

From: **James Wright** [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Apr 17, 2011 at 12:59 AM
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT -- The need for partial maps to supplement descriptions
To: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

Commissioners,

While collecting input testimony, some of the speakers have provided you with maps of the area(s) of concern to them. Others have depended on the Q2 mapper to display a image of their area of concern for you and the audience to view. Most of the time the speaker has not described their area in any but the most vague terms. Their discussion centered more on why they had this interest.

As I mentioned on Saturday, some people (really many people) are very visual. When they see an image it clicks and is memorable to a much greater extent than is any description. Though I am able to comprehend such a description, such is a much more difficult and a more time consuming exercise than viewing a map. With a map, the location and its context immediately pop up. There are folks who have become trained and are skilled at understanding descriptions of land areas where many of us would be more comfortable with an image or an image to supplement any description.

Other governmental agencies dealing with land area also gravitate to maps. USCGS, NOAA, DOD, etc. For example, my county assessor maintains an extensive map file covering all real property in Santa Clara county. When I visit their website and enter my parcel number, I get a map. There is also a "legal description" which is on my grant deed. I've seen it ... once. It had little meaning until the accompanying map was viewed. Then, oh yea!, that's the spot!

In each input you collect where the description is more than simple (not just a whole city or county), a map fragment would be useful to cement an understanding between all parties as to precisely what is being or has been discussed. It does not have to be a map of the whole state unless that is the topic.

For example, in Saturday's discussion on splitting Madera county, The response was to divide Madera by extension of the line between Merced and Mariposa counties. With a marked up map of that area, all would know whether the proposed line went across to Friant in Kern county or should be drawn around O'Neals? [<http://cagenweb.com/madera/MadMap.htm>] Look at this map. You don't know from the description alone which side of O'Neals or that O'Neals is north of Friant. That is a very important piece of information. For the record, a map fragment of those three counties with the proposed division sketched in would nicely complete the documentation of that particular testimony.

It makes sense to complete the record of most testimony with not only the "thousand words", but the "picture" as well.

Thanks,
Jim Wright
a voter from San Jose