

Subject: Voting Rights Season

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/24/2011 5:58 PM

To: [REDACTED]

CC: [REDACTED]

Commissioners,

Some say it's all politics... but I say kudos for your demonstration of service and sacrifice. Nevertheless, after 4 in person appearances, many hours educating the community at large about this Commission and its charge, monitoring the work via the Internet, and both writing and forwarding communication for others in order to insure their access to this process, I have concerns.

It is abundantly clear, after today's repeated closed session, that the "letter" of the law is being covered by legal counsel, however I am very concerned the regarding the lack of attention to the spirit of the Voting Rights Act. Most importantly, your role is cast in Voting Rights Season... and we are "called" to remember the history of the VRA.

Laws and tactics resulted in denying access to voting for African Americans. Even 58 years later, there was a sentiment that if African Americans would only be reasonable people and be patient, the problem of being denied equal opportunity to elect and pursue office would somehow be worked out. In summary, many felt that there was a problem, but no urgency, even though the NAACP had formed principally to remove those barriers in 1909.

Finally, the year after the hard fought Civil Rights Act was signed into law (during the peak of civil unrest) there was a break through -

August 6, 1965 - The Voting Rights Act was signed by President Lyndon Baines Johnson (A Texas Democrat)

July 20, 2006 (41 years later) - The Voting Rights Act was renewed and signed by President George W Bush (A Texas Republican) and extended for 25 years to yr 2031

July 29, 2011 - You, the CRC (a tri-partisan group) will send forward a product for review to Californians

August 15, 2011 - Again CRC will cast the final votes to govern elections in California for 10 years

Your legacy must be a legacy of protecting human and civil rights. Doing the right thing *trumps* doing things right!

I urge you to protect all Californians, but not abandon or forget those who have a long history of being disadvantaged and discriminated against in the electoral arenas. African Americans continue to face hurdles in electing their candidates of choice without the protection of the law. Don't forget those often forgotten!

Claim your places in history as knowledgeable, compassionate, skillful, and who are willing to stand with the spirit of the VRA for the cause of justice and equity. You are called upon to fearlessly protect the 15th amendment.

We remain partners in this experiment in democracy as long as there is evidence that the spirit of the

Voting Rights Act has been understood and will be upheld. When it becomes evident otherwise, we must move to the beat of the "freedom drummer". We must be heard!!

On our watch, it is my prayer that we will do the right thing. I am available for discussion and clarification.

Be well!

Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker
5th District - AME Church
Ward EDC
(Member of AARC)

Subject: Commissioner Meltdowns

From: david salaverry <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 7:41 PM

To: "Office, Communications" <[REDACTED]>

Dear Commission,

Everyone in the room is exhausted, but emotion is NOT the way to move the ball forward. All of us have our political passions, and ALL Californians, not just the poor and the dispossessed need to be considered.

The commission has consistently tilted towards the interests of what it considers the dispossessed, when in fact demographically our state is fast becoming truly diverse. Hispanics are 37% of the population, Anglos 40%. People of color in aggregate are at a higher percentage than Anglos.

Filkins-Webers reading of the Supreme Court was instructive, clear, precise. Please try to lower the emotional temperature and make appeals to reason, not political feeling.

David Salaverry

[REDACTED]

CCAG, California Conservative Action Group

www.fairthelines.org

BELL, McANDREWS & HILTACHK, LLP

Attorneys and Counselors at Law

██████████, ██████████
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

██████████
FAX ██████████

CHARLES H. BELL, JR.
COLLEEN C. McANDREWS
THOMAS W. HILTACHK
BRIAN T. HILDRETH
ASHLEE N. TITUS
AUDREY PERRY MARTIN

██
SANTA MONICA CA 90401

██████████
www.bmhlaw.com

██████████
PAUL T. GOUGH
ROBERT W. NAYLOR
OF COUNSEL

July 24, 2011

BY EMAIL: ██████████
& Commissioner public email addresses

California Redistricting Commissioners
California Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Commissioners:

Today, the Commission retired into two closed session meetings that were not noticed under Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Both of these closed session meetings occurred when it appeared that public disputes between Commissioners threatened consensus on proposed district lines. There was no apparent reason other than to discuss possible resolution of this unexpected public dispute. During public session, Commissioner DiGuilio mentioned that it was known that several Commissioners (not named) did not favor the Congressional maps at their current stage of adoption/visualization and announced that she was not going to vote for the Congressional maps unless modified to address her concerns about three Los Angeles Congressional districts (South Bay, the Beach cities and the Malibu coast.) There has been no public discussion that would inform the public of such internal conversations.

This leads us to conclude that Commissioners have been discussing possible compromises, deals, trades and decisions outside the public meeting. Such non-public, serial meetings would constitute serious violations of the Open Meeting law and severe violations of the public trust. Prior to the start of today's final meeting, one Commissioner was overheard discussing with a Commission staff member and another commissioner that a proposed resolution had been drafted to hire the Gibson Dunn and Morrison Foerster firms to defend the commission's plans in court. The

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

Letter to California Redistricting Commissioners
California Redistricting Commission
July 24, 2011
Page 2

proposed resolution was not made part of the Bagley -Keene Open Meeting Act required documents for the meeting.

