

Subject: California Redistricting Commission

From: Richard Daniel <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 28 May 2011 15:19:47 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners:

I am a resident of Contra Costa County, and I am writing to urge your support of all of the Bay Area Maps submitted on May 24, by the California Conservative Action Group and the California Citizens Redistricting Task Force.

We support a fair and competitive Congressional District comprised Lamorinda, Walnut Creek, Oakley, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, The San Ramon Valley, and the Tri-Valley (Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore).

Sincerely,

Richard and Joyce Daniel

[REDACTED]
Walnut Creek, Ca. 94596

Subject: State Commission

From: Allen Payton [REDACTED]

Date: Sat, 28 May 2011 18:48:45 -0700 (PDT)

To: CA Citizens Redistricting Commission <[REDACTED]>

CC: Chris Bowman <[REDACTED]> Larry Molton <[REDACTED]>

CCCRTF,

For those who watched the state Commission meeting either, yesterday or today, you heard a term you may not recognize.

I know I didn't.

It's CVAP. That refers to Citizen Voting Age Population, which is the 18+ percentage of population you see attached to our maps, broken down by race, specifically Hispanic, Non-Hispanic Asian, Non-Hispanic Black and Non-Hispanic White.

It is my understanding that according to their legal counsel direction on the 1965 Voting Rights Act, Section 5, the Commission has to ensure the current CVAP percentages aren't diminished in the four Section 5 Counties in California: Monterey, Merced, Kings and Yuba, from what they are as of the 2000 Census. So the result is those counties drive the map drawing for the rest of the state.

However, I believe it can and might be argued in court on our side, if the Commission draws maps that are gerrymandered to accommodate those counties on this issue, that it's now 45 years later, things have changed, population shifts have occurred, and they should no longer be treated as they were back in the 1960's. But, we'll see.

Larry Molton, who is an attorney from Santa Clara County and has been working with us on our efforts, can correct me if I'm wrong.

Allen Payton
Chairman
Contra Costa Citizens Redistricting Task Force

[REDACTED]

www.FairTheLines.org - California Conservative Action Group

www.ccredistricting.org - Contra Costa Board of Supervisors

www.wedrawthelines.com - California Citizens Redistricting Commission - State Legislature & Congress

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Contra Costa

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 28 May 2011 18:36:38 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Gerrymandering and unfair deadlilnes.

Message Body:

The Commisson set a May 23 deadline for citizen comments affecting the June 10 preliminary maps. When citizens learned the dates for their region's wrap-up on, say, May 19, they had to struggle to get their community to email comments by May 18 so they would be heard. At one May 19 wrap-up, you only used comments through May 14! This was probably typical. I think this is unfair, especially because you didn't even post that region's hearing video until May 19.

Now I see that the Commission is having more group presentations affecting the regions.

These powerful, highly financed, lawyer-laden special interest groups have expensive maps and big influence. Since you stopped citizen comments May 23, where is the average citizens' opportunity to react to these maps?!

Many citizen groups in my area have been working day and night on a volunteer basis to present comments. Unlike the richly financed left-wing political interest groups that are presenting testimony, we are working with no budget at all. You are disfavoring our efforts even though they are the only true citizen-based efforts in the entire process.

You appear to favor the highly, outrageously Gerrymandered maps presented by MALDEF, a virulently political group. You should not be gerrymandering at all. Compact, equally sized districts which respect community (transportation, school districts, towns, cities) interests are required by Article 21 of our State Constitution.

Nothing requires you to find, lump together, and create new "minority" districts, but you appear to be trying to do that. In fact, such an effort is unconstitutional and clearly so.

This is supposed to be citizen-based redistricting, but I fear that the powerful special interest groups will have the final say.

