

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Public Comment: 5 - Ventura

Date:Fri, 15 Jul 2011 04:56:55 +0000

From:Ryan Smith [REDACTED]

To:votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

From: Ryan Smith [REDACTED]
Subject: What is KOI?

Message Body:
Commissioners,

My name is Ryan Smith and I live in Simi Valley California. I decided to tune in your hearing at my desk this morning after reading stories about your impending collapse. I thought it would be more fun than my usual staple of talk radio.

Instead of seeing you all losing your minds, I saw that it was my fellow residents of Simi Valley that have gone one over the coocoo's nest. First we had Mayor Bob Huber testify about how Simi Valley had nothing to do with Santa Clarita and that we were separated by a mountain. Then we had a series of speakers testify about how Simi Valley and eastern Ventura MUST be put with Simi Valley in the Senate plan because we had nothing to do with the San Fernando Valley. [REDACTED] So in Congress we don't share a community of interest with Santa Clarita but for Senate we do?

I was going to write you to share my thoughts on the subject. But I don't want to validate any of it. Because this is all bull being spread by politicians. They want to keep Simi Valley in Ventura in the Congressional plan to protect an incumbent member of Congress and they want to put Simi Valley in Santa Clarita in the Senate plan to protect an incumbent member of the Legislature. THAT'S IT. THEY DON'T CARE AT ALL ABOUT THE ACTUAL RESIDENTS OF SIMI, JUST THEIR JOBS.

I tuned in this morning thinking I would hear about how another state commission was [REDACTED] me over. Instead I have to apologize on behalf of my fellow Simi Valley residents for the grief our "representatives" are causing you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Smith

P.S.- Please explain the term KOI at the start of every hearing. I spent half the morning thinking you were talking about fish.

--
This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: 5 - Ventura

From: Ken Brown <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 16 Jul 2011 02:17:50 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Ken Brown <[REDACTED]>

Subject: More on East Ventura

Message Body:

Commissioners,

I emailed you yesterday to alert you that those advocating so strongly for putting Eastern Ventura with Santa Clarita in the Senate plan. I'd like to point you to the editorial posted today by Scott Wilk where he admits to organizing the recent testimony saying that Ventura cannot go with San Fernando and must go with Santa Clarita in the Senate plan (despite the Mayor of Simi Valley testified before you that eastern Ventura should not be connected to Simi Valley in the Congressional plan).

Why the disconnect? Because the Mayor of Simi Valley is trying to protect the Republican member of Congress and Scott Wilk is trying to protect the Republican State Senator. Putting Santa Clarita one way in one plan and another way in the other is not about communities of interest, it is about making up communities of interest to serve a pro-incumbent agenda.

Just for a little background on Scott Wilk he is an elected member of the Los Angeles County Republican Central Committee, former District Director for Republican Congressman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, former Chief of Staff for Republican Assemblywoman Paula Boland and former Republican candidate for Assembly District 38. Again, if you want to read more check out this blog post from way back in May: <http://www.calitics.com/diary/13534/redistricting-commission-update-if-reps-dont-want-to-answer-the-question-part-2>

Keep the Santa Clarita whole. After that tells these partisan hacks to stick it.

Yours truly,
Ken Brown

P.S.- The funniest thing about Wilk's article is that he complains about the pro-incumbent plan 10 years ago while advocating for dividing people along partisan lines specifically to make sure incumbents he likes stay safe.

Scott Thomas Wilk: Redistricting: The SCV must remain vigilant
July 15, 2011 1:55 a.m.
By Scott Thomas Wilk

Unless otherwise stated, the views and opinions expressed are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily represent the views of The Signal.

Anything that makes government more transparent and accountable, I support.

That is why I joined the majority of Californians in voting for Proposition 11 and Proposition 20. These propositions wrestled control of redistricting away from the state Legislature and established an independent commission to draw new boundaries for legislative districts.