These examples of violations of the Open Meeting laws are simply the latest in a long series of violations of the law and Proposition 11: (1) abuse of the closed session laws to resolve internal disputes; (2) apparent out-of-meeting discussions about possible compromises, deals, trades and decisions outside the public meeting; and (3) failure to post relevant Commission decision documents, and (4) the refusal of certain Commissioners to respond to public records requests “until after the lines have been drawn.” As others have made clear in past objections to you, the Commission is to do business in public. Public business includes discussion that concerns, or leads to decisions of a substantive and procedural nature. Doing business in public was what was to distinguish the Citizens Commission from the Legislature which had a sorry history of conducting show public hearings about redistricting and making decisions behind closed doors. Regrettably, the Commission is faring no better than the Legislature on this subject.

Other notable violations of open meeting laws include: (1) the process of interviewing and hiring staff; (2) the process of establishing standards for RFPs and RFIs for line drawing consultants and counsel; (3) failure to post information on proposed actions prior to meetings from January through today.

Two other notable issues reflect the attitude of circling the wagons to squelch public dissent: (1) the discussion of the apparent complaint by Karin MacDonald against Commissioner Ward and Commissioner Blanco’s role in promoting an investigation which led to an angry outburst against Commissioner Filkins Webber for making the matter public; and (2) the discussion concerning an apparent attempt by Mr. Claypool to communicate with a Commissioner concerning an internet search he undertook to undermine public testimony.

It is hardly surprising in view of these examples and a cavalier approach to the open meeting laws. Some Commissioners appear to believe that the real decisions of the Commission can be made in private. However, the commission is not a jury. Jury deliberations are conducted privately for a reason. The Commission was supposed to air its dirty laundry in public as part of the messy process of redistricting. This public discussion was to inform the public of Commissioners’ positions and views about the proposed factors important to the commissioners and how they resolved them.

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

Letter to California Redistricting Commissioners
California Redistricting Commission
July 24, 2011
Page 3

The Commission has nearly completed its public hearing phase. With the past violations and abuses, we are gravely concerned that the Commissioners will continue to communicate in serial meeting fashion during the next week before July 29 in an attempt to resolve internal disputes about maps and to make deals, compromises and trades outside the public's view.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Charles H. Bell, Jr.
Charles H. Bell, Jr.

CHB: sd

Subject: NALEO testimony on Commission visualizations - Update

From: Astrid Garcia <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 8:26 AM

To: [REDACTED]

CC: Rosalind Gold <[REDACTED]>

Dear Members of the Citizens Redistricting Commission,

Testimony submitted by Arturo Vargas, Executive Director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund on Thursday, July 21, noted that while the Commission has taken steps that greatly improve the maps, by taking into account greater community of interest testimony and compliance with the Voting Rights Act, there are still several changes that can be made to ensure the Latino community has fair representation. The Senate plans are of particular concern based on analysis that found the Commission's latest publicly available visualizations (dated July 18) reduce the number of Latino effective senate districts from five to six and weaken Latino opportunity districts.

Additionally, we wanted to offer a correction from our testimony on Page 7. Attached is the updated version of our testimony but I have highlighted the correction here.

“In the Orange County area, existing SD 34 has a Latino CVAP of 38.4%. In contrast, the Latino CVAP of the WSTSA district in the Commission's SoCal visualization options ranges from 26-29%, a considerably weaker Latino opportunity district than currently exists. The district should be reconfigured to increase its Latino CVAP.”

On behalf of the NALEO Educational fund, I write to reemphasize our position and respectfully urge the Commission to consider any changes that would further weaken the opportunity for Latino community members to elect their candidates of choice.

We thank you for consideration of our views, and we greatly appreciate your service to our State.

Sincerely,

Astrid Garcia
Director of State Election Policy and Redistricting

NALEO Educational Fund
[REDACTED]
Los Angeles, CA 90015



www.latinosdrawthelines.org

www.naleo.org

The NALAO Educational Fund is the leading nonprofit organization that facilitates full Latino participation in the American political process, from citizenship to public service.

— Attachments: —

NALEO Testimony to CRC on July visualizations fin 07-11.pdf

366 KB



Founder
Hon. Edward R. Roybal (Ret.) †

Board of Directors

Hon. Juan C. Zapata, **Chairman**
Member, Intergovernmental Policy Committee on Trade

Hon. Hector Balderas, **Treasurer**
New Mexico State Auditor

Ms. Ivelisse R. Estrada, **Secretary**
Univision Communications Inc.

Mr. Andrew Baldonado
Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc.

Hon. José (Pepe) Estrada
WalMart Stores, Inc.

