

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Contra Costa

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 2011 18:40:28 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Subject:

Message Body:

This is a CORRECTED comment. I meant JUNE 10 !!!

June 10 is the official date for the release of the first, proposed maps for the Redistricting Commission. The Commission is now under a tremendous amount of pressure to get those maps finalized by the August 15 deadline.

However, now is also the time for the Commission to commence the Independent Peer Review process to check Q2's mapping procedures.

This process, also called an inline process review, is crucial in this case because as all of us remember, it was promised by Commission members to encourage a vote for Q2 back on about March 18 when Q2 was selected after an apparently illegal rule change, and in spite of its apparent lack of actual, real-world mapping experience of ANY kind.

I was in Sacramento at the time Q2 was chosen, and am aware of the promise made by some Commission members to secure the needed votes for Q2.

Now is the time for the Review. It must be done. We cannot trust our line drawing to a novice mapping company without some check on the process used. The Rose Institute, which I think should have been chosen for the mapping work, is the best choice to do that review.

Already Commissioner Ward, who is one of the Commissioners who was promised the independent peer review in exchange for his reluctant vote for Q2 back in March, has asked for that review.

Instead of a courteous acknowledgement of the need for the review, Maria Blanco, who in my opinion should not be on the Commission in the first place due to her numerous conflicts, has attacked Ward for his request.

Is the Commission breaking down at this critical juncture? What on earth is going on?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 8 - Contra Costa

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 2011 15:41:33 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Carol M Hehmeyer <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Peer Review Process

Message Body:

July 10 is the official date for the release of the first, proposed maps for the Redistricting Commission. The Commission is now under a tremendous amount of pressure to get those maps finalized by the August 15 deadline.

However, now is also the time for the Commission to commence the Independent Peer Review process to check Q2's mapping procedures.

This process, also called an inline process review, is crucial in this case because as all of us remember, it was promised by Commission members to encourage a vote for Q2 back on about March 18 when Q2 was selected after an apparently illegal rule change, and in spite of its apparent lack of actual, real-world mapping experience of ANY kind.

I was in Sacramento at the time Q2 was chosen, and am aware of the promise made by some Commission members to secure the needed votes for Q2.

Now is the time for the Review. It must be done. We cannot trust our line drawing to a novice mapping company without some check on the process used. The Rose Institute, which I think should have been chosen for the mapping work, is the best choice to do that review.

Already Commissioner Ward, who is one of the Commissioners who was promised the independent peer review in exchange for his reluctant vote for Q2 back in March, has asked for that review.

Instead of a courteous acknowledgement of the need for the review, Maria Blanco, who in my opinion should not be on the Commission in the first place due to her numerous conflicts, has attacked Ward for his request.

Is the Commission breaking down at this critical juncture? What on earth is going on?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission