

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment at 4-15-21 CCSD Board Meeting Agenda Item 4.  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 14, 2021 6:17:41 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Comment at Board Meetings 4-15-21.docx](#)

---

To CCSD Directors,

Attached please find our suggestions for enhancing public comment opportunities at CCSD Board meetings.

Thank for your consideration of these suggestions.

Crosby and Laura Swartz

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Ossana Terterian](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 4/15/21 Agenda Item 7.C. on election  
**Date:** Thursday, April 15, 2021 2:03:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [election division within district.pdf](#)

---

Please include this public comment in the written record of this meeting, 15 April 2021.

I do intend to read it out loud too.

☺

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

**From:** Elizabeth Bettenhausen [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Apr 13, 2021 at 10:11 AM  
**Subject:** 4/15/21 Agenda Item 7.C. on election  
**To:** Cindy Steide [REDACTED] Donn Howell [REDACTED] Harry Farmer [REDACTED] Karen Dean [REDACTED] Tom Gray [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** John Weigold <[jweigold@cambriacsd.org](mailto:jweigold@cambriacsd.org)>, Kathe Tanner [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Board of Directors:

The **attached** section of the California Code is pertinent to your deliberations on the item concerning election districts.

Please consider it, as you review the California Voting Rights Act, to determine what action needs to be considered here in Cambria.  
[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB182](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB182)

On the face of it, it's not clear to me why the CCSD needs to "contract with the National Demographics Corporation, which will perform a racially polarized voting analysis to determine if CCSD's current use of an at-large voting system may violate the California Voting Rights Act."

I do believe that white racism is expressed in many ways in Cambria. But hiring a for-profit corporation to perform a "racially polarized voting analysis" raises many questions of assumptions and statistical analysis. As the description from NDC points out, "While the Federal Voting Rights Act enjoys nearly 50 years of legal precedents, California's version both builds on and directly rejects those

precedents. Unfortunately, the law itself and the two court decisions issued so far do not clearly define the terms and potential liability involved" (Agenda, p. 76).

I note that the threat of lawsuit is often posed by the CCSD District Counsel and staff as a compelling reason to take a specific action. Never have I found the specific action adequately substantiated with supporting evidence of the threat..

In this case in Item 7.C., could money be better spent by posting many items on the CCSD website in Spanish, as well as English? That might contribute to diversifying candidates for the CCSD Board of Directors. Of course, that assumes the dominant white meaning of "racially polarized." What meaning do you as CCSD directors use?

Thank you for your public service.

Elizabeth Bettenhausen

Full-time resident of Cambria, CA, since 22 March 2002

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** Comment for agenda item 7c for today's board meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, April 15, 2021 12:32:45 PM

---

Comment Re: Agenda Item 7C April 15, 2021 CCSD Board Meeting

It is good that the board is being proactive in addressing any possible redistricting required by the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA), but the board should seriously consider not hiring National Demographics corporation. A cursory search indicates that they have ties to the Republican party and have provided inaccurate data.

Here are three articles outlining concerns with NDC:

<https://www.davisvanguard.org/2019/08/proposed-demographer-firm-found-to-have-fabricated-data-in-north-carolina-two-weeks-ago/>

<http://www.santamariasun.com/news/20265/redistricting-commission-votes-to-keep-controversial-demographer/>

<https://www.independent.com/2020/11/11/santa-barbara-county-redistricting-committee-gets-new-legal-counsel/>

Especially concerning would be if NDC reached out to the CCSD in an unsolicited bid. The board should have learned its lesson on no bid projects or consultants providing unsolicited offers.

I encourage the board to involve the community and to look at free resources available from the state, the California Special District and non partisan organizations like the League of Women Voters. Here is a resource they provide.

[https://my.lwv.org/sites/default/files/leagues/wysiwyg/%5Bcurrent-user%3Aog-user-node%3A1%3Atitle%5D/lwvcef\\_fair\\_maps\\_california\\_local\\_redistricting\\_toolkit.pdf](https://my.lwv.org/sites/default/files/leagues/wysiwyg/%5Bcurrent-user%3Aog-user-node%3A1%3Atitle%5D/lwvcef_fair_maps_california_local_redistricting_toolkit.pdf)

Since lawsuits have been regarding cities and larger municipalities and a cap has been set at 30,000 for lawsuits, I think speaking about lawsuits is just a scare tactic. Certainly a record of the board discussing the issue, getting community involvement (bilingual) and availing itself of free nonpartisan resources would show that the board and community are doing its best to make voting fair in Cambria. Hiring a consulting firm with ties to one party will not.

Susan Mackey  
Cambria Community Member