

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Fran Davis <francespdavis@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 1, 2018 10:05 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: redistricting initiative

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to consider and approve placing the "You Draw the Line" ordinance on the November ballot. It is far superior to the RIG process, including as it does more robust and fully developed guidelines for choosing applicants and including opportunities for much greater community engagement--so important in these times when community members so often feel left out of the process.

Thank you,
Fran Davis
P.O. Box 304
Summerland, CA
93067

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Michael Steinfeld <cardiomike@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 1, 2018 8:11 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: You draw the lines initiative

I am a registered voter in Santa Barbara district one and I support the you draw the lines initiative for inclusion on the November ballot. Thank you.

Michael Steinfeld
Sent from my iPhone

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Luella Engelhart <lengelh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 7:51 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Put "You Draw the Lines" on the ballot

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to put the "You Draw the Lines" ordinance on the ballot and to do a study of the "Reason in Government" initiative.

My concerns are that the RIG initiative will not protect voter rights. The YDL initiative, on the other hand, will mirror what the State has done in redrawing district lines and it will focus on community engagement, which is vital.

I cannot attend your meeting tomorrow, so I am writing because I want you to hear my concerns. Please put "You Draw the Lines" on the ballot.

Sincerely,

Luella Engelhart

965 La Senda
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Nancy Mulholland <nmulhol04@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 9:07 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: County redistricting

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the Board to vote to put the "You Draw the Lines" ordinance on the November ballot as an alternative option for a Redistricting Commission in the County. Also, I would like the Board to do a study of both the proposed initiatives for redistricting commissions, the "Reason in Government" initiative and the "You Draw the Lines" initiative. It is important that residents have the merits/drawbacks of both initiatives examined and published.

Thank you for your attention to this request, and for your service to the residents of the County.

Nancy Mulholland
115 W Pedregosa St
Santa Barbara

nmulhol04@yahoo.com

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Linda Stewart-Oaten <ellesso@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 9:53 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: RIG v You Draw the Lines Ordinance

Dear SB County Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my concerns regarding the possibility that the so-called RIG redistricting plan, as drawn up by Peter Adams, could be implemented in our County. I'm really worried that the design of this plan, which states that its members would be drawn by lottery, and not by a rigorous vetting process to insure that the members were not chosen from a pool of outside interests, would effectively result in by-passing input from our own citizens. With only 5 voting members, it leaves too many opportunities for outside entities, including oil companies, to exert influences that are counter to the needs and concerns of our county, in both the long and short term.

Instead, I'm in favor of the much more stringent guidelines put forth in Das Williams' alternative redistricting plan known as the "You Draw the Lines Ordinance", which spells out specific requirements for a larger number of voting members serving, and specifically calls for community engagement in the re-drawing of maps.

In summary, I ask you to reject the RIG plan and implement the much more palatable You Draw the Lines Ordinance.

Best wishes,

Linda Stewart-Oaten
167 Lyric Lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
(805) 967-0263

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Katie Davis <kdavis2468@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 11:16 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Comment on July 3 BOS Agenda items 4 and 5

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

Agenda item 4: I strongly support the BOS putting the "You Draw the Lines" ordinance on the ballot so that voters have the option of choosing a fair and representative Santa Barbara Citizens' Independent Redistricting and Voting Rights Protection Commission. Thank you to Supervisor William's office for proposing this in light of the cynical RIG proposal.

Agenda item 5: While you must put the "Reason in Government" (RIG) initiative on the ballot because narrow interest groups were able to pay to get sufficient signatures, you should order a report on it. The public has a right to understand the undemocratic nature of this proposal and who has funded it. For instance, with the onerous requirements that someone has to have registered in one party for 8 years and ensuring a democratic minority on the commission in a democratic majority county, the proposal is attempting to exclude young people and a representative commission. I hope that this attempt to silence UCSB/TV by creating a biased commission proves motivating to students this November.

