

Subject: Registration Data

From: "Peter Van Meter" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 2011 11:00:25 -0700

To: <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners -

The direction that you are giving this morning (6/1) to look at registration data for "cohesiveness" or other COI indication is an explicit violation of the constitutional requirement to "not include relationships with political parties" in the line drawing process.

Please do not do this.

Peter Van Meter, Principal

MyCRE LLC

[REDACTED]
Sausalito, CA 94965

Day: [REDACTED] Evening: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Former Sausalito City Council Member

CRC Applicant

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT -- Follow-on Meetings

From: James Wright <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 2011 20:51:58 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED]

Commissioners,

Your meetings between release one and two should concentrate on two points.

1. Commissioners should present and discuss that portion of the four maps which are of local concern at the meeting location.
2. Solicit comment about the edges of districts shown in those maps.

Meetings between release two and three should concentrate on two points.

1. Commissioners should again present and discuss that portion of the four maps which are of local concern at the meeting location with emphasis on any changes which were made following the first release.
2. Solicit comment about only the edges of districts shown in those maps

Any Meetings to be held after release three may be only for the sole purpose of explaining the final maps.

The notice for each meeting must clearly identify which specific districts are the only ones to be discussed at each meeting.

Jim Wright
a voter from San Jose

Subject: AD visualizations

From: Allen Payton [REDACTED]

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 2011 15:52:14 -0700 (PDT)

To: CA Citizens Redistricting Commission <[REDACTED]>

CC: Karin MacDonald <[REDACTED]>

Dear Commissioners:

I just took a look at the Bay Area Assembly District visualizations you received from Q2, today and have mixed thoughts.

On one hand combining the East Bay communities of Lamorinda (Lafayette, Moraga & Orinda), Walnut Creek, the San Ramon Valley (Alamo, Diablo, Danville, Blackhawk, San Ramon, Camino Tassajara and Eastern Alameda County together does make sense.

Just a few concerns, however. It appears you've split Walnut Creek, which doesn't seem necessary. Also, why is it necessary for the Hayward AD to cross the Alameda-Contra Costa County line? There aren't very many people, if any in that area.

What you've done to Eastern Contra Costa County on the other hand, doesn't make sense. In fact the map shows you've disregarded the little input you've had from that area, which was to keep Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Discovery Bay together. As a reminder they have common Joint Powers Authorities for highway, transit and major transportation improvements in their sub region of the county. Plus Antioch handles Brentwood's police dispatch, just to name a few reasons they should be kept in one district.

Instead you've split off Brentwood, Byron and Discovery Bay and gerrymandered them into a district with Solano county, and portions of Sacramento and Yolo Counties.

You can't even get to those East Contra Costa communities from any of the rest of the district without having to drive through an adjacent district, unless you travel by boat. It's definitely not compact by any means, stretching across four counties in a rather random manner.

It would make more sense to put Martinez, Pacheco, Vine Hill, Mountain View and a portion of Concord in the same district as Solano County, instead, since Solano County and North-Central Contra Costa County are connected by the Benicia Bridge and I-680 - which is a major transportation corridor for Solano County commuters.

Please put Brentwood, Byron and Discovery Bay and the rest of Eastern Contra Costa County back together with Antioch, Oakley, Bethel Island, Knightsen, Pittsburg and Bay Point. We have the Mt. Diablo foothills and the Sacramento River to the north and the San Joaquin River to the east as natural boundaries.

Below are the communities and population figures you would have to move from one district to the other. Just a shift between two districts is all that would be necessary.

If you move the following communities into the same district as Antioch, Pittsburg, Oakley and Bay Point:

Brentwood 51,481

Discovery Bay 13,352

Byron 1,277

Non-CDP Areas 7,696

TOTAL 73,806

you could move the following communities into the district with Solano County:

Martinez 35,824

Vine Hill 3,761

Mountain View 2,372

Pacheco 3,685

Alhambra Valley 924

Concord (part) 27,240

TOTAL 73,806

or

Martinez 35,824

Vine Hill 3,761

Mountain View 2,372

Pacheco 3,685

Alhambra Valley 924

Pleasant Hill 33,152

TOTAL 79,718 +5,912

For those of us who live here, that would make more sense and you would have much more compact, common-sense districts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Allen Payton

Chairman

Contra Costa Citizens Redistricting Task Force

[REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

www.FairTheLines.org - California Conservative Action Group

Subject: Public Comment for May 27 & 28

From: Chrisrob <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 2011 21:12:56 -0700 (PDT)

To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

CC: Laura Andrus [REDACTED] Walter Klein <[REDACTED]> ,
[REDACTED]

Hello,

I was instructed by Commissioner Barabba that I would not be able to comment on agenda items at the Northridge Commission meetings so I should send in my comments in writing.

Please find a MSWord document which covers the key areas I wanted to address.

Please make sure all members of the Commission receive a copy and that Q2 Data receives a copy in case part three of my piece creates any extra work.