Historically, the process has gone like this: Every 10 years, the U.S. Census Bureau conducts a census and updates the state's demographic information, and then the

Legislature draws new political boundaries for Congress, the state Senate and state Assembly.

Clearly, there is a built-in bias in this system, and it cried out for reform.

The redistricting plan of 2001 is the most poignant example. The two major parties cut a deal to lock in their seats. What it did was disenfranchise every voter in the state and made our elected officials less accountable.

Here's an example: For the last decade (five elections), only one congressional seat has changed hands between the parties. So let's do the math: 53 seats x 5 elections = 265 races. Divide 265 into 1 = 0.0037.

So, if you were an incumbent congressman, your chances of getting re-elected were better than 99.99 percent.
Reform was necessary to ensure the integrity of the democratic process.

Now we have the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. To quote the CCRC website, the commission is using the following criteria for redistricting: "Districts shall have reasonably equal population; the plan must comply with the federal Voting Rights Act; districts shall be geographically contiguous; the geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, local neighborhood or local community of interest shall be respected; districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness; and to the extent practicable, each Senate district shall be comprised of two whole, complete, and adjacent Assembly districts."

On June 10, the CCRC in four separate 14-0 votes released its first draft of new boundaries for Congress, State Board of Equalization, Senate and Assembly.

That's when everything hit the fan.

People who had not followed the process suddenly engaged and the commission has been swamped by both oral and written testimony in opposition.

Our Senate district started north at the top of the grapevine and ended in Malibu in the first draft map despite zero testimony advocating such a district.

Numerous times during the process the commission instructed its consultants to craft a SCV to East Ventura County Senate district.

It should be noted that SCV has been with east Ventura County in a Senate seat in the 1980s, 1990s and last decade. However, this second round the consultants offered a "visualization" of a Senate district that included Antelope Valley, SCV and San Fernando Valley plan that include Pacoima, Lake View Terrace and other northeast SFV communities.

This was shocking, as no testimony in favor of such a plan exists. Even more breathtaking: Not a single commissioner commented when it was presented.

So, a number of us traveled to Sacramento the next day to advocate against the Senate visualization.

After our public testimony the commission spent about an hour reviewing L.A. County Senate districts and again instructed the consultants to draft a SCV to east Ventura County Senate district. Later that day, the commission, realizing it is nowhere close to having a plan completed, voted 13-1 to not release a second-draft map on July 14, and just release the next version on July 28 with the final vote culminating on August 15.

Under the law, a supermajority of nine of the 14 members are needed for approval. This

is made tougher by the requirement that they also obtain majorities of each subset: 3-of-5 Republicans, 3-of-5 Democrats, and 3-of-4 decline-to-state/other political party commissioners.

If I had to handicap it, I would say it is now 50/50 as to whether the commission approves a final plan. If the CRC does not approve a plan, redistricting goes to the courts to draw.

However, we must remain vigilant to ensure that our community is protected. You can track the process through www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov. You can review maps and make a comment by clicking the button, "Tell Us What You Think," and then follow the prompts.

Louis L'Amour once said, "To make democracy work, we must be a nation of participants, not simply observers."

Scott Thomas Wilk is a member of the California Republican Party and elected member to the Republican Party of Los Angeles County.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting of Moorpark to LA County

From: jima garrett [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 2011 11:02:09 -0700 (PDT)

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

CC: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]> Mike Garrett

<[REDACTED]>

Good Morning. My husband and I have lived in Moorpark since 1986 and are following closely the news articles regarding the proposed political redistricting of Moorpark and Simi Valley by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

We are writing this to say we are totally against any and all redistricting efforts of this nature. If we had wanted to be part of LA County we would have moved to LA County many years ago. We love Moorpark and love being part of Ventura County. Please stop this ridiculous effort on behalf of the citizens as we believe you are wrong in feeling that we want to be part of LA County. We do not.

Thank you,

Michael and Jima Garrett

[REDACTED]

Moorpark, CA 93021-2129