

Molly Casey

From: "Mark Taylor" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 9:39 AM
Subject: Clarification on Press Release

Hello,

You noted in the most recent press release that "The Commission will be posting visualizations of proposed districts, and make equivalency files available **for organizations and news outlets** to provide greater detail to the public on the visualization proposals." (emphasis added) Will the equivalency files also be available to individuals? I hope that you will post the equivalency files to your website in the manner that you did for the 1st draft maps so that they are available to all individuals who may wish to review and comment. If there is a different process envisioned for distribution, please let me know what action I need to take to ensure that I receive the equivalency files as soon as they are released.

Thank you,

Mark Taylor--

Mark Taylor

<a href="mailto:[REDACTED]"

Molly Casey

From: "Tony Quinn" <[REDACTED]>
 To: [REDACTED]
 Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 9:53 AM
 Subject: Saturday's Decisions
 From Fox and Hounds today.

Excluding The Public: The Redistricting Commission Goes Dark



By Tony Quinn

Political Commentator and Former Legislative Staffer

Mon, July 11th, 2011

Running out of time, beset by rebellious consultants, and manipulated by partisans, the Citizens Redistricting Commission has decided to exclude citizens from the process. The Commission is going dark.

On Saturday, the Commission voted not to release a second set of draft redistricting maps to the press or the public on July 14 as promised. They also voted not to post maps of the districts they are drawing on their own redistricting website. Despite a \$3 million budget and hundreds of thousands of dollars paid to their consultants, the consultants told them they had no time for public maps. Outside groups are being recruited for that task.

Their line drawing staff also has announced that the Commission must be done with its directions by July 20; they will accept no more directions on districts after that -- despite the fact it is three and a half weeks until the Commission is supposed to adopt its final maps. This will allow for no public input on the final maps since their staff will have stopped working. California will get whatever districts their consultants concoct over the next nine days -- like it or not.

Since the release of their first sets of maps on June 10, and resultant uproar from communities that felt ill treated, the Commission has tied itself in knots over racial districting, redrawing the Los Angeles and Bay Area urban cores over and over, while giving the back of its hand to the rest of the state. For much of suburban and rural California, their new districts are far worse than anything the legislature ever drew.

Just take the senate seats drawn for Sacramento County. Sacramento's population would allow it less than two full Senate districts, but the commission's "visualizations" (all the press and public gets to see these days) divides the county into five different districts. One is within the county; another runs the Delta region off to Lakeport; yet another delivers the east county to a district in Fresno. But my favorites are the one that places Folsom and Fair Oaks into a district with Yreka on the Oregon border, and the one that runs Rancho Cordova off to Red Bluff.

Did anyone ever ask for such absurdities? The public record shows that never in the history of California has Sacramento's representation been so sliced and diced. If I had my druthers, I'd load this Commission and their staff into a bus and make them drive the two hours from Rancho Cordova to Red Bluff. They could have a five minute pit stop, and then I would force them to drive three more hours to Yreka.

What should they have done? All they needed to do was to look at the Supreme Court Masters plan enacted in 1991. The Masters divided the state into natural regions; in the north state, they ran one district down the coast; one district combined the rural counties, and one district followed the Sierra Range. Sacramento got two compact districts, exactly as it deserved.

Had the Commission regionalized the coast and Bay Area, as they were urged to do but refused, they would have seen that the area is due exactly 18 Assembly districts and nine senate districts. They could have been easily drawn, but this Commission refused to do so because it has a partisan agenda to create Democratic districts along the coast and deliver a two thirds majority to legislative Democrats. I warned this would happen when they excluded republicans from their line drawing process, and now it has happened.

GOP Sen. Sam Blakeslee was drawn a district he cannot win that runs from Morgan Hill to San Luis Obispo (Disclosure, I was an expert witness in a lawsuit filed by Morgan Hill challenging this exact district in the 2001 legislative gerrymander.) His Republican colleague, Sen. Tony Strickland, also has a district he cannot win running from eastern Ventura County to Encino in Los Angeles County. In the process, a new Democratic district readymade for Democratic Assemblyman Das Williams is created in Santa Barbara and western Ventura County.

Did all this happen by accident? Of course not. These districts were not drawn by the Commission or its "overworked" staff but by the Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE), a group of political activists working to rid their counties of politicians they do not like. Gabino Guirre, a Democratic Commission member from Ventura County, who engineered this plan, is on the board of advisors of CAUSE and is a financial contributor.

