

Date: Mon, Oct 11, 2021 at 11:19 AM

Subject: Fwd: Redistricting

To: <[shapecaliforniasfuture@auditor.ca.gov](mailto:shapecaliforniasfuture@auditor.ca.gov)>, <[VotersFirstAct@crc.ca.gov](mailto:VotersFirstAct@crc.ca.gov)>, Representative Doris Matsui <[CA06DMima@mail.house.gov](mailto:CA06DMima@mail.house.gov)>

Could you please get this information to the right people on the California Redistricting Commission? I would like to see the boundaries of District 1 changed. Doug LaMalfa is the incumbent. Here is the research one that supports making these changes. And to Congresswoman Matsui---Could you give up some Democratic residential areas and add them to neighboring District 4, so we can get Tom McClintock out of there!

It was prepared by the CD-1 Alliance.

I am writing to the commission and today because I want the new Congressional and State Senate/ Assembly districts to be less gerrymandered than they were in the last cycle. ProPublica had an excellent article in 2012 that explained how the Democratic Party influenced the redistricting process by abusing the "community of interest/public input" process to protect incumbents. I'm a Democrat, but I think that's wrong. It's led to too many uncompetitive seats on both sides - and I think that has been bad for our state and for our country. I look at what the Republicans are doing overtly in other states, and I don't want the same process to happen *de facto* here in California. It is certainly not what voters in California wanted when they created a non-partisan committee.

I know the committee cannot take "partisanship" into account when drawing borders. I just hope that we can get better borders than we got in the last cycle - when trying to draw "nonpartisan" districts just led to gerrymandering.

I would like the committee to focus on the following:

1) I hope the committee does not draw long, narrow districts. District 2 is a great example of a district with a nebulous "community of interest" ("the coast") that creates a long and narrow district that effectively simulates hyper-partisan gerrymandering. Many of the current districts, when looked at from a map, are awkwardly narrow and transparently political. I hope the newer districts are more compact, like squares.

2) I hope the committee looks at economic and demographic data when determining true communities of interest. Many of the public comments that have been previously submitted seem to be thinly-veiled attempts to get partisan districts. Data isn't perfect at identifying true "communities of interest", but it's certainly less *biased* than public interest in many cases. Going back to District 2, because it's near the top of the list and it's so obviously *effectively* gerrymandered, it's hard to see Marin and Humboldt as alike in much beyond them sharing a preference for Democratic politicians: certainly Marin is more akin to the Bay Area in economy, average income, and education, and Humboldt is more similar in these demographic and economic characteristics to Shasta County and the rest of the North State.

3) I hope the committee changes district lines. Many of the comments I've seen just call to keep everything the same. I want the democratic process to be dynamic, and the new districts should reflect that dynamism. Obviously the Congressional districts need to change a little (because we have lost a Representative) and the State districts have seen population shifts, but I hope the committee embraces some dramatic shifts that keep politicians on both sides involved in their community - rather than coasting to reelection.

I know you have an unenviable task, and many people are writing in to tell you what they think. I just wanted to write in with some general thoughts on the importance of the committee's work: **to ensure that voters pick their representatives, and not the other way around.** I think that much of the "public comment" so far has been about protecting incumbents and I'm opposed to that.

Thank you,