Robert M. Neff
Culver City

Public Input.doc

Concerns at the Start of the Line Drawing

By Robert M. Neff

June 1, 2011



This is a public comment for the May 27th and May 28th meetings of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission which were held on the CSU Northridge campus. As there was no opportunity to provide this comment in person, I am submitting the comment in writing and asking that all members plus key staff receive a copy. Please also announce the receipt of this comment for the record.

My name is Robert Neff, and I was a presenter at San Marcos & San Jose. I also attended the Northridge Commission meetings May 26th through May 28th. I submitted the “Starting Assembly Plan” which provided a value neutral redistricting of the 80 Assembly Districts without violation of county or city lines down to a deviation below 0.01%. I also submitted a State Senate layover of the “Starting Assembly Plan” and a plan for the Board of Equalization.

There are three areas of discussion:

- 1) The start of the Line Drawing process plus a view of Section 5 and Section 2 Districts.
- 2) Historic African American Districts in Los Angeles.
- 3) Election standards before drawing Section 2 Districts.

1) The Start of Line Drawing plus a view of Section 5 and Section 2 Districts

I had hoped to speak to you before you started your process to encourage you to look at all current districts and their representation and deviation from the target population. Then my suggestion would have been to begin to close split cities and counties. This could have been taken further, and the individual districts could have been balanced to see how this would effect the districts statewide. The ideal would have then been to proceed to adjust the districts using Community of Interest testimony as well as to meet the needs of Section 5 and Section 2 communities.

The Commission started the work of drawing actual district lines by first focusing on drawing Section 5 and Section 2 Districts. My concern is that it seemed that these two different types of districts were being treated the same.

The policy purpose behind the Voting Rights Act (from which the two sections come) was to counter established discrimination and/or to empower an identified group to effect representation. The problem is that there are many ways to measure representation. In general one can look at three levels of representation for a specific ethnic group:

Level A - Only members of the specific group are likely be elected

Level B – Members of the group are competitive to be elected


Level C – The group can influence who is elected.

“Level A” is a point that is likely to be considered discriminatory. “Level B” can range over a number of possibilities where the specific group has a high to low likelihood of electing one of their own members. Satisfaction of this level is very subjective. “Level C” is often forgotten with the drawing of districts for group representation and in itself is even more subjective as the ability to influence has different definitions.

Concerns at the Start of the Line Drawing

By Robert M. Neff

June 1, 2011



Many Commissioners have been very concerned with possible challenges to the districts that are drawn. Section 5 Districts are very distinct. The standards are dictated by judicial action on behalf of the ethnic groups named in the original suits, and the opponent in court would be the U.S. Department of Justice. Section 2 Districts are very different as the standards are not as clearly defined; and groups are most likely to take action in court. To meet Section 5 needs, various rules such as not crossing incorporated city lines can be ignored. However, all the other rules still need to be met when possible for Section 2. A Section 2 drawing that reaches a certain number (say 53%) becomes undesirable if it crosses incorporated city lines, compared to a similar plan that has a lower number (say 49%) that does not cross those same city lines.

With the poorly defined standards for Section 2 districts there are some other points to consider:

- 1) Is there any history of discrimination in the area?
- 2) Is there evidence of group bloc voting?
- 3) Are there candidates from the group running for office?
- 4) Is there broader leadership from the group in the greater community?

Some want a specific line to use in making these decisions. By default many states use a 50% standard (or 51%) to decide that a Section 2 district needs to be drawn. There are problems with this used by itself.

Historically the early examples of discrimination where such standards were set were in districts which had only “Black” and “White” populations. In these cases using a 50% (or 51%) standard to draw such a district for “Black CVAP” would empower the African American community. Using this standard does not necessarily do a good job of addressing multi ethnic areas as are found in California. Not that the Commission should create new standards, but there are other ways to look at the numbers to establish what is a “majority-minority” district:

- 1) All minorities vs Non-Hispanic Whites (NHW)
- 2) Top group vs NHW
- 3) Top group vs next group (NHW or other)
- 4) Top group vs all others groups (including NHW)

In Case #1 there could be 32% Hispanic Origin, 12% Black, and, 8% Asian for 52% versus 48% NHW for a district where the NHW are no longer the majority.

With Case #2 if the Hispanic Origin was 42% (12% Black and 8% Asian for a total of 62%) versus the NHW being at 38% then again the NHW is no longer the majority ... but now the Hispanic Origin has a plurality.

For Case #3 there could be 44% Hispanic Origin versus 26% Asian (12% Black & 18% NHW) giving the Hispanic Origin a margin of 18 points better than the Asian.


Case #4 is the most common model used by groups seeking Section 2 actions for their community. However, the numbers could be 53% Hispanic Origin versus 10% Black, 12% Asian, and, 25% NHW. This not only places Hispanic Origin with a true majority versus all other groups (not just NHW) but also results in a 28 point advantage over the next largest group.

These different ways of measuring “majority” show that there are different standards that can be used rather than the straight 50%.

Concerns at the Start of the Line Drawing

By Robert M. Neff

June 1, 2011



2) Historic African American Districts

I wanted to address the issue of what have been viewed as the African American districts in Los Angeles. With the redistricting plans that I dealt with ten years ago and with my own political involvement over the years being mostly in Los Angeles County, this brings me very close to this issue. Also illustrated is my concern of how Section 2 districts are drawn.