But the partisanship does not end there. CAUSE also went after freshman Republican Assembly member Jeff Gorell and turned his GOP-leaning district into a Democratic one. Gorell will now go down as the briefest serving legislator in California history; shortly after his election in 2010, Gorell, a lieutenant commander in the Navy reserve, received orders for Afghanistan. He is risking his life for this country while his political enemies back home manipulated this Commission to eliminate his district.

In 2008, Commissioner Aguirre hosted a fund raiser for and made a campaign contribution to the Democrat who ran against Strickland's wife (the then Assembly member) in 2008, and against Gorell in 2010.

The excuse for this district was to reunite the city of Oxnard, the Democratic core of Ventura County, and something of a holy grail with the Commission. The Commission is supposed to keep cities whole,

right? But that does not apply when it comes to Republican cities. They blithely divided up Rancho Cucamonga in an Bernardino County, combining part of it with far off Pasadena in a district that's far more outrageous than anything the legislature did in that area ten years ago. The upshot is to fracture Los Angeles foothill suburbs, and, guess what, create another Democratic district.

So it is clear why the Commission has now gone dark, satisfied to live out its final weeks in a cocoon surrounded by an "exhausted" professional staff and consultants whose redistricting competence was always in question and whose partisan biases are now apparent.

So what needs to be done with these districts? A referendum must be qualified against these plans if the final districts look anything like they do now. Fortunately for the citizenry, the referendum law was changed by the voters last fall, and all that any group has to do is to collect enough signatures to trigger a referendum and the issue goes immediately to the California Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court staff has already begun making discrete inquiries as to how it might proceed if come this fall redistricting drops into its lap. The law provides plenty of time for the Court to draw districts for the 2012 election.

Having made their process impenetrable to substantive criticism, ignoring meaningful public input or even simple common sense, this Commission has sadly invited upon itself the need to move redistricting to an impartial judiciary.

Tony Quinn

New E-Mail: 

New Home Page:

<http://www.tonyquinnhomepage.com>

</html

Molly Casey

From: "Ron Davis" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 8:58 PM
Subject: Resist

Sent from my iPad

Molly Casey

From: "Craig Wilson" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 12:30 PM
Subject: Public Comment: General Comment
From: Craig Wilson <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Final Maps

Message Body:

It's still not too late to do the right thing: pattern the maps after the very fair effort of the 1991 Supreme Court Masters.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Molly Casey

From: "Robert J. Apodaca" <[REDACTED]>
To: "CRC" <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 3:04 PM
Subject: Not so transparent

It is nearly impossible for the public to analyze your "visualizations". It is difficult to see the bigger picture from all the pdf's of various plans. And it is not clear how or if they fit together into a state plan. Please post equivalency or GIS files for current "visualizations". Without these files, you are preventing any real examination of your work. If you do not post files which can be analyzed your commitment to transparency is meaningless. And, your posting of submitted plans is incomplete. Please provide a database of submitted plans. Has Q2 imported the plan submissions and organized them in a way that is accessible and useful to the Commissioners?

United Latinos Vote

--

Robert J. Apodaca

T [REDACTED] 7 1 F [REDACTED]

Molly Casey

From: "david salaverry" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 6:56 PM
Attach: Memo to Commission, RE Commissioner Parvenu July 8 reassurances about maps.pdf
Subject: Memo to CRC re Commissioner Parvenu July 8 reassurances about maps

Dear CRC,

Please post.

Regards,

David Salaverry

[REDACTED]
CCAG, California Conservative Action Group
www.fairthelines.org

California Conservative Action Group

MEMO

To: Citizens Redistricting Commission
From: David Salaverry, CCAG
RE: Commissioner Parvenu's comments of July 8
Date: July 11, 2011

On July 8 Commissioner Parvenu made a special effort to reassure organized groups that the Commission has been considering all maps submitted, not just the "unity maps" created by MALDEF, CAPAFR and AARC. Notwithstanding Parvenu's comments, there is little evidence that the Commission is taking maps other than those produced by MALDEF and other "alphabet groups" seriously.

There have been countless references to the MALDEF iterations, to CAPAFR, AARC, APALC, CAUSE, etc. sprinkled over weeks of line drawing sessions and little mention of citizen groups' maps. When Q2 was asked to pull up an overlay of the MALDEF "unity maps" they were able to do so within a minute as these were preloaded on Q2's hard drives. On the other hand, when reference was made to CCAG maps in line drawing sessions, mappers were unsure if they had our equivalency file.

