From: Greg Kubelek
To: Gomez, Daisy
Subject: Re: public hearing district elections
Date: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 11:13:26

Thanks for responding. Below are my comments first submitted January 22.

To the City Clerk of Santa Rosa, California
I am submitting comments relative to the question of districted elections, the process of which appears to be starting anew after the fires. These comments should be included in the public record as testimony in a public hearing, the first of which may occur as early as February 6, 2018.

1. The required amendment of the city charter to accommodate district elections cannot be carried out under the terms of that same city charter. To meet the requirements of the demand letter, the question cannot be put before the voters as required.

The city council should treat this issue the same as racial covenants which were legal when the covenants were drafted, but are not legal anymore. In this case, the California Voting Rights Act, conflicts with the city charter.

2. All of the present city council should be dissolved in 2018. None of the members seated have received more than 21 percent of ballots cast. Needless to say, this is not democracy, and there is no reason to pretend it is.

City voters, if they were aware of this, would be troubled that the city council is being controlled by so few votes.

3. The demand letter cannot be satisfied by leaving a majority of the non-district seats in place.

4. Had Measure Q succeeded in 2012, A four-member majority would've taken office in the 2016 election. This is not the present case. Some method must be found to have 4 districted seats up for grabs in the current year.

A method of doing that would be assign each of current seven seats to the present council to numbered districts, and then use language of Measure Q to elect four districted seats this year, and complete the process in 2020.

5. Drawing up the new districts, is going to be tricky. The devil is in the details, as they say.

6. Reducing the council to 5 seats would parallel the county government and also satisfy the state voting law by electing a three - member

majority this year,

7. The city of San Rafael also is in receipt of a demand letter, and also has a five-member council. How is San Rafael approaching this?

8. I have grave suspicions that the opponents of democratic voting, will attempt to get a last-minute injunction to derail the December election.

A special election in June, would protect against this and also relieve the problem of run-off balloting, should it be required.

Again, I would like this letter to become part of the public record at the presumed first public hearing Feb. 6, 2018.

9. The Sonoma County Alliance's political action committee has taken great interest in this question (as it did with Measure Q in 2012) But its advocacy does not appear in the public record. Why?

Regards, Gregory Kubelek

On 2/6/2018 11:07 PM, Gomez, Daisy wrote:

> Greetings,
>
> Please check the district elections website again at https://srcity.org/districtelections. I believe everything is back in order now with the SpeakUp, Santa Rosa!, the public input page. Would please forward to me your previous email submitted on January 22nd so that we can update the website and we will make sure it's available at https://srcity.org/2605/Public-Input?
>
> Thank you,
>
> **Daisy Gomez, CMC**
> **City Clerk**
> City Clerk Department
> 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 10
> Santa Rosa, CA 95404
> Tel. (707) 543-3016 | Fax (707) 543-3030 dgomez@srcity.org
>
> City of Santa Rosa

From: Greg Kubelek <bluecanoe@sonic.net>

Date: February 6, 2018 at 10:04:16 PM PST
To: <ccoursey@srcity.org>
Subject: public hearing district elections

Was able to attend the public hearing on district elections via video.

Appreciated your comments about the need for public input on the question, and the implication that the district elections website (city clerk) was operational.

I noticed the the website was updated somewhat, but my comments submitted on January 22, were not listed under correspondence submitted. Apparently that document disappeared into the ether.

Additionally, the hyperlink to submit comments (join the discussion) is not operational. It says public comments are closed.

Regards, Greg Kubelek