Dear Commissioner,

As a voter residing in Chico (Butte County), I would like to commend you for your efforts in helping to clean up California’s electoral maps. It’s a huge job, but you are doing what the voters asked of you and for that we are thankful.

On July 11th your commission made some changes to the Assembly districts in our area, particularly the Mt. Cap and Yuba Districts. Let me offer my support and say that I applaud these changes and I think you got it right.

Previous maps had lumped Chico in with mountain counties to the east, but we have so much more in common with our western neighbor counties. Lower Butte County is agriculture based. We produce some of the highest yields of rice, almonds, and walnuts in the region. Our local college, Chico State University, has an incredible ag program for our students. Even Butte Community College has a campus in Glenn County.

The Chico Enterprise Record published an editorial expressing these same views, and I am including it with this letter. They state that Shasta County would be better suited with the mountain counties in the east, and I could not agree more. I believe this principle works for both our local Assembly and State Senate districts, and I would ask you to make no further changes to our region’s districts.

Thank you again for your efforts and your consideration,

Sincerely,

Erik Lyon
Editorial: Good and bad of redistricting

Our view: While we support the redistricting commission efforts, there are some weird things about the maps in our neighborhood.

Initial analysis of maps released earlier this month by the citizen’s commission redrafting California’s legislative and congressional districts, indicates the panel may have hit one of its desired targets. But wow, it did some strange things to Butte and Glenn counties.

On the good side, the nonpartisan Public Policy Institute of California found the new maps released would increase the number of "competitive" districts in the state from 16 to 34.

In those district, Republican candidates would have to reach out to Democrat voters, or vice versa, which should produce more moderate candidates — a good thing.

But that’s still just 34 of the 173 legislative and congressional districts, not exactly a number that’s going to bring partisanship to a screaming halt. It’s a start, and that's about all.

And as we said, a couple of the maps are odd from our perspective.

In the assembly maps, Butte County is separated from the rest of the Sacramento Valley and grouped with a mountain district that stretches from the Lake Tahoe basin around the northeast corner of the state to include half of Siskiyou County.

One would think Shasta County would have fit better as a good two-thirds of that county is mountainous, and it’s flanked on two sides by the mountain district.

Instead, Butte County sticks out like a thumb, connected to its new district only by the border with Plumas County. The rest of Butte’s surrounding counties — Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Glenn and
Tehama — are in the separate valley district.

Hard to see how that keeps "communities of interest" together.

The congressional map is even stranger for Glenn County, as reported on today's front page.

Western Glenn County is in a pretty coherent district with Butte County that stretches to the state's northeast corner.

But the line dips back east to encompass the cities of Orland and Willows, and hooks them to a so-called "Yuba" district that is anything but.

It does include Yuba County and Sutter, Colusa, Lake and part of Yolo. But it also has most of Napa County and the most populous parts of Sonoma County, including the city of Santa Rosa. The majority of the district's population is in those later two counties.

Rather than being a "Yuba" district it's more of a "Napa-Sonoma" district. The attached rural counties will be marginalized by the connection.

Again, we wonder what "community of interest" stretches from Santa Rosa to Yuba City to Orland. And the separation of Glenn County's two cities from the bulk of the county's population is just strange.

We know there's no way the final product will please everyone. And since of none of the 13 meetings scheduled to take public comment on the draft maps is north of Sacramento, it gives us a pretty good idea who's going to be displeased.

It seems like the commission could have done better than this.
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