What is your plan to remedy this problem? I understand that it will be very hard to alter the June 10 maps after they're published.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter,

Carol M. Hehmeyer

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Contra Costa

From: Dolores Shore <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 28 May 2011 15:42:58 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Dolores Shore <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Attn: California Redistricting Commission:

Message Body:

Attn: California Redistricting Commission:

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Dolores Shore _____; I am writing to urge your support of all of the Bay Area Maps being submitted by the California Conservative Action Group. I support fair and competitive districts that fully comply with Proposition 11 with district geography criteria of natural geographical boundaries such as mountain ranges, bodies of water, of equal population and that comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act. I want my district lines to maintain district contiguity, and compactness by keeping cities, communities and neighborhoods intact as much as possible.

1. I strongly oppose the Sierra Club Bay Area plan that violates the Voting Rights Act and gerrymanders the TriValley.
2. I agree with the Sierra Club plan ONLY on the one point, not to cross the Bay and Golden Gate Bridges.
3. I reject the San Joaquin County Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting plan; they carve up the TriValley to create a San Joaquin district favorable to a tiny fraction of our Bay Area population.
4. I reject the Latino Policy Forum maps; they create an absurd district that jumps over the water to connect Marin, half of San Francisco and West Oakland in violation of the Federal Voting Rights Act.
5. I strongly oppose the California Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan and insist that districts not jump across the East Bay hills, because the communities from San Leandro to Milpitas have little in common with the Tri-Valley, and everything in common with each other. The commission got overwhelming testimony in the Oakland input hearings to this effect, both from Tri-Valley and from Oakland, San Leandro, Milpitas, Richmond, El Cerrito etc. to the effect, "Keep the Berkeley Oakland Hills as a natural geographic barrier between urban, ethnic, diverse communities west of the hills and suburban bedroom and office park communities east of the hills."
6. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) gerrymander of Union City, an overwhelmingly Asian and Latino city along the East Bay shoreline that CIJEE links with the Tri-Valley communities such as San Ramon and Livermore. Union City is linked to its neighbors in Fremont and Newark by ethnicity, job patterns, and I-880. It has no connection whatsoever to Danville! Additionally, there was very clear testimony at the Oakland input hearing from community groups centered around the auto industry who did NOT want to be connected to Tri-Valley.
7. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan forcing communities of Lamorinda and Pleasant Hill into a district with Berkeley, as was done in 1981, and is being resurrected by CIJEE. The Berkeley-Oakland area is different in every demographic respect from the suburban communities on the other side of the mountains.
8. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan gerrymandering that put the mid-Peninsula area around Palo Alto with the city of Santa Cruz - a city on the other side of a mountain range, in a different county, and on the ocean.
9. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan which splits the Latino community in San Jose into two Assembly districts, although it should be kept together in one district.
10. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan for

Marin. Any AD based in Marin should expand north along Hwy 101, to reach people who work in Marin. It should not be gerrymandered far east to Benicia, which it has nothing in common with.

11. I strongly oppose the Institute for Jobs, Economy, and Education (CIJEE) plan which merges North Bay districts with SF districts. We insist that the North Bay districts be kept separate from the SF districts.

12. I reject the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting CAPAFR plan. Specifically but not limited to joining Fremont with The TriValley: the City of Pleasanton.

13. I reject the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) plan for violations of the Voter Rights Act and abusive gerrymandering. So ridiculous that one commissioner spoke out during MALDEF's presentation on 5/26 in Northridge stating "Why so many Gerrymander Fingers?"

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: How NOT to draw district lines

From: Jerry <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 28 May 2011 08:09:05 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

I am Gerald Hashimoto, a Republican who ran in the 9th Congressional District in Cal. I urge the commission to NOT allow district to cross natural, geographical boundaries. The change in social, cultural, social, moral, and ethnic values are astonishing, to put it mildly. My district encompassed Berkeley-Oakland, one world; it crossed the Oakland Hills to Castro Valley. This area was so different, that I was obligated to run, in essence, 2 different campaigns.

Specifically:

- 1) do not permit districts to cross Bridges, such as the Bay Bridge, the Golden Gate, Richmond, or Dumbo.
- 2) do not permit bridges to cross mountain ranges or hills, specifically the Oakland-Berkeley Hills.

with regards,
Gerald Hashimoto.