Hon. Anitere Flores
Florida State Representative

Hon. Mike Fernandez
Cargill

Hon. Ron Garcia
Councilmember, City of Brea, CA

Hon. Stephanie Garcia
Pueblo City Schools Board President

Hon. Sylvia R. Garcia, **NALEO President**
Former Commissioner, Harris County, TX

Hon. Uvaldo Herrera
State Farm Insurance Companies

Hon. Pauline Medrano
Deputy Mayor Pro-Tem, City of Dallas, TX

Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard
Member of Congress

Hon. Susan Santana, Esq.
AT&T

Board of Advisors

Hon. Karen Avilla
First Vice-President, Hispanic Elected Local Officials, National League of Cities

Hon. Kevin Carbo
Chair, National Hispanic Caucus of School Board Members

Hon. Pedro Colón
Milwaukee County Circuit Court Judge

Hon. Rey Colón
Alderman, City of Chicago, IL

Hon. Lorraine Cortés-Vázquez
AARP

Hon. Mike DeLaO
Chair Elect, National Hispanic Caucus of School Board Members Ex-Officio Member

Hon. John J. Duran
Mayor Pro-Tem, City of West Hollywood, CA

Hon. Luis Fortuño
Governor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

Hon. Charles Gonzalez
Member of Congress, Chair, Congressional Hispanic Caucus

Hon. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Maryland State Delegate

Hon. Gerri Guzman
School Board Member, Montebello Unified School District, CA

Hon. Paul D. López
Councilmember, City of Denver, CO

Hon. Iris Y. Martinez
Illinois State Senator, President, National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators

Hon. Michele Martinez
Councilmember, City of Santa Ana, CA

Hon. Alex Padilla
California State Senator

Hon. Ana Rivas Logan
School Board Member, Miami-Dade County, Public Schools, FL

Hon. Justin Rodriguez
Councilmember, City of San Antonio, TX

Hon. Sergio Rodriguez
President, Hispanic Elected Local Officials, National League of Cities

Hon. Ross Romero
Utah State Senator

Hon. John Sapient
New Mexico State Senator

Hon. Fernando Shipley
Mayor, City of Globe, AZ

Hon. Fernando M. Treviño
School Board President, East Chicago, IN

Hon. Don Francisco Trujillo II
Former Deputy Secretary of State, NM

Hon. Luz Urbáez Weinberg
Commissioner, City of Aventura, FL

Executive Director

Arturo Vargas

Los Angeles, CA 90015

Washington, DC 20003

Houston, TX 77002

New York, NY 10005

Orlando, FL 32819

Partnership Council Members

Chairman's Council Member
State Farm Insurance Companies

Advance America
AT&T
Southwest Airlines
Univision Communications Inc.
WalMart Stores, Inc.
The Walt Disney Company

Testimony

by

**Arturo Vargas, Executive Director
National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed
Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund**

before

the California Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Sacramento, California
July 21, 2011**

† Deceased

Members of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission:

I am Arturo Vargas, Executive Director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund. Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony which presents our perspectives on the visualizations the Commission has been developing in preparation for its release of the final maps.

The NALEO Educational Fund is a non-profit, non-partisan organization that facilitates full Latino participation in the American political process, from citizenship to public service. Our constituency includes the more than 6,000 Latino elected and appointed officials nationwide. Our Board members and constituency include Republicans, Democrats and Independents. We are one of the nation's leading organizations in the area of Latino civic engagement, and we are deeply committed to ensuring that California's 2011 redistricting provides the state's Latinos with a fair opportunity to choose their elected leaders.

Since we last submitted testimony to the Commission on June 28, 2011, we continue to actively mobilize the Latino community to provide meaningful public input into the Commission's redistricting process. We have continued to help community members gain access to the Commission's visualizations for their regions, and provided them with assistance on submitting comments to the Commission. We are continuing a robust program of webinars, email blasts and individual phone calls reaching Latinos throughout the state.

We commend the Commission for continuing its hard work in developing its visualizations, and we appreciate that it has responded to several of the concerns we raised regarding the impact of its first draft maps on Latino opportunities for fair representation. We urge the Commission to carefully examine some additional areas in the state where the Commission should restore existing Latino effective districts, create new ones, or strengthen Latino representation opportunities. In this testimony, we first provide recommendations on how the Commission should proceed with its remaining mapping process. We then compare the number of existing Latino effective districts with those proposed in the Commission's visualizations,¹ and provide

¹ We base our analysis on the districts displayed in the most recent interactive visualizations on the Statewide Database website as of this writing (visualization dates range from July 17 – July 19, 2011); these visualizations are entitled "to be presented": <http://swdb.berkeley.edu/gis/gis2011/>.

comments on revisions the Commission still needs to make in order to ensure that their maps provide Latinos with a full opportunity for fair representation. We then present a compilation of specific suggestions from community members with whom we have worked regarding how the visualizations affect their communities of interest and how lines shown be drawn in their regions of the state.

