

The purpose of redistricting is a goal of creating representation that reflects the needs of the citizens in disparate regions of a state. The needs, issues and culture of a rural region are very different than that of urban areas. Both should be represented within a functional government body. Redistricting goals would see commonality of interest, geographical location and shared transportation corridors being brought together.

Plan A fails to accomplish this in totality. The lines obviously are a cynical attempt to disenfranchise and suppress the voices of the more rural regions by inundating their district with urban voters who will support policies that are often at direct odds with the rural voters' needs. The crocodile tear laden claims that this will promote "unity" are specious. This is a naked attempt to promote a false "unity" by forced compliance. "We know what you need better than you do because we're the urban enlightened - sit down - shut up - and do as you're told." Unity? Nay! Enmity will be the result.

A prime example in A is the torturous line drawing to include of the college areas of Eugene to suppress the rural votes to the East and South. Unity? Hardly. Rural interest repression of representation - achieved. Other examples include the dissection of Portland Metro suburbs so that these population concentrations can control who represents the rural and coastal regions of NW Oregon. It is obvious that that the tech areas around Intel have little in common economically or needs wise with Tillamook. Distribution of Chinese manufactured shoes has little in common with loggers. The pairing of Bend and Portland without a transportation corridor and the disruption of the contiguity of multiple counties, Deschutes, Multnomah (other than population), Clackamas, and Marion are some of the other examples. Multiple Indian tribal lands are also split.

Plan C is in the same vein as Plan A. Again the University of Oregon urban area is split off to pair with and effectively disenfranchise the rural interests of Eastern, Western and Southern Lane County. Southern Eugene has to be split by 4? This is quite obviously done to shift population concentrations to suppress the voice of rural regions that are included within these proposed districts. Willamette Valley issues are not the same as Oregon Coastal issues; yet, under Plan C Corvallis and Coos Bay are under the same representation, Despite the shared, common interest of Junction City, Harrisburg, and Monroe (so common that they share a chamber of commerce) they are divided by 3 in clear violation of redistricting's mandated goals. Further, the Cow Creek Indian Reservation is split 3 ways.

Plan B has its issues. However, of the three plans it seems to at least take into account the importance of keeping contiguous areas, counties and interests together.

For instance, under Plan B the Southern Oregon Indian tribes are kept together - Warm Springs, Umatilla, Burns Paiute, and Klamath. The natural border of the Cascades is recognized and incorporated. Eastern Oregon which is very disparate from the West is kept together recognizing the geographical, economic and cultural differences. The plan does split Multnomah and Jackson Counties which must be done due to population realities. The plan keeps the growing Washington County suburbs of Portland together. Overall the plan best recognizes that there are numerous, disparate interests in the State of Oregon and allows them to be best represented in contiguous groupings rather than gerrymandered into silence.

I must then support Plan B of the submitted plans for both Congressional and State Senate and House Districts.

Ralph G. Howell  
Jackson County  
3277 Annapolis Dr.  
Medford, OR 97504