

Subject: Redistricting

From: Chuck <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 2011 13:15:44 -0400 (EDT)

To: [REDACTED]

Thanks to those who worked out the redistricting to a meaningful solution.

Chuck Johannsen

Dana Point

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Harold Reed <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 2011 18:56:19 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Harold Reed <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Redistricting

Message Body:

My wife and I are unhappy with the new redistricting and definitely oppose it. We are happy with our representatives and object to your changes.

Harold & Lydia Reed
Anderson, CA 96007
Shasta County

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: "Eric S. Fisher" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 2011 22:20:49 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Eric S. Fisher <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Please comply with the constitution - fix the "preliminary final maps"

Message Body:

Please fix the "preliminary final maps", and do not split cities such as Torrance. As acknowledged on your website, wedrawthelines.ca.gov, the commission is to follow the state constitution and applicable federal law.

The "preliminary final maps" fail in several respects:

Article 21, Section 2 (d) (4) [geographic integrity] states "The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected to the extent possibly without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions." With these maps you seem to go out of your way to split cities such as Torrance, Modesto, Fresno and several others. In addition, many of your proposed boundary lines are jagged, saw-toothed, or bulbously herniated protrusions. They resemble the scandalously drawn, gerrymandered 2000 lines, which ironically prompted the Voters FIRST Act proposition.

Article 21, Section 2 (d) (5) [compactness] states "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." It is not hard to find numerous examples where this subsection was ignored. On the congressional map, the most obvious are the 33rd and 44th districts. On the state senate map, the 26th. And what can possibly explain the "yin/yang" tornadic swirl of lines over Bakersfield?

Article 21, Section 2 (d) (6) [makeup of senate and equalization districts] States "To the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, each senate district shall be comprised of two whole, complete, and adjacent Assembly districts, and each Board of Equalization district shall be comprised of 10 whole, complete, and adjacent senate districts." If Assembly districts are drawn in accordance with the criteria called for, then this formula would ensure that the criteria is met for senate and equalization districts. And it is a good idea that was followed until the flawed 2000 lines were drawn. How can the committee justify not even attempting to meet this criterion?

We, the voters, approved the proposition establishing the commission primarily because the legislature ignored the equivalent provisions in the California constitution, resulting in the 2000 egregiously gerrymandered districts, particularly for state senate in LA county. It is distressingly disappointing that you have mimicked their efforts.... a fifth grader could have done much better.

PLEASE, re-draw the lines to comply with the criteria in the California constitution.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Redistricting

From: Deborah Robinson <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 2011 16:15:27 -0700

To: [REDACTED]

Please maintain the districts that benefit African-Americans because people died for the right to vote. Also, please maintain the 36th District as recently won by Rep. Janice Hahn. Thank you.