

---

**From:** Ashlee Vinyard [avinyard1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 3:40 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Fwd: FW:  
**Attachments:** 20110405161822763.pdf

Please see attached. It is confidential from Lamar.

CONFIDENTIAL — LET'S DISCUSS BEFORE  
YOU SHOW ANYONE

Redistricting Proposal

*Jama*

- Maintains the core of current districts unless requested otherwise
- Strives to be fair and reflect the changing demographics of Texas
- Creates four new districts as allowed by the census results
  1. One new likely Republican district in East Texas
  2. One new likely Republican district in South Texas
  3. One new Voting Rights Act district in South Texas that leans Republican
  4. One new Voting Rights Act district in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area
- Results in 25 congressional districts that lean Republican and 11 that lean Democratic

---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 08, 2011 5:59 PM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Re:

Yes

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [<mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 08, 2011 06:50 PM  
**To:** Smith, CLS  
**Subject:** RE:

I'm just now having a chance to check email and voicemails. Are you still in the office? I can visit right now if you are available.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Smith, CLS [<mailto:CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 08, 2011 10:14 AM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:**

Need to talk w u and joe re redist. Thought we were going to finish w individual dists yesterday but have had a slowdown. Lamar =

---

**From:** Tony Essalih [essalih@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2011 9:36 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** FYI

The map that Congressman Smith and Eric sent to my boss last night is absolutely perfect, from our perspective, if it's workable.

Thanks, Gerardo.

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2011 1:56 PM  
**To:** Greg Hill  
**Subject:** Call

Greg,

I got your message but I'm swamped with the House Redistricting Map right now. Let's plan on touching base next week after this is voted off the floor.

Best,

Gerardo

---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2011 4:41 PM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'

I contacted Jeb and he just emailed back that he did discuss situation w co judge tho he didn't say whether the co judge was persuaded. Lamar=

---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2011 2:08 PM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'

Pls call when u can. Lamar=

---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:05 PM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Re:

Don't know why. Try cell 202 716 9622 or office.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [<mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2011 03:58 PM  
**To:** Smith, CLS  
**Subject:** Re:

Which number? Just tried to call you on the number that appeared and got a busy tone.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 3, 2011, at 2:08 PM, "Smith, CLS" <[CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov](mailto:CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov)> wrote:

> Pls call when u can. Lamar



**From:** Ashlee Vinyard [avinyard1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 03, 2011 3:30 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Fwd: FW:  
**Attachments:** 20110503160914891.pdf

21<sup>st</sup> CD

Core

Bexar (part) - up to 350 K

Comal

Travis (part) - up to 100K (high tech precincts  
because of Judiciary Committee  
Jurisdiction)

Blanco or West Hays (not in current district)

Hill Country (all or part)

Kendall

Kerr

Bandera

Real

Gillespie (not in current district)

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2011 10:31 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano

Eric told me u were asking re hays and travis and kerr. Do u need any more input from me?  
Appreciate ur cking. Lamar Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2011 10:47 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano

If have 275 in bexar 100 in comal 85 in kendall and kerr 40 in hays can handle 200 in travis if 57 mccain dist. Is that where u r headed. And does house expect to make map public? Lamar Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2011 10:52 PM  
**To:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Re:

Call me at work if you can. 512-463-0697

On Fri, May 20, 2011 at 10:47 PM, <lamarsmith21@gmail.com> wrote:

> If have 275 in bexar 100 in comal 85 in kendall and kerr 40 in hays  
> can handle 200 in travis if 57 mccain dist. Is that where u r headed.  
> And does house expect to make map public? Lamar Sent via BlackBerry  
> by AT&T  
>

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 21, 2011 12:01 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** One more idea

Cuellar has been the most helpful dem. He wld like part of bexar 50-150 and part of hildalgo if that is possible.

Also if mccaull and I share travis I feel a little obligated not to have a higher mccain than he does. Hope u have the high tech pcts I like.

And I think u kno I will sacrifice whatever I need to to help quico.  
Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, May 30, 2011 7:13 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Cc:** Eric Opiela

Do u have ryans email. Pls pass on. Wld it help quico on the margin if I gave him 3k more in bexar (either gop or hispanics) and took edwards co in exchange. Need to check demographics of edwards. If helps check w quico or scott.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Corbin Casteel [wcc@redrockstrategies.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 3:04 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Fwd: 9 Jun 11  
**Attachments:** 9Jun11.zip; ATT00001..txt

Begin forwarded message:

> ----- Forwarded message -----  
> From: Dub Maines <dubmaines@gmail.com>  
> Date: Thu, 9 Jun 2011 13:15:12 -0500  
> Subject: 9 Jun 11  
> To: Dub Maines <dubmaines@gmail.com>  
>  
> I would really appreciate you looking at this modified  
> Solomons/Seliger map. It is 26R and 10D, as is the one the House  
> Committee just passed. However, the Committee-passed map badly  
> retrogresses CD20 without creating a new VRA district. CD35 is in no  
> way a VRA district; it is a district that re-elects Congressman  
> Doggett - whether he receives the support of Hispanic voters or not.  
> In the map I've sent you, CD25 is a heavily-Republican, Hill Country,  
> West Texas district. CD20, contains the southeast quadrant of Travis  
> County, has incumbent Congressman Charlie Gonzales in it, is heavily  
> Bexar County, and is a legal, performing VRA district. CD35 is an  
> open seat and is a district from southern and central Bexar County to  
> Webb County. It is a legal, performing VRA district.  
> The Committee map, as passed, has next to no chance of pre-clearance -  
> either by Justice or the DC circuit court. The map I've sent you has a  
> very high probability of pre-clearing - at least in the DC court. This  
> is the analysis of those who have practiced in the Voting Rights area  
> - very successfully - for over 25 years. I would encourage you to  
> speak with them about the Committee-passed map. They may be from evil  
> DC, but they ARE the premier experts in this area, and I believe it  
> would be prudent to entertain their thoughts on this map!  
> There seems to be quite a bit of confusion about Section 5 pre-clearance.  
> Section 5 is not like Section 2, in that Section 2 deals with existing  
> maps and makes minimal changes to those existing maps, if the courts  
> feel changes are needed. Section 5 pre-clearance decides if a map ever really "exists."  
> If a map is not pre-cleared, then it is as if nothing had ever been drawn.  
> The courts will draw the map de novo as they did in 2001. Doggett will  
> be re-elected. Canseco will not be. Farenthold will not be. They will  
> likely split the baby on the 4 new seats. The Ds pick up a net of 4  
> seats. The Rs pick up a net of zero seats. This idea of challenging  
> the Constitutionality of Section 5 is high-risk poker with no discernible positive return.  
> Again, I would appreciate you importing and looking at this map.  
> Please call on me if you have any questions, comments, or suggestions.  
> Thank you,  
> Dub Maines  
> 972-898-6796  
>  
> --  
> Sent from my mobile device



---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 5:29 PM  
**To:** 'eopiela@ericopiela.com'; 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Fw:

Sessions called me yest and asked me what he cld do. So this is it. Don't have Daniels email so pls send to him.

-----Original Message-----

To: Pete Sessions  
Subject: Re:  
Sent: Jun 9, 2011 5:26 PM

Ok. Need to get word to Dale not to make any calls. AG upset. And pls call barton. Dub mains sending emails criticizing cd 20. May be used against us in court. We didn't kno Dale was making calls or wld have advised him not to do so. Lamar

-----Original Message-----

From: Pete Sessions  
To: 2235EEA9  
Subject: Re:  
Sent: Jun 9, 2011 5:19 PM

I will am with dan beneshek in upper pennensula michigan..doing an event..

-----Original Message-----

From: 2235EEA9  
To: Pete Sessions  
Subject:  
Sent: Jun 9, 2011 6:10 PM

Pls call. Lamar

---

**From:** Smith, CLS [CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 5:39 PM  
**To:** 'eopiela@ericopiela.com'; 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Fw:

Send to DH

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pete Sessions  
**To:** 2235EEA9  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 5:33 PM

Will do...

-----Original Message-----

**From:** 2235EEA9  
**To:** Pete Sessions  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 6:26 PM

Ok. Need to get word to Dale not to make any calls. AG upset. And pls call barton. Dub mains sending emails criticizing cd 20. May be used against us in court. We didn't kno Dale was making calls or wld have advised him not to do so. Lamar

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pete Sessions  
**To:** 2235EEA9  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 5:19 PM

I will am with dan beneshek in upper pennensula michigan..doing an event..

-----Original Message-----

**From:** 2235EEA9  
**To:** Pete Sessions  
**Subject:**  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 6:10 PM

Pls call. Lamar

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 8:23 PM  
**To:** Smith, CLS  
**Subject:** Re: Fw:

No hurry, but give me a call when you get a chance. Just want to talk you through a few things.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2011 at 5:38 PM, Smith, CLS <[CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov](mailto:CLS.Smith@mail.house.gov)> wrote:

Send to DH

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pete Sessions  
**To:** 2235EEA9  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 5:33 PM

Will do...

-----Original Message-----

**From:** 2235EEA9  
**To:** Pete Sessions  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 6:26 PM

Ok. Need to get word to Dale not to make any calls. AG upset. And pls call barton. Dub mains sending emails criticizing cd 20. May be used against us in court. We didn't kno Dale was making calls or wld have advised him not to do so. Lamar

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pete Sessions  
**To:** 2235EEA9  
**Subject:** Re:  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 5:19 PM

I will am with dan beneshek in upper pennensula michigan..doing an event..

-----Original Message-----

**From:** 2235EEA9  
**To:** Pete Sessions  
**Subject:**  
**Sent:** Jun 9, 2011 6:10 PM

Pls call. Lamar

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 9:26 PM  
**To:** Lamar Smith

Here is the language from the case that I mentioned to you. Please do not forward this email.

"We have never said that the entry of an objection by the Attorney General to any party of a state plan grants a district court the authority to disregard aspects of the legislative plan not objected to by the Attorney General."

