

Region 9 - Sacramento  
June 26

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

**Subject:** Public Comment on Proposed District Boundaries

**Date:** Sun, 26 Jun 2011 11:11:23 -0700

**From:** John Munn <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

**To:** <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

To: California Citizens Redistricting Commission

Re: Public Comment on Proposed District Boundaries

Attached are comments on proposed district boundaries affecting Yolo, Solano, and Sacramento Counties. In summary, the proposal to divide the City of Sacramento into separate districts violates the Proposition 11 criteria for maintaining the geographic integrity of cities, counties, neighborhoods, and communities of interest. In addition, creating a finger running along Interstate 80 over the Yolo Causeway so that the City of Davis can be used to fix a population imbalance created by splitting the City of Sacramento clearly violates the Proposition 11 criteria of not bypassing nearby areas of population to include more distant populations.

Sincerely,

John R. Munn



**JRM Reapportionment Comments.pdf**

8K

---

## Reapportionment Comments

John Munn  
June 26, 2011

I am a resident of Davis, and I have some experience with the current Assembly District from being a candidate in past elections, so I am going to focus my comments on Davis and on the proposed Assembly boundaries.

My view is that current Assembly District 8 did not suffer from Gerrymandering that has affected other parts of the state.

The current district is made up of small to medium sized cities, most of which are connected by major freeways, and includes agricultural lands. And, with a few exceptions that I thought would be fixed, its boundaries do not divide communities.

What I expected were changes to account for increased population and to keep communities together, so I was very surprised by the proposed new boundaries.

I find the argument that Davis and Sacramento are alike because some Davis residents commute to work in Sacramento or go there to shop to be mostly irrelevant for the purposes of district representation.

Davis is a small to medium sized city with financial and infrastructure concerns that are more like other small to medium sized cities. Sacramento is a much larger city with big city issues and conflicts, like who should pay for an arena. Trying to represent the two at the same time would create unnecessary complications.

It makes more sense to keep Davis in an Assembly District with other cities that have similar concerns. For example, Davis should be in a district with other small and medium sized cities that have common interests about the Interstate 80 corridor.

The shape of the proposed district also makes little sense. The width of the finger reaching across the Yolo Causeway is actually deceptive, because there are few if any people living in it. In fact, this boundary could be drawn on the north and south sides of the freeway with the same effect. This is clearly a finger that conflicts with Commission direction to not bypass nearer populations to include a more distant population.

Finally, I have no idea how splitting Sacramento, and then using Davis to help balance population, meets the criteria of geographic integrity for cities or not bypassing nearby populations.

I just never imagined that applying the Proposition 11 criteria could result in splitting the City of Sacramento, or dragging Davis across the Yolo Causeway to be combined in a district with Sacramento. And I will leave it at that without speculating about why such an arrangement is being proposed.