

**Redistricting Advisory Commission
Public Comment Sent Via Email
Round 2 Draft Maps
Additional Comments from Oct 26**

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Kate McClain <katemcclain1@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 8:45 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting Advisory Committee

Greetings,

Thank you Redistricting Advisory Committee members for volunteering your time to represent the population of Humboldt County. I specifically reject A2's awkward and unusual boundaries and also reject C2's changes. I do support the opportunity to keep the majority of the current District boundaries intact and reconnect our communities around obvious and long standing linkages and geographic connections.

I do not support the A2 or C2 redistricting maps presented that alter the existing District boundaries. The alternatives A2 and C2 do not represent the way our communities are historically or currently linked.

The existing 2012 District Boundaries are aligned with geographic features, watershed boundaries, past community connections, and road network connections. These features help explain many of the reasons for why various communities are in certain districts. They are the basis for much of the district boundaries that have been around for decades and in some cases over a hundred years.

Over the years some of these “geographic communities of interest” were split simply to balance population. In 2010 Scotia was placed in one District and Rio Dell another. The Blue Lake Rancheria was split between the 5th and 3rd Districts and Blue lake was disconnected from Glendale in 2010. I support small changes to the existing District Boundaries to balance the population among the Districts and to reunite long standing “geographic communities of interest and connectivity.”

Respectfully,
Kate McClain
McKinleyville, CA

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Ken Miller <tamer1@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 8:38 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting

It ain't broke, leave it alone

2020 REDISTRICTING in HUMBOLDT COUNTY

There are two basic drivers of this redistricting:

1. Population balance between districts
2. Combining communities of interest

So far some communities of interest identified are;

- A. Native American communities
- B. Rural communities
- C. Renters

There are other communities of interest. **Geography and transportation networks (roads) play a crucial role in connecting our communities.** For example starting in the south county...

Shelter Cove, Whitethorn, Thorn, Redway, and Garberville are connected by the Shelter Cove Road as this is the inland communities connection to the coast;

Ferndale, Petrolia, and Honeydew have always been connected as ranching and farming communities where in fact back in the late 1800's the lower Mattole Valley was the bread basket for Humboldt County before the Railroad was built and highways constructed inland;

Fortuna, Rio Dell, Scotia and other Eel River Valley communities are connected by the 101 corridor and flood plain farming as part of the Eel River Valley;

Manilla and Arcata have long had a connection sharing the Arcata bottoms which lies between them;

Samoa and Fairhaven are connected as part of the peninsula;

Arcata, Bayside, and Freshwater are connected by Old Arcata Road and Kneeland and Fickle Hill by extension is connected with Freshwater and back around Fickle Hill Road to Arcata;

Blue Lake, Glendale, and Fieldbrook are connected communities and by extension Fieldbrook is connected with McKinleyville. In fact many addresses in Fieldbrook are listed as McKinleyville;

Redwood Valley has long been connected with Willow Creek via the old highway called Chezem Road, Three Creeks Road, and Brannon Mountain Road. Today they are connected by Highway 299. In addition, the Willow Creek Community Planning Area includes the Chezem Road community in recognition of this long standing connectivity based on geography and road networks;

Friday Ridge, Willow Creek, Hoopa, Weitchpec, and Orleans are connected as parts of the Trinity and Klamath River Corridors and the farming and fishing communities that are supported by these fertile valleys and flowing rivers. These areas also are home to several of our areas tribal communities including the Tsnungwe, Hoopa, Yurok, and Karuk Tribes;

Moonstone, Moonstone Heights, Westhaven, Trinidad, Patricks Point (Sue-meg...Yurok name), and Big Lagoon are all a part of the Trinidad area uplifted marine terraces and have multiple connections due to geography and place;

Orick, Ball Hills, and Weitchpec have long been connected by Bald Hills Road which was in fact a part of the Trinidad Trail back in the mid 1800's.

Summary:

When you look at the existing District Boundaries from 2010 these geographic features, watershed boundaries, past community connections, and road network connections help explain many of the reasons for why various communities are in certain districts. They are the basis for much of the district boundaries that have been around for decades and in some cases over a hundred years.

Over the years some of these "geographic communities of interest" were split simply to balance population. In 2010 Scotia was placed in one District and Rio Dell another. The Blue Lake Rancheria was split between the 5th and 3rd Districts and Blue lake was disconnected from Glendale in 2010.

