

**Subject:** Maps voted on last July 28 disappoint.

**From:** "Charles" <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Tue, 02 Aug 2011 20:47:52 -0400

**To:** [REDACTED]

**CC:**

After having seen the maps voted on last July 28, I must say that, prima facie there seems to be intent to do spite unto the three northern-most Communities of Interest in California. Given that the maps viewable (on the Statewide Database) last July 26, namely those current as of last July 18, be the same as those voted on last July 28, the selfsame things said about them, last July 26, are those which are to be said of them today.

At best, the decision last July 28 was a disappointment for the ages!

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?

Thank you.

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

**From:** "Charles" [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 26/07/2011 16:57  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** In re, inter alia, most recent viewable (those current as of July 18 2011 11:59 PM PDT)

Note: Original message sent as attachment

-----Original\_message-----

**Subject:** In re, inter alia, most recent viewable (those current as of July 18 2011 11:59 PM PDT)  
**From:** "Charles" <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Tue, 26 Jul 2011 19:57:31 -0400  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**CC:**  
**BCC:**

After having seen the most recent NorCal Redist. Visualisations, I am become increasingly convinced that the three NorCal Assembly districts, the three NorCal Senate districts, & the three NorCal Congressional districts should be left alone! After having seen the viewable Visualisations, not just those most recent, it is become increasingly clear that there seems to be quite a hostility to the NorthState insomuch as there seems to be an overarching aim to chip away at the representation of the people of the NorthState by taking parts of communities of interest & attempting unification thereof with entirely separate & different communities of interest, thus attempting to create (insofar as it may be possible for any gerrymanders to do so) hybrid communities 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 those hostile to the NorthState! ¿Por qué?

Remember, just as Unification (of the three NorCal communities of interest) is an act of hostility against the people of the NorthState, so too is Partial Unification is an act of hostility against the people of the NorthState! Just say NO to Unification (even Partial Unification)!!

Now, the cost of Unification, even Partial Unification, would be an effective loss of representation for the region, as a whole. Under Unification, even Partial Unification, it will be even easier, than now is the case, to trample under foot the rights of people living in the Unification (or, in the case of Partial Unification, each Unification)! Let us consider now, for a moment, whether or not the three northern-most regions constitute a single community of interest, or for that matter, two communities of interest.

The region inclusive of Humboldt & Mendocino Counties have a culture all their own. Geographically, Humboldt & Del Norte Counties are separated from Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama 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 Tehama 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, cannot be combined into a single "community of interest" for redistricting purposes. Nor can they be contorted into a pair of communities of interest (be they a whole & a hybrid, or two hybrids).

What explanation is there for reducing the North-state's collective representation in Congress by one District? 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**?

Three things are needful, here.: **(a)** Maintain the North-state's current level of collective representation in Sacramento & in Congress (e.g., 3 Assembly Districts, 3 State Senate Districts, & 3 U.S. Congressional Districts).; **(b)** 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 **(c)** 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 LOSS WHATSOEVER OF NORTHSTATE REPRESENTATION, PERIOD!!! What's so hard to understand about that?

Original\_message