I. The Commission's Mapping Process

The Commission is now at a critical stage in its mapping process. The deadline for the adoption of the final map is less than a month away, and as the Commission starts to complete its final work, it is even more crucial that members of the public have a meaningful opportunity to provide input into this process.

Together with other groups who are conducting outreach to California's underrepresented communities, we joined in a letter submitted on July 19, which urged the Commission to release another draft map before the August 15 deadline to allow members of the public a formal 14-day period to provide comments to the Commission that could be incorporated into its final maps. The letter provided two alternative interpretations of the Voters First Act which would enable the Commission to release another draft and comply with the Act's provisions. We continue to believe that this is the optimal approach for ensuring meaningful public comment, because it will allow persons to have the time to carefully review a static set of maps, and articulate their recommendations in a coherent manner.

The Commission's current approach of continually posting updated visualizations in a relatively unpredictable manner creates significant challenges for public comment. Essentially, individuals are trying to analyze a "moving target," because their review of one set of visualizations can become outdated in a matter of days or even hours. Unless members of the public are able to consistently monitor the Commission's hearings and review every single version of the visualizations, they are not able to keep up with the proposed changes and provide well-informed input on them. It is not feasible for members of the public who have work or family demands to follow the Commission's activities in this manner. At some point, the public must have a sense that whatever visualizations they are commenting on are very close to final, and must have one last opportunity to carefully analyze the visualizations, particular with respect to assessing the

overall statewide impact of individual regional and level of government visualizations. We urge the Commission to release another set of draft maps with a formal 14-day comment period to achieve this goal.

If the Commission chooses not to release another set of draft maps, we ask that it more fully implement the recommendations set forth in our July 13 letter to the Commission. We commend the Commission for implementing some of our recommendations by posting easily accessible interactive visualizations with citizen voting age population (CVAP) data for each district. We urge the Commission to implement our other suggestions, particularly with respect to notifying the public when it has posted near final visualizations, with statewide visualizations for every level of office, and providing a minimum 72-hour comment period before making any final changes. We understand that the Commission's review of several sets of visualizations provide it with an opportunity to assess a wide range of options and ultimately develop the best maps possible for the state. However, at some point, members of the public need to have the confidence that they are providing well-informed input on a near final set of visualizations, and that the Commission will not decide on unanticipated last-minute significant changes when adopting the final maps.

II. Latino Effective Districts and the Commission's Recent Visualizations

Under the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA), the Commission's maps must provide Latinos with a fair opportunity to elect the representatives of their choice. Under the Voters First Act, which created the Commission, compliance with the VRA is the second-highest ranked criterion for its maps. In summary, based on an analysis of the number of districts with at least 50% Latino CVAP,² the Commission's most recent visualizations generally represent a significant improvement over its first draft maps, particularly with respect to the Assembly and Congress. However, the Senate visualizations still raise concerns because of the reduction of Latino effective districts, and the diminution of Latino presence in districts that are likely to become Latino effective districts in the near future. We also believe the Commission should further enhance Latino electoral opportunities at the Assembly and Congressional level.

² Generally, districts with at least 50% Latino CVAP will hereinafter be referred to as "Latino effective" districts. In a few cases, we have categorized districts with 49% Latino CVAP as Latino effective districts because they are essentially performing as or are extremely likely to perform as Latino effective districts.

Table 1 reveals that the Commission’s current visualizations create four additional Latino effective districts overall at the Assembly level.

Table 1
Latino Effective Districts – State Assembly

Existing			Visualization			
Region	District #	Latino Share of CVAP	Region	District Name	Latino Share of CVAP	
Central Valley	31	53.0%	Central Valley	FSEC 2	51%	
Los Angeles metro area	39	62.4%	Los Angeles metro area	LASFE	52%	
	45	50.8%		LADNT	51%	
	46	67.8%		LAVSQ	50%	
	50	71.4%		LAELA	58%	
	57	57.4%		LASGL	57%	
	58	63.4%		LACVN	51%	
Inland Empire	61	49.8%		LADNN	56%	
	62	54.5%		LAPRW	57%	
Orange County	69	52.0%		Inland Empire	RLTFO	52%
					POMVL	51%
			San Diego County	SSAND	51%	
			Orange County	SNANA	53%	
			Imperial/Riverside Counties	COACH	50%	

Source for district CVAP: For existing districts, MALDEF analysis based on the U.S. Department of Justice’s Special Tabulation of the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate Data (2005-2009). For Commission visualizations, Latino CVAP was taken from the districts on the interactive visualization website.

For the Assembly, the Commission’s visualizations create the following additional Latino effective districts:

- In the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the visualization creates an additional Latino effective district in the San Fernando Valley (LASFE) and the core Los Angeles area (LAVSQ). We would note that LAVSQ, which has a Latino CVAP of 50% and a Black CVAP of 40%, is a district which offers competitive representation opportunities for both ethnic communities.

