

Subject: Public Comment: 2 - San Bernardino

From: James Walters <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 2011 16:59:40 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: James Walters <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Where are the transcripts?

Message Body:

Why are the transcripts not showing up past April on your website? With all the accusations that this process is being hijacked by special interest groups, I would think it would be a priority to get these transcripts out to the public as soon as possible. It really does make it look like there is something to hide.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

The new Kings County districts make sense but at least in the Senate plan, the Section 5 districts for Merced and Monterey do not. The Merced-Monterey districts were among the worst of the 2001 gerrymander; with Monterey County cut up so one Senate district runs miles south to Santa Maria and the other takes Salinas Latino neighborhoods and hooks them with Merced. This was done not to enhance minority voting opportunities but to satisfy favored politicians. Unfortunately, the Commission's maps retain this division. A better plan to enhance minority opportunities would be to combine Monterey's large Latino population with East San Jose, a more sensible community of interest, and thus create a new Latino Senate district.

Then there is Stockton. Alas poor Stockton, I knew thee well. Why is it that every decade Stockton gets dismembered? The current plan is so bad that not one legislator or member of congress representing San Joaquin County actually lives in that county. Sadly, the Commission maps don't improve things. Stockton's new congressional district goes off to Antioch, miles away and with no community of interest. Uniting Stockton with closer communities like Tracy makes more sense. And one San Joaquin Assembly district runs from Lodi through four counties with stopovers in Discovery Bay, Vacaville and Woodland. Surely, the Commission can do better than that.

After June 10 there is certain to be an outcry from many communities who won't like what they see. Early on the Commission said it would hire a peer reviewer to go over the maps and provide a second set of eyes. Given their academic background, the line drawing team publicly stated they favored peer review as it is common in the academic world. They should be held to this.

Now comes the hard part, reconciling the many legitimate communities of interest who still have reason to be displeased. The Commission has done well in its first exercise, much better than I thought it would. But further community hearings, and an experienced peer reviewer (obviously with no connection to either party), will make the final product even better.

Tony Quinn

New E-Mail: [REDACTED]

New Home Page:
[REDACTED]