

From: Emy Estrada <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 2:07 PM

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

Please stop this, it will be big mistake.

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Christina Henny <henof[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 9:59 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Christina Henny <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Please post accurate agendas, and on time!

Message Body:

I am trying to follow these last proceedings but you are not posting accurate agendas! It is July 14 at 10 AM and your site still has an inaccurate, old agenda from some earlier time. So I have no idea what is going to happen today. Isn't there a LAW that you have to post accurate agendas with a certain amount of lead time? Finally, please post the videos ASAP. You are preventing me from learning and reacting quickly, whic is my right.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Raul Cabral <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 5:12 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Raul Cabral <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Open process

Message Body:

This new redistricting procedure should have been more open and transparent process. Allowing all segments of Californians to dictate their own future.

Now there is a behind closed doors, -doing the math, -crunching the numbers, -and cutting corners to minority communities. In a procedure were Californians really didn't vote for.

Where is the public maps along the way?

Commissions current definition of: "Communities of Interest" ?(commonality)

*superficial, Gated communities

*materialistic, Wage incomes

*geographical, Communities
 with bike
 lanes

When I went before the the Commission April 14, (Bakersfield). I spoke about the LGBT community in a particular part of town. The Commissions response, "We don't recognize THAT"

How generous will the Commission be with Communities of Color, when drawing district boundaries, will it be guaranteeing a simple majority in districts? Will these simple majority districts be disenfranchised, with ethnic prison population numbers that are only added for boundary district lines, but then short change minorities on election numbers.

Worst yet, politicians that run on district boundaries, based on prison constituents that guarantee incumbency and not accountability. NOT TOO DEMOCRATIC!!!

The commissions redistricting should be more open, transparent, participating, to include all Californians, so that we could all be heard and represented, and not blurr the lines from day to day.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: ellen swensen <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 9:36 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: ellen swensen <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Post Videos and Agendas ASAP!!!

Message Body:

You are very late in posting videos and also your agendas are inaccurate and late. This violates Bagley-Keene public meeting laws and may invalidate this whole process. Where is Friday July 15 real agenda? How about July 14 which is now over?! How can I as a citizen know what is going on if you fail to notice the public in time and within the law?! How can I comment on videos/transcripts you don't post in time??!!

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting Comment (in re "July 11 2011" Visualisations)

From: "Charles" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 4:48 PM

To: [REDACTED]

CC:

Now, the "July 11 2011" Visualisations have finally been posted, well, most of them, anyway. The July 1 2011 Visualisations were never posted. And after having seen the July 1 2011 NORCO Senate & Yuba Senate Visualisations, one can easily see why, the shameful things that they are, esp. the "not over bridge" visualisations. But given the brevity of days remaining between now & that by which any Final Map must be already completed, it would seem prudent to comment primarily on the "July 11 2011" Visualisations, though many of the things which could be said of them could also be said of the First Draft Maps & of the "over bridge" Senate visualisations from July 1 2011.

After having spent some time reviewing the several maps, it would appear as though the three northernmost regions currently covered by the three extant districts for each of three offices: Assembly, State Senate, & U.S. Rep., would, under this proposal, be made to lose some representation. Granted, what appears in the First Draft Map is certainly preferable to Unification. However, the North-state, under this Draft, would nonetheless be made to lose some representation, to the tune of 11% (a loss of one Congressional District). The First Drafts were even worse. Under them, the loss of representation would have been to the tune of 22% (a loss of one Senatorial district & of one U.S. Congressional District). And under the July 1 2011 Senate visualisations, Shasta County would have been lumped in with the Coastal counties which, as I have stated in a previous Redistricting comment, are an entirely separate Community of Interest from that in which is Shasta County, just as (generally) any two different countries may be so described.

Now, if the First Draft, ultimately, would've been chosen, then couple the loss of representation in the North-state with the recent rise in the State's population, not to mention the wont of Sacramento to too oft govern in ways hostile (in varying degrees) to the North-state, & one can easily see the problematic nature of the proposition that is the First Draft Map. Far better it would be for the urban coastal regions, from the San Francisco Bay Area to the Los Angeles Basin, which regions collectively already hold the lion's share of power in Sacramento, to be made to sacrifice some of their power, to the benefit of the North-state.

And the July 1 2011 "not over bridge" Senate NORCO & Yuba Visualisations would have been even worse, in that two polar opposite communities of interest (Dare one say two polar opposite cultures (in many ways)?) would have been brought together in some "oil & water" type of arranged marriage that at least one of the two parties would desire NOT!!