- In the San Diego County area, the Commission creates a new Latino effective district, SSAND.
- Consistent with the recommendations in our June 28 testimony, Latino areas in the Coachella Valley of Riverside and Imperial County appear to be united in a new Latino effective district, COACH.

We also commend the Commission for restoring a Latino effective district in the Orange County area (SNANA) that had been weakened in the first draft maps released on June 10, and for respecting the community of interest which includes the Latino areas of Santa Ana and Central Anaheim. We urge the Commission to retain a Latino effective district in this area for any future mapping.

We urge the Commission to look closer at its configuration in the southern part of the Central Valley, because we believe that a Latino effective district should be created by increasing the Latino CVAP of the KINGS district. As discussed in more detail in Appendix I, community members recommend that this should be accomplished in part by including Latino areas in Visalia and Tulare in the KINGS district.

**Table 2
Latino Effective Districts – State Senate**

Existing			Visualizations		
Region	District #	Latino Share of CVAP	Region	District Name	Latino Share of CVAP
Central Valley	16	50.9%	Central Valley	KINGS	51%
Los Angeles metro area	22	52.1%	Los Angeles metro area*	LAELA	52%
	24	56.1%		LALBS	52%
	30	68.6%		LAPRW	50%
Inland Empire	32	51.8%	Inland Empire*	POMSB	51%
Imperial County/Riverside County area	40	49.0%			

*Although the Commission presents multiple options for its Senate visualizations in the Los Angeles and Southern California areas, the Latino CVAP of all of the Latino effective districts in these areas is identical, and there are no other Latino effective districts in any of the options.

Source for district CVAP: For existing districts, MALDEF analysis based on the U.S. Department of Justice's Special Tabulation of the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate Data (2005-2009). For Commission visualizations, Latino CVAP was taken from the districts on the interactive visualization website.

Table 2 reveals that the Commission's map reduces the number of Latino effective districts at the Senate level from six to five. We urge the Commission to review the following areas, in order to create or restore Latino effective districts, or strengthen Latino opportunities:

- The Commission should create an additional Latino effective district in the Central Valley by strengthening the Latino presence in the MRCED district, which is 43% Latino CVAP.
- In both of the Commission's Los Angeles visualization options, the district covering much of the San Gabriel Valley, LACVN, is only 44% Latino CVAP. Currently, most Latinos in this area are in Latino effective Senate districts, and LACVN should be reconfigured to strengthen its Latino CVAP.
- In Los Angeles' San Fernando Valley area, existing SD 20 is very close to becoming a Latino effective district, with 47.0% Latino CVAP. In contrast, in the Commission's visualizations, LASFE, which covers a considerable amount of the same area, is only 38% Latino CVAP. The district should be reconfigured to increase its Latino CVAP.
- In the Imperial County/Riverside County area, existing SD 40 is virtually a Latino effective district, with 49% Latino CVAP. In the Commission's visualizations, ISAND, which covers much of the same area in Imperial County, is only 46% Latino CVAP. While the diminution of the Latino CVAP in the district is relatively small, the configuration of ISAND is particularly problematic because it does not include the heavily Latino areas of Coachella Valley, which existing CD 40 does. As discussed in our June 28 testimony, we believe that Latinos of Imperial County and the Coachella Valley share the same challenges with respect to education, employment, and access to health care, and should be united in the same district.
- In the Orange County area, existing SD 34 has a Latino CVAP of 38.4%. In contrast, the Latino CVAP of the WSTSA district in the Commission's SoCal visualization options ranges from 26-29%, a considerably weaker Latino opportunity district than currently exists. The district should be reconfigured to increase its Latino CVAP.

(Table 3 appears on the next page)

**Table 3
Latino Effective Districts – Congressional**

Existing			Visualizations		
Region	District #	Latino Share of CVAP	Region	District Name	Latino Share of CVAP
Central Valley	20	50.5%	Central Valley	KINGS	49%
Los Angeles metro area	31	49.9%	Los Angeles metro area	DOWNTOWN	73%
	32	53.6%		DWWTR	50%
	34	64.8%		ELABH	50%
	38	65.3%		COMP	49%
	39	51.9%		COVNA	51%
Inland Empire	43	51.7%		SFVET	51%
			Inland Empire	ONTPM	52%
			San Diego/Imperial County	IMSAN	51%

Source for district CVAP: For existing districts, MALDEF analysis based on the U.S. Department of Justice's Special Tabulation of the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate Data (2005-2009). For Commission visualizations, Latino CVAP was taken from the districts on the interactive visualization website.

Table 3 reveals that Commission’s visualizations add two additional Latino effective districts; in contrast, its first draft maps at best retained the existing number of Latino effective districts. We commend the Commission for its efforts to respond to the concerns raised by many community stakeholders regarding the stagnation of Latino effective districts in its first draft Congressional maps.