With a little effort and understanding of these long standing "geographic communities of interest and connectivity", these communities can be reconnected and population can be also be balanced.

Lets use this opportunity to keep and reconnect our communities around obvious and long standing linkages and geographic connections.

Ken Miller
1658 Ocean Drive
Mckinleyville, Ca 95519
707-8397444
707-4967444cell/text

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Mary Burke <mburke5@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 8:22 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>, County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Madrone, Steve" <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Wilson, Mike" <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Bohn, Rex" <RBohn@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Bushnell, Michelle" <mbushnell@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Bass, Virginia" <VBass@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Comments on redistricting

To the Redistricting Advisory Committee,

I do not support the A2 or C2 redistricting maps presented that alter the existing District boundaries. The alternatives A2 and C2 do not represent the way our communities are historically or currently linked.

The existing 2012 District Boundaries are aligned with geographic features, watershed boundaries, past community connections, and road network connections. These features help explain many of the reasons for why various communities are in certain districts. They are the basis for much of the district boundaries that have been around for decades and in some cases over a hundred years.

Over the years some of these “geographic communities of interest” were split simply to balance population. In 2010 Scotia was placed in one District and Rio Dell another. The Blue Lake Rancheria was split between the 5th and 3rd Districts and Blue lake was disconnected from Glendale in 2010. I support small changes to the existing District Boundaries to balance the population among the Districts and to reunite long standing “geographic communities of interest and connectivity.”

Thank you to the Committee members for volunteering your time to represent the population of Humboldt County. I specifically reject A2's awkward and unusual boundaries and also reject C2's changes. I do support the opportunity to keep the majority of the current District boundaries intact and reconnect our communities around obvious and long standing linkages and geographic connections.

Respectfully,

Mary Burke
581 School Road
McKinleyville, CA 95519

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Bob Pagliuco <sheggyboy@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 9:24 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>, County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting Maps

To the Redistricting Advisory Committee,

My name is Bob Pagliuco and I have been a Humboldt County resident since 2001 and I currently live in McKinleyville. I apologize for not commenting earlier in the process, as I have just become aware that these maps were being produced. I do not support the A2 or C2 redistricting maps presented that alter the existing District boundaries. The alternatives A2 and C2 do not represent the way our communities are historically or currently linked.

The existing 2012 District Boundaries are aligned with geographic features, watershed boundaries, past community connections, and road network connections. These features help explain many of the reasons for why various communities are in certain districts. They are the basis for much of the district boundaries that have been around for decades and in some cases over a hundred years.

Over the years some of these “geographic communities of interest” were split simply to balance population. In 2010 Scotia was placed in one District and Rio Dell another. The Blue Lake Rancheria was split between the 5th and 3rd Districts and Blue lake was disconnected from Glendale in 2010. I support small changes to the existing District Boundaries to balance the population among the Districts and to reunite long standing “geographic communities of interest and connectivity.”

Thank you to the Committee members for volunteering your time to represent the population of Humboldt County. I specifically reject A2's awkward and unusual boundaries and also reject C2's changes. I do support the opportunity to keep the majority of the current District boundaries intact and reconnect our communities around obvious and long standing linkages and geographic connections.

Thank you,

Bob Pagliuco

In Opposition of A2

From: Katherine <katherinebettis@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 9:14 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>, County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: No to redistricting plan A2

I live in district 1.

No to A2.

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Ken Miller <tamer1@suddenlink.net>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 8:50 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting 2

To the Redistricting Advisory Committee,

I do not support the A2 or C2 redistricting maps presented that alter the existing District boundaries. The alternatives A2 and C2 do not represent the way our communities are historically or currently linked.

The existing 2012 District Boundaries are aligned with geographic features, watershed boundaries, past community connections, and road network connections. These features help explain many of the reasons for why various communities are in certain districts. They are the basis for much of the district boundaries that have been around for decades and in some cases over a hundred years.

Over the years some of these “geographic communities of interest” were split simply to balance population. In 2010 Scotia was placed in one District and Rio Dell another. The Blue Lake Rancheria was split between the 5th and 3rd Districts and Blue lake was disconnected from

Glendale in 2010. I support small changes to the existing District Boundaries to balance the population among the Districts and to reunite long standing “geographic communities of interest and connectivity.”

