



Fwd: Redistricting

Voter <[redacted]>
To: [redacted]

Fri, Jul 22, 2011 at 10:48 AM

8 Napa
July 21

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

Subject: Redistricting
Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2011 18:15:39 -0400 (EDT)
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission,

Attached please find a pdf file of my letter regarding redistricting.

Cordially,

Cynthia A. Johnson
[redacted]



Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission.pdf
142K

Dear Citizens Redistricting Commission,

The latest draft of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission Assembly maps had two significant alterations to the first released proposal. The first is the removal of Santa Rosa from its historic partnership with Napa County. The second is an ill-advised division of Santa Rosa into three different Assembly districts. Santa Rosa appears to have been divided arbitrarily, for population reasons alone. This runs contradictory to the spirit and mandate of the Redistricting Commission, as it fails to protect ecological and economic communities of interest.

The most egregious change was the trifurcation of Sonoma County, with Santa Rosa as the focal point. In this proposal, the MARIN district would seize 44.1% of the County (and not necessarily the portion of the county most closely tied to Marin) , while the DMNDO district would have 41%. This leaves the NAPA district with a paltry 14.9%. Historically, California has recognized the significance of the wine industry and the benefit to partnering these two great regions, specifically Santa Rosa and its associated wine growing regions with Napa County.

The wine industry is responsible for \$200 million and \$500 million in Sonoma and Napa Counties respectively. These figures do not take into account the tourism this industry fosters.

'Wine Country' isn't just a colloquial way of looking at Napa and Sonoma, it's an economic model with infrastructure designed to enhance and benefit the partnership. Highway 12 runs through Santa Rosa and into Napa County and is the pulse of the entire region. Many infrastructure projects have used this highway as a guide, creating a vibrant and essential link. Further, in this redistricting proposal, Napa County is attached to Lake County rather than Santa Rosa and Sonoma County. A significant case can be made that the Mayacamas mountain range, which divides Napa and Lake, makes the partnership of these two counties infeasible. Whereas Napa and Santa Rosa have developed significant infrastructure ties, Napa and Lake Counties have not. It makes much more sense for the NAPA district to retain Santa Rosa, while Lake County remains with the DMNDO district.

Connecting Napa County with Yolo County and the Greater Sacramento area as shown in the latest visualizations is another serious violation of the mandate of the Commission. Napa County, along with Sonoma County, is one of the nine Bay Area counties and a member of major Bay Area governmental planning agencies such as the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission that drive regional housing, land use, job growth, water use, and transportation policies. Severing Napa County's representation in this region and placing the county in the Greater Sacramento area severely disrupts Napa's historical common social, economic, and geographical connection with Sonoma County and the Bay Area.

Based on these factors, coupled with the fact that this important district went unrepresented on the commission, I respectfully ask that the commission reconsider their latest district proposal. Instead of dividing Santa Rosa into thirds (which will create a bureaucratic nightmare); reattach it to Napa. In addition, Rohnert Park should be returned to its 101 corridor configuration. The demographics and numbers still meet the mandate of the commission while protecting a significant community of interest.

Cordially,

Cynthia A. Johnson

Sebastopol CA 95472