- In the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the visualizations create an additional Latino effective district in the San Fernando Valley (SFVET) and in the south and southeast Los Angeles area (COMP). We note however, that the DOWNTOWN district, with 73% Latino CVAP is highly “packed,” and we urge the Commission to shift some of its Latino population to districts that are south and east of it, to strengthen the Latino presence in the surrounding districts.

- In the San Diego County area, the Commission creates an additional Latino effective district, IMSAN.
- In the Inland Empire area, the Commission restored a Latino effective district (ONTPOM) which it had weakened in its first draft maps, and we urge the Commission to ensure a Latino effective district remains in this area in the final maps.

While we believe the Commission's Congressional visualizations are a strong positive step toward ensuring that the growth in the state's Latino population is reflected in opportunities for fair representation, we believe that there are additional areas where the Commission must create Latino effective districts, or strengthen Latino opportunities.

- In the Central Valley area, the Commission should create an additional Latino effective district. In the Commission's visualizations, there are four districts that cover the south and mid-Central Valley area: KR (Latino CVAP 23%), KINGS (Latino CVAP 49%), MRCED (Latino CVAP 41%), and FRSNO (Latino CVAP 30%). Thus, there is only one essentially Latino effective district (KINGS); we believe that by reconfiguring the districts in this area, the Commission can create a second one.
- Existing current CD 47 in Orange County is 44.1% Latino CVAP. In the Commission's visualization, proposed SNORN in the same area has a Latino CVAP of 42%. While this is a relatively small diminution from the existing Latino CVAP, in the Commission's first draft maps, there was a far more significant reduction in the Latino CVAP in the districts covering the SNORN area. Moreover, in visualizations that preceded the most recent, the Latino CVAP of SNORN was less than 42% - in some cases, ranging from 35-38%. We commend the Commission for respecting the community of interest in the area by uniting Latino neighborhoods in Santa Ana and Anaheim in the most recent visualization. We urge the Commission to be mindful of retaining this community of interest and a strong Latino opportunity district in this area.

In addition, we understand that several community members have raised concerns about the impact of the Commission's visualizations on representation opportunities for the African American community at each level of office, particularly in the Los Angeles area. We believe that the Commission can maintain fair districts for African Americans without diminishing Latino opportunities, and we urge it to do so. In this connection, we note that three voting rights

organizations representing California's diverse ethnic communities (the African American Redistricting Collaborative, the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting, and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund) have submitted "unity maps" for the Assembly and for Southern California Senate districts. These maps show that it is possible to create increased Latino electoral opportunities while respecting the voting rights of all three underrepresented communities.

III. Community Member Input on Visualizations

As we have continued to mobilize Latinos to provide input into the Commission's redistricting process, community members have shared their perspectives on how proposed lines affect their communities of interest. We have attached a compilation of these comments in Appendix I, and we urge the Commission to give them serious consideration as they continue with the mapping process.

IV. Conclusion

The California Citizens Redistricting Commission has an unprecedented opportunity to ensure that all Californians have an opportunity for fair representation in the state's electoral process. The maps that the Commission draws will shape the political landscape for the next ten years, and will help determine whether Latinos and other underrepresented groups can continue to make political progress in the state. By making significant changes to its first draft maps, the Commission has taken a positive step closer toward protecting the voting rights of Latinos and ensuring that its maps reflect the growth of the Latino population. At the Congressional and Assembly level, it has restored or created additional Latino effective districts, and has responded to many comments submitted by Latino community members regarding their communities of interest.

We urge the Commission to continue its progress by rectifying the reduction of Latino effective districts in its Senate visualizations, and strengthening the Latino presence in districts that are close to becoming Latino opportunity districts in the Merced, San Fernando Valley, San Gabriel Valley and Orange County areas. The Commission must also carefully examine its Assembly and Congressional visualizations in the Central Valley area to determine if an additional Latino effective district should be created. We also call on the Commission to give full consideration

to the comments of Latino community members compiled in Appendix I. We believe the Commission shares our vision for a redistricting process that will help ensure the future strength of California's democracy, and we look forward to continuing to work with the Commission to achieve this goal.

Thank you for your consideration of our views and for your service to our State.

NALEO Educational Fund Compilation of Input from Latino Community Members about Communities of Interest*

ASSEMBLY

San Jose:

- San Jose and East San Jose have been split into two separate districts. This divides a Latino community of interest that shares common social and economic characteristics. The Commission should seek to unify San Jose and East San Jose, including the communities in Old Willow Glen, Monterrey Road, Burbank, East Foot Hills, and Penitencia Creek Road.

Tri County Central Coast region (Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties):

- The Commission should continue to maintain together the community of interest comprised of Salinas, Gilroy and Watsonville, including the surrounding farmland areas. Additionally, each of these communities should be kept whole.

