" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Wed, 25 May 2011 11:07:09 -0700

**To:** <[REDACTED]>

I would like to voice my opposition to re-districting. I believe that the way the lines are drawn now are important for those of us that live here. we have a wonderful balance of wine production, agriculture and tourist oriented places, such as the ocean and the redwoods, just to mention two.

I hope you take my voice into consideration.

respectfully,

sabine swallow

[REDACTED]

mendocino, ca. 95460