Regards,

Katie Davis
Goleta, CA

Perez, Lucy

From: Carol Hemingway <cheming3@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 2:17 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: put "you draw the line" initiative on the ballot

Perez, Lucy

From: Brian Goebel <brian.goebel@driving2save.com>
Sent: Monday, July 2, 2018 3:24 PM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: bobcollector@gmail.com; Elliott, Darcel; sbcob
Subject: BoS Meeting July 3, 2018: Ordinance of the Board of Supervisors Adding Section 2-10.9A to the Santa Barbara County Code to Create a County of Santa Barbara Public Independent Redistricting Commission
Attachments: BoS Letter re IRC07022018.pdf

Supervisor Williams,

Attached please find the comments of Reason in Government on the proposed ordinance referenced above. Although we have concerns about some of the language in the proposed ordinance, as our comments make clear, we were pleased to see that you share our goal in establishing a truly independent redistricting commission in Santa Barbara County.

I am submitting the attached letter for Mr. Collector, who is traveling today and tomorrow morning, but will be at the Board of Supervisors Meeting tomorrow afternoon.

If you have questions about the Reason in Government comments or suggested revisions to the language of the Ordinance, you can reach me via this email or Mr. Collector at the email listed above.

Sincerely,

Brian Goebel
Member, Board of Directors
Reason in Government

Reason in Government

1187 Coast Village Road, #292

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

July 2, 2018

Supervisor Das Williams
Board of Supervisors
Santa Barbara County

Re: Ordinance of the Board of Supervisors Adding Section 2-10.9A to the Santa Barbara County Code to Create a County of Santa Barbara Public Independent Redistricting Commission ("Board Ordinance")

Dear Supervisor Williams,

We are writing today regarding the Proposed Board Ordinance that you have placed on the Agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting on July 3, 2018. If passed, the Board Ordinance would be placed on the November ballot and compete with the Initiative we introduced to create an Independent Redistricting Commission for Santa Barbara County ("IRC Initiative").

The Board Ordinance represents a thoroughly-researched alternative to the IRC Initiative. We appreciate your commitment to largely ending gerrymandering in Board of Supervisor elections going forward by establishing an independent redistricting commission. There is clearly widespread support for independent redistricting in Santa Barbara County.

That said, we have some concerns regarding certain language in the Board Ordinance as well as the potential for voter confusion with two actively supported redistricting items on the November ballot. To address the former, we offer a handful of suggested changes to the Board Ordinance for your consideration. We believe these changes would substantially strengthen the measure, ensure fairness, and increase its public support across the County.

Section 2-10.9A.060

Subsection (h)

The Board Ordinance requires a supermajority of 7 votes to pass a redistricting plan. Although the supermajority requirement is consistent with other independent redistricting efforts (*e.g.*, Proposition 11), we believe that in the event a supermajority cannot be achieved, the drawing of boundaries should be conducted by a panel of judges rather than a panel of elected officials as is specified in the Board Ordinance. This parallels the mechanism specified in Proposition 11. As a result, we recommend revising Subsection (h) to read as follows:

"In the event that there are not 7 or more votes for the affirmative approval of a plan, the redistricting plan shall be completed by a panel of 3 retired or active Santa Barbara Superior Court Judges, appointed

by the Presiding Judge of the Santa Barbara Superior Court, no later than December 31 of the year following the federal census. The panel may consider a majority report, minority report or reports and any proposed maps prepared by the commission.”

Subsection (a)(3)

The Board Ordinance states that “Districts shall comply with the California Voting Rights Act of 2001.” We would note that this requirement is not contained in any of the precedent cited for the Board Ordinance. This is likely because the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) is inapplicable in the context of drawing supervisorial districts, which are not “at-large” within the meaning of the CVRA. For this reason, and to avoid potential confusion and any legal issues that could arise by trying to apply the CVRA to the work of the commission, we recommend deleting this language in its entirety.

Section 2-10.9A.040

The Board Ordinance goes further than established precedent in seeking to preclude politically active individuals from serving on the commission. Although we believe this drafting effort is consistent with the stated goal of producing a commission that is independent of the influence of “political parties, campaign contributors or other special financial interests,” the current language is both incomplete and overly-broad.

Subsection (d)(6)

The language is incomplete because it singles out one class of special financial interests – corporate campaign donors – and ignores another – public employee unions (one of the largest sources of campaign contributions in Santa Barbara County elections). Accordingly, to achieve its stated goals and be fair in application, the Board Ordinance should be amended to include the following:

“(E) no commissioner or immediate family member may, within the last 8 years preceding appointment to the commission, have been a member of a union engaged in collective bargaining on behalf of, or otherwise representing the interests of, employees of Santa Barbara County.