Central Valley:

- The Commission should continue to utilize the 99 Freeway as a dividing line for Bakersfield. East of the 99 is a strong Latino community that should be located in a Latino effective district, which can be accomplished by strengthening the Latino CVAP of the KINGS district.
- The Commission should include the communities of East Oroshi, Goshen, Seville, Lemon Cove, Tulare, Woodville, Pixley, Terra Bella, Ducor, and Rich Grove in a Latino effective district. These communities are a community of interest and share agricultural interests, and members of the community are bilingual English and Spanish, or are primarily Spanish-speaking.
- The Commission should continue to keep Sanger in a Latino effective district.
- There is a natural divide between rural and urban Fresno, with a loose boundary that occurs along the Santa Fe railroad lines. The urban areas of Fresno should be maintained in the current Latino effective district, FSEC2.
- The Commission should add the heavily Latino neighborhoods of Tulare and Visalia to the KINGS district. These communities share social and economic characteristics with the Latino communities of interest in KINGS.

* This Appendix is a compilation and analysis of comments from Latino community members regarding the communities of interest affected by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission's latest Visualizations. The NALEO Educational Fund collected the community of interest comments through community workshops and webinars April 2011-June 2011. This document highlights the most salient input from community members and therefore does not encompass all testimony submitted by the Latino community.

Los Angeles:

- The Commission should add Van Nuys, North Hills and Mission Hills to the North East San Fernando Valley district, LASFE. These communities share common social and economic interests with the communities of Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, Mission Hills, North Hills, Arleta, Panorama, Sun Valley, and North Hollywood.
- The Commission should exclude the communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon from the Latino effective district LASFE, and include the communities of Van Nuys, North Hills, and Mission Hills. The communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, and La Tuna Canyon do not share many common social and economic characteristics with the Latino community of interest in the North East San Fernando Valley.
- The Commission should maintain together the community of interest that includes Azusa, Covina, Irwindale, and Baldwin Park. These communities share common social and economic characteristics and should be maintained together in the final maps.

Orange County:

- The Commission should maintain the communities of Santa Ana, East Garden Grove and Central Anaheim in the same district. These cities have several heavily Latino neighborhoods that share common social and economic characteristics and should be kept in the same district in final maps.

Imperial and Riverside County:

- The Commission should maintain a Latino effective district with the Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley unified in the same district. These communities share common social and economic characteristics.

San Diego:

- The Commission should keep together the Latino communities of interest that are east of the 805 Freeway and maintain the historic communities such as Barrio Logan, Logan Heights and Sherman Heights in a Latino effective district.

SENATE

Central Valley

- The Commission should add the heavily Latino neighborhoods of Tulare and Visalia to the KINGS district. These communities share social and economic characteristics with the Latino communities of interest in KINGS.

Los Angeles

- The Commission should continue to maintain together Latino communities west of and in the downtown Los Angeles area in a Latino effective district.

- The Commission should maintain together the Latino community of interest in the Northeast San Fernando Valley district LASFE, including the communities of Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, Mission Hills, North Hills, Arleta, Panorama, Sun Valley, Van Nuys and North Hollywood.

Imperial County and Riverside County:

- The Commission should maintain the Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley in the same district as it does in the Assembly visualizations. These communities share common social and economic characteristics and should be maintained together in final maps.

San Diego

- The Commission should maintain the Latino community of interest along Interstate 78 which includes Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos and Escondido. These communities have common social and economic characteristics.

CONGRESS

San Jose

- San Jose and East San Jose have been split into two separate districts. This divides a Latino community of interest that shares common social and economic characteristics. The Commission should seek to unify San Jose and East San Jose, including the communities in Old Willow Glen, Monterrey Road, Burbank, East Foot Hills, and Penitencia Creek Road.

Tri County Central Coast region (Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties)

- The Commission should continue to maintain together the community of interest comprised of Salinas, Gilroy and Watsonville, including its surrounding farmland. Each of these cities should be kept whole.

Central Valley

- The communities of East Porterville, Orange Cove, East Orosi and southwest part of the City of Fresno share common social and economic characteristics and should be included in a Latino effective district.

San Diego

- The Commission should maintain the Latino community of interest along Interstate 78 which includes Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos and Escondido. These communities have common social and economic characteristics.

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: "Christopher L. Bowman" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 8:59 AM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Christopher L. Bowman <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Live Video Feed for Today

Message Body:

Dear Commissioners:

I won't be joining you in Sacramento today, but planned to watch as much of the meeting on line. The home page indicates that the video feed is for the 23rd, not the 24th. Hopefully, that was a clerical error, and that the meeting will be broadcast, as always.

Please advise. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Christopher L. Bowman

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Ned Menoyo <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 3:15 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Ned Menoyo <[REDACTED]>

Subject: abbreviations on the maps

Message Body:

Hi,

I had a question as to what "LCVAP_095", "BDCVAP_095" and "ADCVAP_095" mean?

I know they have something to do with population variation, but I could not find a notation explaining their meanings.

Thanks!

