



July 6, 2023

The Honorable Anna Caballero, Chair
Senate Governance and Finance Committee
1021 O Street, Suite 7620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: **AB 764 (Bryan): Local redistricting**
As amended 6/19/23 – OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED
Set for hearing 7/12/23 – Senate Governance and Finance Committee

Dear Senator Caballero:

On behalf of the Urban Counties of California (UCC), the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and the League of California Cities (CalCities) we write to share our opposition to Assembly Bill 764 unless it is amended to address our concerns associated with the proposed changes to California's FAIR MAPS Act.

While we can appreciate an interest in ensuring the public's trust in local redistricting processes, counties and cities diligently worked during the 2021 redistricting cycle to comply with the FAIR MAPS Act under extraordinary circumstances, including delayed data from the United States Census Bureau, adjusted deadlines to accommodate such delays, and COVID-related workplace challenges, including widespread health and safety protocols, remote work, and staffing shortages. To our knowledge, these efforts during the 2021 redistricting cycle were met with notable success, as noted in the findings and declarations of AB 764, especially considering that this was the first time that local agencies were tasked with new requirements for the redistricting process amidst a global pandemic. Of course, there is always room for improvement; however, some components of AB 764 impose unreasonable and impractical burdens on California counties and cities with district elections.

Burdensome Reporting Requirements Make Compliance a Challenge. AB 764 contains a number of new reporting requirements for counties and cities that will require significant professional assistance to ensure compliance. New requirements and reports proposed in AB 764, will be costly, time-consuming, and in all likelihood not feasible with existing staff. In addition, each includes strict and short publishing deadlines and, in some instances,

aggressively prescriptive requirements for what must be included in the report. While we support a transparent and accountable redistricting process, stringent new reporting obligations proposed in the bill pose a significant challenge to eventual compliance.

Additional Requirements for Public Hearings Are Costly and Impractical. AB 764 increases the number of public workshops and hearings for all counties and cities with district elections and, in some instances, increases them dramatically. The FAIR MAPS Act required counties and cities to conduct at least four public hearings; some agencies held additional workshops and hearings to better outreach to their communities. In the category of “no good deed goes unpunished,” AB 764 ramps up the number of public hearings to five for the smallest agencies (plus a separate standalone workshop), seven for medium-sized agencies (plus workshops), and nine for the largest agencies (plus workshops). Further, AB 764 adds additional requirements for public meetings to be held on a weekend or evening. Public hearings and workshops require considerable time and effort to plan and execute; such a marked increase in public meetings again makes compliance a challenge. Since AB 764, like the current FAIR MAPS Act, requires live translation of public hearings upon request, this adds one more challenging task to accomplish for each and every one of these additional hearings.


Private Right of Action Adds Significant Uncertainty and Cost. Counties and cities have strong concerns about the special private right of action contained in AB 764 for any *ongoing* violation or *prevention of a future* violation or a *threat* of violation of the provisions of the Act. Existing law provides for robust judicial review of counties’ and cities’ redistricting processes and decisions through a petition for writ of mandate brought under Code of Civil Procedure section 1085. These procedures provide a well-established, stable, and well-understood body of law governing judicial review of these matters, and California courts have not hesitated to intervene when county redistricting does not comply with applicable law. The proposed new private right of action interjects significant uncertainty into both the procedural requirements and substantive standards for judicial intervention, and creates significant uncertainty and invites litigation, even with a 15-day ability to cure. We are unaware of any deficiency in the current provisions for judicial review, and are likewise unaware of any flagrant violations of the FAIR MAPS Act from the 2021 redistricting, which relied upon those provisions. We consequently question the need for such a provision.

AB 764 proposes significant new requirements for local redistricting processes that, given counties’ and cities’ previous performance during the 2021 redistricting process, appear to be unwarranted. While it is reasonable to consider implementation of best practices for the next round of redistricting, AB 764 outlines new obligations that, when taken in total, will simply not support local agencies’ redistricting success. From our perspective, such a failure would only serve to validate public distrust in the redistricting process and in our democratic systems that are already under intense public scrutiny.

We have prepared a number of what we believe are reasonable and appropriate amendments that will serve to improve the redistricting process, while ensuring that counties and cities responsible for administering the process have the resources they need

to execute the process successfully. We also greatly appreciate the ongoing dialogue with the author's office, sponsors, and your committee staff about how to best address our concerns in a mutually beneficial manner. At this time, however, we remain respectfully opposed to AB 764. Please don't hesitate to reach out if we can be of additional assistance.

Sincerely,



Jean Kinney Hurst
Legislative Advocate
Urban Counties of California
ikh@hbeadvocacy.com



Sarah Dukett
Policy Advocate
Rural County Representatives of California
sdukett@rcrcnet.org



Eric Lawyer
Legislative Advocate
California State Association of Counties
elawyer@counties.org



Johnnie Pina
Legislative Affairs, Lobbyist
League of California Cities
jpina@cacities.org

cc: Members and Consultants, Senate Governance and Finance Committee
The Honorable Isaac Bryan, California State Assembly