There has been a submission of plans for districts covering the African American area of Los Angeles (there is a similar area in and around Alameda County). The request was to keep the districts in some similar form and NOT to combine the Black demographics to form a 50% or more district. The presentation was made by leaders from the African American community. The leaders said that the lines of the current districts as they were already drawn were meeting their needs as a community to be represented. They argued that if the Commission were to lump Blacks into fewer districts, they would have less influence, not more.

The issue of these districts illustrates a need for a standard to apply in Section 2 situations. The measure of what numbers are needed to reach “Level B” is open to debate. The legal standard used by most advocates is 50%; however, these existing districts have elected African American representatives for decades. Drawing one or two districts with a 50% or higher Black population would draw numbers away from neighboring districts and would dilute African American representation. **If the purpose of “Level B” is to be able to have the chance to elect a candidate from a group, then the proof of reaching that goal is most clearly shown in having such a candidate elected.**

Here are four current Black Assembly Districts in Los Angeles County where the Black population is below 50%:

AD 47 – 29.50% Non-Hispanic White (NHW), 29.00% Hispanic Origin (HO), 25.58% Black (B), and, 13.78% Asian. And the “Citizen Voting Age Population in 2009” (CVAP) is 37% NHW CVAP, 16% HO CVAP, 33% B CVAP, and, 12% Asian CVAP.

AD 48 – 4.82% NHW, 54.72% HO, 25.36% B, and, 13.67% A.
Citizen Voting Age Pop is 10% NHW CVAP, 31% HO CVAP, 46% B CVAP, and, 12% A CVAP

AD 51 – 11.89% NHW, 49.57% HO, 27.54% B, and, 8.79% A.
Citizen Voting Age Pop is 20% NHW CVAP, 31% HO CVAP, 38% B CVAP, and, 9% A CVAP

AD 52 – 2.07% NHW, 72.92% HO, 22.25% B, and, 1.38% A.
Citizen Voting Age Pop is 5% NHW CVAP, 48% HO CVAP, 42% B CVAP, and, 2% A CVAP

As you can see by the numbers for these four assembly districts any movement to push Black numbers to create one or two districts of 50% or greater Black CVAP would reduce Black numbers in other districts. The same data can be found for State Senate and Congressional districts. A merger of Black numbers would clearly be “packing,” resulting in a loss to the African American community.

Maintaining these districts should not be for the purpose of incumbent protection. Keeping the Black numbers at similar levels will allow the African American community to continue to elect their members (or someone who they have an affinity with), but where the lines are drawn may change which particular African Americans are elected.

There are five spots to focus on for the start of line drawing for districts in this community.

Concerns at the Start of the Line Drawing

By Robert M. Neff

June 1, 2011

- 1) The north face of the Baldwin Hills running north through Village Green.
- 2) The Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza running north along Martin Luther King Boulevard.
- 3) Leimert Park and points east.
- 4) Hyde Park and points south & east.
- 5) Inglewood and points south.

The districts drawn can take in different mixtures of the rest of the Baldwin Hills, and the communities and areas of: Baldwin Village, Baldwin Vista, Chesterfield Square, Crenshaw, Jefferson Park, King Estates, University Park, Watts, West Adams, Exposition Park, Athens, Compton, Florence-Graham, Huntington Park, Inglewood, Ladera Heights, Lynwood, and, View Park-Windsor Hills.

3) Looking at Election Standards for the Rest of the Districts

The historic African American districts of Los Angeles show how “making Section 2 districts” first without looking at which representative standards have already been reached (already achieved “real” Level B with an elected representative from a key group) can cause problems. If districts in an area have already elected minority representation, then the moving of a group or minorities in general into fewer districts creates a packing situation. To protect the larger redistricting plan from legal action, checking to see what already exists is required.

With the current Assembly Districts there are 52 districts with a Non-Hispanic White (NHW) population under 50% and of those districts, in 32 the NHW is not even the plurality (in two cases they are the fourth group).

When looking at Citizen Age Voting Population, there are 32 current Assembly Districts with NHW CVAP below 50%. Of these districts, 21 show the NHW is not even the plurality (in AD 48 NHW is fourth in CVAP).

The numbers in many of these districts are already strong for various groups. The Hispanic Origin CVAP is in the largest group in seventeen districts (with an outright majority versus all other groups in ten districts), the Black CVAP is in the plurality in two districts, and, the Asian CVAP is the biggest group in two districts.

Given that these numbers are already in the current Assembly Districts, many already have elected representatives from their group and so have proven to have achieved “Level B.” Any drawing of Section 2 districts that combines two or more of these districts that have already elected individuals from their group can be considered “packing.” Overly adding to these same districts that have large minority numbers and have elected their own representative could be pushing the CVAP to a “Level A” (discriminatory) margin which creates a whole different problem.

Do check the existing districts for proof of representation (“Level B”) before proceeding with drawing of Section 2 districts, otherwise the Commission is undoing advances in representation that has already been achieved. These same issues exist for the State Senate and Congressional districts.

Thank you,
Robert Neff, Culver City