Thank you to the Committee members for volunteering your time to represent the population of Humboldt County. I specifically reject A2's awkward and unusual boundaries and also reject C2's changes. I do support the opportunity to keep the majority of the current District boundaries intact and reconnect our communities around obvious and long standing linkages and geographic connections.

Respectfully,
Ken Miller

In Favor of C2 (As second option, if minimal change map not available)

From: sue <suejh@humboldt1.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 8:12 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>, County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: redistricting

My name is Sue Hilton and I live in the bottoms outside of Arcata.

Thank you for your work on redistricting--I'm sure it's a really hard job.

I've been commenting on the proposed district maps, both the first round and the second, but I just saw the Lost Coast Outpost article and want to say a few more things.

As I'm sure many folks have pointed out (and as I said in my open humboldt response) your proposed map A2 makes no sense at all. Map C2 is better, but as Hank Sims pointed out, the current districts are actually better than that. I will add that I'd still love to be in the Arcata district (I'm currently with McKinelyville) but it's not as critical to me as getting basically reasonable and balanced districts for everyone. Please consider mostly using existing districts with minor changes for balance and to get rid of oddities.

thank you

Sue Hilton

6210 Lanphere, Arcata

In Favor of C2 (As second option, if minimal change map not available)

From: Andres Rodriguez <andres.rafa.rodriguez@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:40 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>, County Administrative Office
<cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Public comment about proposed redistricting maps to be discussed on Wed Oct 26
Hello Redistricting Advisory Committee,

My name is Andres Rodriguez, and I live in the Arcata Bottoms. Thank you for volunteering your time to recommend potential redistricting maps to the Board of Supervisors.

I am writing to urge you to recommend a map to the Board that makes the least changes possible to the existing districts. The current districts have worked well and only require small changes to remedy population imbalances and to reunite long standing communities of interest such as Rio Dell and Scotia. If this requires asking the mapmakers to make a new map, please do ask that they make a new map.

I also urge you to reject Map A2 for the following two reasons. First, it does not make sense to combine areas of Arcata and Eureka which are two distinct communities separated by Humboldt Bay. Second, it also does not make sense to combine Arcata Bottoms and McKinleyville which are two distinct communities separated by Mad River. Please recommend a map to the Board that keeps the Arcata, Eureka, and McKinlyville communities intact.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Andres Rodriguez

Reject A2 (minimal changes preferable)

From: Kelley Garrett <kellybrookgarrett@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:35 PM

To: "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Hum CO Redistricting

Dear Committee

I live in McKinleyville, Humboldt CO, California. Thank you for your work.

Please recommend to the Board a map that makes the least change to our existing districting. It works the way it is, so why "fix" it if it's not broken?

Please reject A2—no awkward redistricting.

Thank you,

Kelley Garrett

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Gayle Olson-Raymer <go1@humboldt.edu>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:24 PM

To: County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting

Dear Committee Members - My name is Gayle Olson-Raymer and I have been a resident of McKinleyville for 30 years. I am extremely concerned about the work each of you has so generously volunteered to do - working to remap our County districts. Many thanks to each of you for working on behalf of our County. This is a really important job and I want you to know that I appreciate your efforts.

I have examined each of the three maps that I have been able to access. Upon examination, the first question that came to mind is - why would we redraw our district boundaries when they have been working well for years? Since balancing population in districts is extremely important, it seems the best approach to take to any current imbalances would be to make some minor alterations - not make huge population shifts as shown in the proposed maps. In fact, my analysis of the maps indicates that any of them could actually make population imbalances worse.

Furthermore, it is unclear why the Committee might support such a realignment. Humboldt County residents have more in common - both economically and socially - with the coastal and inland communities along Highway 101 than they do with the inland communities to the east along Highway 5.

In terms of the proposed maps, none are realistic alignments of population. I especially find Map A2 puzzling as it looks like the proposed district is extremely awkward and unwieldy. Map C2 is less awkward but still puzzling. Is the purpose of such maps to balance population - and if so, I can only see that Humboldt residents would have to compete with the majority conservative voters, thus placing Humboldt residents in a minority position. In short, these maps keep me asking my initial question about why we are trying to fix something that is not broken.