On appeal, the Supreme Court agreed with the State that "in the absence of any finding of a constitutional or statutory violation with respect to those districts, a court must defer to the legislative judgments the plans reflect, even under circumstances in which a court order is required to effect an interim legislative apportionment plan."

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 9:28 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re:

Good to kno. R other cases to the contrary. Do u expect this view to prevail. Can use regardless.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano <[ginteriano@gmail.com](mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, 9 Jun 2011 21:26:23 -0500  
**To:** Lamar Smith <[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:**

Here is the language from the case that I mentioned to you. Please do not forward this email.

"We have never said that the entry of an objection by the Attorney General to any party of a state plan grants a district court the authority to disregard aspects of the legislative plan not objected to by the Attorney General."

On appeal, the Supreme Court agreed with the State that "in the absence of any finding of a constitutional or statutory violation with respect to those districts, a court must defer to the legislative judgments the plans reflect, even under circumstances in which a court order is required to effect an interim legislative apportionment plan."

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 9:29 PM  
**To:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Re:

Haven't found anything to the contrary and it was reaffirmed in Balderas in 2001. We expect it to prevail.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2011 at 9:27 PM, <lamarsmith21@gmail.com> wrote:  
Good to kno. R other cases to the contrary. Do u expect this view to prevail. Can use regardless.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano <ginteriano@gmail.com>  
**Date:** Thu, 9 Jun 2011 21:26:23 -0500  
**To:** Lamar Smith<lamarsmith21@gmail.com>  
**Subject:**

Here is the language from the case that I mentioned to you. Please do not forward this email.

"We have never said that the entry of an objection by the Attorney General to any party of a state plan grants a district court the authority to disregard aspects of the legislative plan not objected to by the Attorney General."

On appeal, the Supreme Court agreed with the State that "in the absence of any finding of a constitutional or statutory violation with respect to those districts, a court must defer to the legislative judgments the plans reflect, even under circumstances in which a court order is required to effect an interim legislative apportionment plan."

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2011 9:30 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re:

Great. Tks.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano <[ginteriano@gmail.com](mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, 9 Jun 2011 21:29:11 -0500  
**To:** <[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re:

Haven't found anything to the contrary and it was reaffirmed in Balderas in 2001. We expect it to prevail.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2011 at 9:27 PM, <[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Good to kno. R other cases to the contrary. Do u expect this view to prevail. Can use regardless.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano <[ginteriano@gmail.com](mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, 9 Jun 2011 21:26:23 -0500  
**To:** Lamar Smith<[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:**

Here is the language from the case that I mentioned to you. Please do not forward this email.

"We have never said that the entry of an objection by the Attorney General to any party of a state plan grants a district court the authority to disregard aspects of the legislative plan not objected to by the Attorney General."

On appeal, the Supreme Court agreed with the State that "in the absence of any finding of a constitutional or statutory violation with respect to those districts, a court must defer to the legislative judgments the plans reflect, even under circumstances in which a court order is required to effect an interim legislative apportionment plan."

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 6:41 PM  
**To:** gina.santucci@mail.house.gov

will you call me asap...281-814-9575 or 512-463-0697



---

**From:** Santucci, Gina [Gina.Santucci@mail.house.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 7:14 PM  
**To:** 'ginteriano@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Re:

I will get back to you later tonight. Waiting to speak to Brady's Chief.

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [<mailto:ginteriano@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 07:41 PM  
**To:** Santucci, Gina  
**Subject:**

will you call me asap...281-814-9575 or 512-463-0697

---

**From:** lamarsmith21@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 10:40 PM  
**To:** Eric Opiela; Jennifer Brown  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: okay....this has to stop.

Just had long talk w harvey hildebran who called me back. He did not know about the solomon amend and when I explained it took cd 20 back to benchmark and increased hispanics in cd 23 he said he wld study it and barton map and might not offer barton. Said purpose of barton was to improve cd 20. He also did not kno barton wld make a lot of del unhappy and hurt canseco and took three incumbents below 55 mccain so he said he wld study solomon amend tonite before making a decision. Think if burt called him and explained his amend hh wld not offer his. Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, 13 Jun 2011 22:29:06  
**To:** Brown, Jennifer Y.<[Jennifer.Y.Brown@mail.house.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Y.Brown@mail.house.gov)>  
**Cc:** 'lamarsmith21@gmail.com'<[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: okay....this has to stop.

Not that we don't have enough to worry about, as I was making my way through all the reports for each district I finally got to the Solomons amendment. Makes me want to shoot through the roof. I didn't go through all of this for nothing today. I got the stats in CD 20 to benchmark, 58.1 SSVR, etc. just to have them drop it back down to 55.6. I had a voice wondering in the back of my head how they were able to find enough Hispanics to jack Quico up from 52.8 to 54.1. I knew they couldn't do it alone with just 10k more in Maverick. They stole them from CD 20. This was the whole point behind this exercise. I gave them the tools to fix this, and it was used for this. I'm tempted to try to get someone to offer what I gave them as an amendment to Solomons amendment, but know that will blow things up.

Urrrgh!

EO