Let us consider now, for a moment, whether the three northern-most regions constitute a single community of interest, or not. The region inclusive of Humboldt & Mendocino Counties have a culture all their own. Geographically, Humboldt & Del Norte Counties are separated from Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama Counties by chains of mountains that run from western Siskiyou County down through western Trinity County. The two main east-west State Highways running through Trinity County are scarcely passable through the better part of the winter season, most years. Often, these same roads become totally impassable due to rock slides. Summer 2008 was no picnic, either, for the wildfires of that year forced major routes to become ad hoc bases of operation for fire crews. And mountain passes connecting central

Siskiyou County with western Del Norte County can frequently, during the winter, become impassable. Even when they are not, winter travel is not for the faint of heart. Needless to say, the regions comprising Congressional District 1, Assembly District 1, and Senate District 2 are as separate from those comprising Congressional District 2, Assembly District 2, & Senate District 4 as any two can be while also being north of Sacramento. And this is not to mention the flow of communications & of commerce flows considerably more often north-south than east-west. Needless to say, the two regions cannot be identified as a single community of interest. What about the north-east region? Can it be combined with the north-central region as a single community of interest? Not exactly. The major east-west routes between north-central & north-east are all two-lane roads, though they nominally be identified as State "Highways." The major corridor of commerce & of travel in the north-east region is U.S. Highway 395, a route that circumnavigates the mountains that it does as it passes upward toward the Oregon border. Culturally, Modoc County has more in common with its neighbor to the south than with its neighbor to the south-west. Likewise, Lassen County is similarly separate from Shasta & from Tehama Counties, owing in part to the location of Lassen Volcanic National Park & its proximity to & intersection with State Routes 44 & 89. The most principal community in Plumas County, Chester, is considerably isolated from those along major routes of travel & commerce in the north-central region. All that, while the major routes of north-south travel & commerce in the north-central region are Interstate Highway 5 & State Route 99. Needless to say, the three regions of the North State, the north-west, the north-central, & the north-east, cannot be combined into a single "community of interest" for redistricting purposes.

Note well Cal. Const. Art. XXI, § 2(d)(4), "The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions. Communities of interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates." Note also Cal. Const. Art. XXI, § 2(d)(5), "To the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population."

As for the Bay Area's State Assembly Districts, the "July 11 2011" Visualisation does appear to represent some improvement over the status quo. As for the Bay Area's State Senatorial Districts, those appearing in the "July 11 2011" Visualisation would appear a little more geographically compact than their status quo counterparts. As for the Bay Area's U.S. Congressional Districts, those appearing in the "July 11 2011" Visualisation are a very definite improvement over their status quo counterparts.

But what explanation is there for reducing the North-state's collective representation in Congress by one District? It is not the least bit necessary to at all reduce the collective representation of the North-state to make the necessary improvements to the boundaries of districts in the Bay Area & So-Cal. This does not have to be a situation of "either or." It can easily be made a situation of "both and." And it can be so by doing, concurrently, three things.: **(a)** Maintain the North-state's current level of collective representation in Sacramento & in Congress (e.g., 3 Assembly Districts, 3 State Senate Districts, & 3 U.S. Congressional Districts).; **(b)** Make such improvements to the boundaries of districts in the Bay Area as are (more or less) proposed, in the "July 11 2011" Visualisations, to be made.; and **(c)** Make such improvements to the boundaries of L.A. Area & So-Cal districts as are proposed in the First Draft. But above all, let there be NO LOSS WHATSOEVER OF NORTHSTATE REPRESENTATION, PERIOD!!!

Thank you.

P.S.:

Incidentally, just as a postscript, why can there not be a GAIN in representation for the Northstate? We need more, not less! How is it that all changes are proposed to be at the EXPENSE of the Northstate, if they be changes at all? What's up with **THAT?**

Subject: redistricting

From: Miguel Lopez <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 2:18 PM

To: [REDACTED]

"NO" to redistricting. All you will have is a block of people here that will vote against you

--

Thank you,

Miguel Lopez

Palm Realty

40420 10th Street West

Palmdale, CA 93551

Phone: [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]

DRE #: [REDACTED]

Subject: We Are Not Pleased

From: "Peggy's iMac" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/14/2011 10:32 AM

To: [REDACTED]

To the Redistricting Commission:

I have sat in two public hearings held by your Commission over the past few months. You seemed to be listening to those concerned citizens who spoke to you. Now I understand that you have gone back on your plan to issue another set of lines for input. The visualization maps that you published are of no use whatsoever. There is no way to distinguish where the lines fall and what is there. They are a joke.

You have heard over and over again, that we understand your charge is to keep cities and counties together as much as possible, and to address communities of interest. I have been reading how you have proposed lines throughout the state, and it is blatantly obvious that you are not interested in adhering to these requirements. This is the worst gerrymandering that I have ever seen, and I am a life-long resident.

You are just asking for a referendum, and that's what you will get if you stick to the route that you have thus far proposed. Your commission will go down in state history as a dismal failure. Is that what you want?

Don't think for one minute that the voters will sit idly by and let this happen to their good intentions. They asked for fair and impartial redistricting and you are not giving it to them.

This is truly disappointing. You can do better.

David Sadler

Simi Valley