

Subject: Tentative Final Maps based on faulty data cannot possibly comply with Const. Req.s!! The Mt. Whitney mislocation incident is (likely) but only ONE symptom of a greater problem!

From: "Charles" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 2011 20:47:31 -0400

To: [REDACTED]

CC:

Recently, it came to my attention that Mt. Whitney, according to some maps being used by the Commission, was a full 125 miles (approx.) from its actual location. If something such as that can be off by so great a distance, what other data bits are likewise erroneous? Could it be that the data leading the Commission to believe it at all a good idea to attempt to join 1.5 Communities of Interest into one hybridisation?

The tentative Final Map is fatally flawed, needless to say!

And a map such as THAT cannot possibly satisfy even the most rudimentary level requirements of Cal. Const. Art. XXI, § 2(d).

Here's the truth.:

=====

Parts of one community of interest has been taken & force-fed-style unified with entirely separate & different community of interest, thus attempting to create (insofar as it may be possible for any gerrymanders to do so) hybrid community made of part of one community of interest combined with the whole of another. Thus three is made to become two. Of course, the "on the ground" reality of the matter is that which quite escapes the minds of those Hell-bent on the idea of Unification, even Partial Unification.

Note well Cal. Const. Art. XXI, § 2(d)(4), "The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or **community of interest** shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions."

The result of last July 28 vote simply does not accomplish that, but instead tramples under-foot the geographic integrity of at least two of the three northern-most Communities of Interest in California. Now that fact is simply beyond the ability of anyone to dispute, just as the Law of Gravity is similarly beyond dispute.

Note also Cal. Const. Art. XXI, § 2(d)(5), "To the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population."

Again, that simply was not done! Rather, the opposite was done (to the three northern-most Communities of Interest in California). This fact is simply beyond the ability of anyone to dispute, just as the Law of Gravity is similarly beyond dispute.

Here, again, is a refresher course on the geography of the three northern-most Communities of Interest in California.:

The region inclusive of Humboldt & Mendocino Counties have a culture all their own. Geographically, Humboldt & Del Norte Counties are separated from Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehema Counties by chains of mountains that run from western Siskiyou County down through western Trinity County. The two main east-west State Highways running through Trinity County are scarcely passable through the better part of the winter season, most years. Often, these same roads become totally impassable due to rock slides. Summer 2008 was no picnic, either, for the wildfires of that year forced major routes to become ad hoc bases of operation for fire crews. And mountain passes connecting central Siskiyou County with western Del Norte County can frequently, during the winter, become impassable. Even when they are not, winter travel is not for the faint of heart. Needless to say, the regions comprising Congressional District 1, Assembly District 1, and Senate District 2 are as separate from those comprising Congressional District 2, Assembly District 2, & Senate District 4 as any two can be while also being north of Sacramento. And this is not to mention the flow of communications & of commerce flows considerably more often north-south than east-west. Needless to say, the two regions cannot be identified as a single community of interest. What about the north-east region? Can it be combined with the north-central region as a single community of interest? Not exactly. The major east-west routes between north-central & north-east are all two-lane roads, though they nominally be identified as State "Highways." The major corridor of commerce & of travel in the north-east region is U.S. Highway 395, a route that circumnavigates the mountains that it does as it passes upward toward the Oregon border. Culturally, Modoc County has more in common with its neighbor to the south than with its neighbor to the south-west. Likewise, Lassen County is similarly separate from Shasta & from Tehema Counties, owing in part to the location of Lassen Volcanic National Park & its proximity to & intersection with State Routes 44 & 89. The most principal community in Plumas County, Chester, is considerably isolated from those along major routes of travel & commerce in the north-central region. All that, while the major routes of north-south travel & commerce in the north-central region are Interstate Highway 5 & State Route 99. Needless to say, the three regions of the North State, the north-west, the north-central, & the north-east, they are three entirely separate Communities of interest, **period**.

Here's a question. **¿Por qué estamos aquí, en el Norte, siendo sometido a los caprichos de quienes son hostiles a nosotros?*** In English, "Why are we, here in the North, being subjected to the wonts of those hostile to us?"

Is there any other reason for the hybridisation of 1½ Communities of Interest in this, the northern-most trio of Communities of interest, so that 3 becomes 2½? **¿Por qué?**

It is not the least bit necessary to at all reduce the collective representation of the North-state to make the necessary improvements to the boundaries of districts in the Bay Area & So-Cal. This does not have to be a situation of "either or." It can easily be made a situation of "both

and." But that seems not to be the manifest intent of the effort, to date! Why can there not, instead, be a GAIN in representation for the Northstate? We need more, not less! How is it that all changes are proposed to be at the EXPENSE of the Northstate, if they be changes at all? What's up with **THAT?**

Four things are needful, here.: **(a) Reverse** the decision made, last July 28! Scrap that map!; **(b) Recognise**, in the new map, the North-state's three northern-most extant Communities of Interest; **(c) Make** such improvements to the boundaries of districts in the Bay Area as are (more or less) proposed, in the "July 11 2011" Visualisations, to be made.; and **(d) Make** such improvements to the boundaries of L.A. Area & So-Cal districts as are proposed in the First Draft. But **above all**, let there be NO DEROGATION WHATSOEVER OF THE GEOGRAPHIC INTEGRITY OF THE THREE NORTHERN-MOST COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST IN CALIFORNIA, PERIOD!!! What's so hard to understand about that?

=====