I have questions and concerns about how the Commission might follow the Chapter 92 "Sunshine Law" provisions.

In the last cycle, 2011-12, I felt the Commissioners carried out most of their deliberations in Executive Session, denying observers the ability to fully understand what their thinking was and how best to craft testimony.

It was my strong impression what discussion they did conduct in open session was stilted, reserved and a pale, superficial presentation of the actual debate, the actual deliberation.

Further, because substantive issues were explored more fully in Executive session, commissioners were inhibited from sharing with the public what was discussed, further hobbling public understanding and testimony.

Because most of the debate took place in a sealed bubble, I believe was a contributing factor in allowing the Commission to make such grievous errors with their decision to ignore the constitutional mandate that only permanent residents be included in the population base for the purposes of alloying legislative seats between the Basic Island Units and then apportioning districts within each county.

I would like clarification on the role of the Deputy Attorney General in advising the Commission. Is all advice from the Deputy privileged, with the public not allowed to learn what was said? Or is the privilege going to be narrowly construed? Will all discussion and deliberation during executive session going to be treated as confidential or will confidentiality be limited to those matters which are legitimately confidential. Again, narrowly construed?

Thank you,
Bart Dame

"Civil disobedience is not our problem. Our problem is civil obedience. People are obedient in the face of poverty, starvation, stupidity, war, and cruelty. Our problem is that the grand thieves are running the country. That's our problem!"

- Howard Zinn