In fact, the Commission received our first equivalency file May 24 and our second June 28. That Q2 didn't realize they had our material is problematic, as was Commissioner Parvenu's July 28 uncertainty about our name. Trying to restore our confidence, he referred to us as "The California *Conservation* Action Group." Not only did the Commissioner get our name wrong, he flipped our politics 180 degrees.

Our line-drawers, Chris Bowman and Allen Payton, have been mapping since 1991 when they submitted Bay Area proposals to the Special Masters. In 1995, Bowman was a Mayoral appointee to the San Francisco Elections Task force. In 2002 Bowman prepared maps at Karin Macdonald's UC Berkeley office and was one of two SF finalists considered. Allen Payton submitted Supervisorial plans for both Contra Costa and Alameda Counties being considered currently by both county boards. It's not as if our maps were amateur efforts with mustard stains prepared on the backs of napkins.

We don't know if the Commission will vote to approve its final draft or whether there will be a judicial challenge. We do know that if the matter goes to the courts, there will be robust discovery that examines all the plans submitted, how they were processed, evaluated, and to what extent they were taken into consideration by the Commission. We will insist on nothing less.

Regards,



David Salaverry

CCAG, California Conservative Action Group

www.fairthelines.org

Molly Casey

From: "Shupe, Christina" <[REDACTED]>
To: "Communications Office" <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 8:16 AM
Subject: Fwd: Public comment received
From: <=pan style="FONT-SIZE: 10pt"> Bobby Dutcher [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: [Monday, June 20, 2011 9:18 AM](#)

[The Assembly and Senate maps look fine, but the Congressional change would mix up the rural North Coast with Marin and Sonoma Counties. These 2 Counties are very liberal, and elect candidates like Lynn Woolsey. The rural Counties like Lake County are more conservative, even though they still elect Democrats like Mike Thompson. Farming, ranching, and tourism are important to the northern Counties, while Marin and Sonoma seem better educated and more urban oriented. The demographics of these areas are totally different and I really don't like the new boundaries of this. I've run this by a couple of other local people and they like it less than I do. If you could pass this on I'd really appreciate it. Thanks.](#)

-

[Bobby Dutcher](#)
[REDACTED]

Molly Casey

From: "Office, Communications" <[REDACTED]>
To: "Daniel Claypool" <[REDACTED]> "Kirk Miller" <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 8:25 AM
Subject: Fwd: PUBLIC COMMENT -- 14 day review
 FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: James Wright <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jul 8, 2011 at 8:19 PM
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT -- 14 day review
To: [REDACTED] [gov](#)

Commissioners,

I've been trying to find a reference to a 14-day post-decision review requirement and have failed. It is not in the language of either propositions 11 or 20. It is not in the regulations for forming the Commission. Bagley-Keene has a 14-day notice requirement for meetings with some exceptions, but does not seem to require a post-decision comment period of any kind.

Therefore, the Commission should review and relax their stated schedule to permit ample time for producing the BEST MAPS POSSIBLE.

Specifically, a final vote can be delayed into August as long as formal agreement happens prior to August 15.

Since no revisions will happen after the final decision, **14 days of post-decision review in your schedule serves no purpose.**

And, yes, publication of a 2nd draft is very necessary.

There should be a period of 14 days of public review allowed following release of the 2nd draft maps and prior to the final tweak and your deliberations to reach a final decision ... because that is really the 14-day notice period for your review and decision meetings. Also, please take your time in reviewing each of the 177 districts in marching to decision. Those presentations and your discussion will help to form the basis for your published narrative and report. The rush-to-decision for the 1st draft maps was very unsettling and cannot occur for the final ones.

As far as the DOJ review is concerned, give them the 2nd draft maps because any changes that are needed beyond that point will necessarily be very minor from all sources (including any recommended by DOJ).

Jim Wright
 a voter from San Jose

Molly Casey

From: "monla" <[REDACTED]>
To: <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 10:02 AM
Subject: Excuse me?

I smell something fishy; so please rectify your actions before they go to the news reporters. We don't want gerrymandering lines drawn; but like I said news reporters will eat it up if you choose to keep this stance.

Keep the South Bay together from Marina Del Rey to Palos Verdes Peninsula, including Torrance, with straight lines.

No squiggles, no curves...straight lines.

Most Sincerely,
Monica Griffin
90266