Ned

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Jevette White <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 8:49 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jevette White <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting and education

Message Body:

How can do more. I am Concerned for all our young people more than every before they will be affected and where can they cast their vote we will be gone and they will be living in the community we created.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Jevette White <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 8:49 PM

To: [REDACTED]

From: Jevette White <[REDACTED]>

Subject: redistricting and education

Message Body:

How can do more. I am Concerned for all our young people more than every before they will be affected and where can they cast their vote we will be gone and they will be living in the community we created.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comments

From: Julie Thompson <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 4:55 PM

To: [REDACTED]

I don't understand, I see online a ton of comments about a certain suggestion, change or city and then I watch the commission meet and they don't listen to ANY of it?!!!! What is the point of 'public comments'? The entire API community has been totally ignored by this commission. I am horrified that so many other groups were given consideration but the OC API community which is some of the largest clusters of Asian-Americans in the country was totally ignored.

This is not fair representation.

Subject: Re: Chamber BOE Map

From: "Tamie A. Dramer" <[REDACTED]>

Date: 7/24/2011 8:46 AM

To: Chris Parker <[REDACTED]>

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

You sir- have done your homework!

T

Sent from Tamie's iPhone

On Jul 23, 2011, at 3:43 PM, Chris Parker <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for your hard work.

This morning the commission received a new proposed map for all four Board of Equalization seats from California Taxpayers' Association and several Chambers of Commerce, the Chamber map. This new map is a radical departure from the Commission's work up to this point and its late submission, for such a radical change, can only be seen as a ploy to limit public comment.

Ignores Communities of Interest

The proposed Chamber map ignores well known communities of interest. By taking Sacramento County out of the inland valley area and linking it with San Francisco, the new map violates the long standing relationship Sacramento has with the Central Valley. Sacramento news stations cover the area from Chico to Modesto regularly. Sacramento has clear transportation connections to the valley area with rail, shipping, freeways (both 5 and 99), government with organizations like Sacramento Area Council of Governments (<http://www.sacog.org/about/>), and education with the Los Rios Community College system that includes parts of Yolo, Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento County (http://www.losrios.edu/lrc/lrc_about.php).

Moreover, Sacramento is an inland community and shares many of the demographics and issues, water and the delta system being principal among them, facing our neighboring counties to the north and south. Sacramento shares little with the big urban centers of San Francisco and San Jose and their neighboring counties that make up the greater Bay Area. The coastal counties are united by their geography both in terms of their proximity to the ocean but also because of the mountain range and transportation corridor. It's relatively easy to get from San Luis Obispo to San Francisco via Highway 101. It's not easy at all to get from San Luis Obispo to Sacramento. This similarity in the coastal counties is reflected in your maps for Assembly, Congress, and Senate along the coastal region where none of the districts dig into the inland area. The proposed Chamber map violates communities of interest principals and should not be considered.

Not Compact

While it is difficult to make any district compact that covers one fourth of the population of the State, the proposed super district in the Chamber map is not compact in the Proposition 11/20 measure. In this case, the Chamber is grabbing population from distant coastal areas in lieu of much closer population inland. In the same vein, by putting Sacramento together with the Bay Area the chamber map is dismissing the closer population in San Joaquin, Merced, and Stanislaus for the much more distant population in the Bay. With existing transportation corridors, it is faster to reach the population in Fresno and Bakersfield from Sacramento than it is to reach the population in Santa Cruz. The proposed Chamber map violates the compact and contiguous requirement and should not be considered.

Too Radical

The proposed map is a radical departure from anything submitted before. It breaks up the coastal area, separates Sacramento from the inland valley, oddly cuts LA county, and ignores public comment and activity regarding San Bernardino and Riverside counties. It also all too conveniently keeps incumbents safe. If the map had been submitted earlier in the process, it might have been a good opportunity for more public comment and more discussion. However, at this late date the map's submission is such a radical change it hardly gives time for proper consideration. The proposed map also completely ignores the hard work you have done building Assembly and Senate maps. The proposed Chamber map is too radical in its divergence from the Commission's work as well as established communities of interest and should not be considered.

Keep the CRC Visualizations

While the July 11/18 visualizations include the odd district connecting San Diego to Siskiyou county, there is at least basis for that connection in looking at the mountain counties from San Bernardino on up. That linkage is also supported with the recent proposal for a South California, including the 13 counties you presently have in the ORSD district. The linkage is also supported by public testimony to keep Riverside and San Bernardino counties together for the BOE. There is also a clear connection among the counties on the border of the state, much as there is a clear connection among coastal counties.

Similarly, the Central Valley counties are correctly contained in the East district, and the Coastal counties contained in the West district. Moreover, the visualizations recognize the clear connection southern LA county has with northern Orange county -- they are nearly indecipherable when driving south -- and the clear connection southern Orange County has with San Diego.

You could consider adding the area west of Highway 27, south of 101, to the Ventura county line to make an almost perfect population for both the East district and the LA districts (the East district is currently under by roughly 63K and the LA district is over by 60K, it appears from rough maps the area west of highway 27 and south of 101 to the Ventura county line contains about 60K people).

Thank You,

Chris Parker
Sacramento, CA