(F) no commissioner or immediate family member may, within the last 8 years preceding appointment to the commission, have served as a consultant to a union engaged in collective bargaining on behalf of, or otherwise representing the interests of, employees of Santa Barbara County.”

In addition, we would strike “or had a significant influence” from Subsection (C) because that term is undefined.

The current subsection (D) should become subsection (G).

Subsection (d)(6) is overly-broad because of the definition of “Significant Financial Interest” in Section 2-10.9A.020. Accordingly, we recommend revising that definition to achieve a workable mechanism for meeting the Board Ordinance goal of a creating commission that is independent of special financial interests.

Section 2-10.9A.020(d):

Although we understand the intent of this subsection, the language is so broad that it could disqualify many politically inactive residents of Santa Barbara County from serving on the commission. For example, under the current language, a Santa Barbara County resident who owned a single share of Proctor and Gamble stock would be disqualified from serving on the commission if Proctor and Gamble donated \$500 to a candidate for office in Santa Barbara County. Similarly, a minority shareholder of an LLC who does not serve on its Board of Managers or hold an officer position within the LLC, would be unable to serve on the commission if the LLC contributed \$500 to a candidate within the County and generated \$100,000 a year in revenue within the County. This is true despite the fact that the minority shareholder has no legal mechanism for preventing such a contribution and would almost certainly not even be formally involved in deciding whether to make the contribution given the typical manner in which LLCs operate. These are just two examples of the overly-broad nature of the current language in the Board Ordinance, and we do not believe that the Board Ordinance is intended to have such sweep. Accordingly, we would revise Subsection (d) to narrow its scope. Our suggested revision:

“‘Significant Financial Interest’ includes the following:

- (i) Owning a controlling interest in (individually, or in combination with immediate family members), serving on the Board of, or serving as an Officer of, any for-profit company, corporation, or other business entity with gross receipts of over \$100,000 derived from doing business in Santa Barbara County in any of the last five calendar years prior to appointment.
- (ii) Being an immediate family member of any person described in subsection (i) above.
- (iii) The County Board of Supervisors may adjust the dollar amounts stated above by the amount by the cumulative change in the California Consumer Price Index, or its successor, in every year ending in zero.

Subsection 2-10.9A.040(e)(1)(D):

We believe that each supervisorial district should be treated identically in the creation of the pools from which the commissioners are drawn. Accordingly, this subsection should be revised to read:

“Nine (9) applicants from each existing supervisorial district shall be included in the list of most qualified applicants, unless there are less than nine (9) applicants from the district that meet the minimum qualifications set forth in subdivision (d), in which case the total number of qualified applicants will constitute the pool.”

Subsection 2-10.9A.040(f):

For clarity, after “create a subpool for each of the five existing supervisorial districts of the board,” we would add “comprised of qualified applicants residing in the district corresponding to the pool to which they have been assigned.”

Subsection 2.10.9A.040(h)(1) and (h)(3):

The five commissioners selected by random drawing are responsible for selecting the remaining six commissioners. However, the Board Ordinance does not specify the vote by which these selections are to be made. In keeping with the supermajority requirement for the operations of the commission as whole, we believe subsection (h)(1) should be revised to read:

“The five selected commissioner shall review the remaining names in the subpools of applicants and shall appoint six additional applications to the commission. In order to be appointed, an applicant must receive the vote of at least four of the five selected commissioners.”

With regard to subsection (h)(3), we would note that proportionality on the commission with regard to registered voter percentages in the County may not be possible, and could detract from the stated goals of independence and impartiality. For this reason, we would include the language found in AB 801 and SB 958, and insert it immediately following “most recent statewide election”:

“However, the political party preferences of the commission members are not required to be exactly the same as the proportion of political party preferences among the registered voters of the County.”

Conclusion:

We appreciate your commitment to independent redistricting, and thank you in advance for your consideration of these suggested changes to the Board Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Robert Collector, on behalf of

The Board of Directors
Reason in Government

cc: Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Darcel Elliott, Chief of Staff, First District Supervisor Das Williams