Another serious problem is that by putting Humboldt in another district, we would lose the excellent representation given to us by Congressman Huffman, Senator McGuire, and Assemblyman Wood. I have called, sent texts, and emailed each of these representatives dozens of times and have always found them and their staff to be attentive to my concerns and grateful for my input. I would hate to lose such responsible and responsive representation.

Thus, I respectfully ask the Committee to reject these maps, retain the vast majority of our current and well-functioning district, and make only the minor changes that would address the few areas where population may need to have minor adjustments.

Again, thank you for your work - and thank you for giving my letter some thought.

Sincerely - Gayle Olson-Raymer

--

Gayle Olson-Raymer, Ph.D.
Retired, Department of History
Humboldt State University
go1@humboldt.edu

In Favor of C2 (alternatively leave the map as is)

From: Katrina Hanson <katrinah13@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:25 PM

To: County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for the work that you're doing to serve the residents of our county.

I am a resident of Eureka (District 4), and I am asking you to approve map C2 or to leave the map in the current status quo. As a resident of the current District 4, I am concerned about the changes laid out in map A2. I feel that my concerns and needs are much more aligned with other residents of Eureka, rather than those of Arcata, and feel that my community would be better served by representation that leaves the current county districts intact.

Thank you,
Katrina Hanson
Williams St
Eureka

In Favor of C2 (alternatively leave the map as is)

From: Maya B <yekdor@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:19 PM

To: County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: County Redistricting

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for the work that you're doing to serve the residents of our county.

I am a resident of Eureka (District 4), and I am asking you to approve map C2 or to leave the map in the current status quo. As a resident of the current District 4, I am concerned about the changes laid out in map A2. I feel that my concerns and needs are much more aligned with other residents of Eureka, rather than those of Arcata, and feel that my community would be better served by representation that leaves the current county districts intact.

Thank you,
Maya Brodkey
Williams St
Eureka

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Patrick Carr <nedlud432@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 7:13 PM

To: County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting

Hello,

I'm an Arcata resident and have only been slightly following the redistricting issue until I read of how bizarre the currently considered maps are.

I appreciate that volunteers are doing their utmost to create a reasonable map. I thank the Redistricting Advisory Committee members for their time and effort. But I really am concerned that the two maps I've seen, A2 and C2, are solutions to problems that don't exist. For one thing, the moderately decent population balance of the 2010 redistricting map is swung wildly awry with these two attempted solutions. Also, the idea of joining much of Arcata with Eureka's west side is frankly bizarre. And Titlow Hill with the Shelter Cove area? Weird. I believe that districts really ought to be made of contiguous areas of land.

Please, if anything, just make some nudges adequate to adjust the population fairly and then bring Scotia and Rio Dell into the same district.

Don't make us wonder if the mapmakers got hold of some of those hallucinogenic mushrooms the Arcata City Council just made legal in our city.

Thanks, Patrick Carr

In Opposition of Both Maps

From: Susan Seaman <susanseamaneureka@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday October 26, 2021 5:25 PM

To: County Administrative Office <cao@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Miller-Rubio, Neftali" <nrubio-mills1@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Redistricting Comment

I apologize that this email is so late, but I wanted to make sure I reached out about the Redistricting Advisory Committee recommendations.

Redistricting is such an important project for a jurisdiction. We are also going through it in Eureka. I appreciate anybody who takes the time to be part of the process.

I really do want to impress that unless it's trying to correct some previous inequities, which has not been demonstrated in the current supervisorial district map, a quality redistricting should not be dramatic or exciting. Keeping things as close to the original functional district is less confusing for voters and doesn't feed into narratives about unnecessary gerrymandering, which can make people less trustful of the government. None of us in a government role need that additional hurdle to gain our constituent's trust.

As the County seat, the City of Eureka should remain intact. The core of this community of interest is in the historic core of the city,

which roughly consists of Old Town/Downtown and the adjacent neighborhoods. These community interests include economic development, infrastructure and other important topics that certainly affect the broader community, but can have a very different impact on say Arcata vs. Eureka.

If jurisdictions need to be split to achieve rough proportionality, it would make more sense to pull from the areas of Cutten and around the Municipal Golf Course,

I am asking you to please reject map A-2 and C-2. Thank you.