

## Testimony for Redistricting of Congressional Districts

Thank you for taking the time to read my written Testimony regarding the reorganization of the Congressional Districts here in Oregon. I am a Retired US Army Colonel, born and raised in Oregon and retired Oregon Law Enforcement. I have lived on both sides of the Mountains and understand the political differences that exist here in Oregon.

To better understand the issues at hand I initially reviewed ORS 188.010 and then Plan A, B and C to better understand both the democratic reorganization plans (Plans A and C) and the Republican plan (plan B) and which plan better follows ORS188.010.

I established three simple criteria from ORS188.010 the first was item c. from ORS 188.010 “Utilize existing Geographic or political Boundaries”. Which I determined to be the Cascade Mountains and the Indian Reservations located here in Oregon, (by Federal Law).

I then focused on was item d. “Don’t unnecessarily divide communities of interest”. I believe item c really lays out both geographic and Political boundaries by using the Cascade Mountains and the various Tribal Indian Reservation as distinct Geographic and political boundaries. I view the Indian Tribal communities as an existing Community of Common Interest and as a political and geographical boundary here in Oregon.

Last item I looked at item e “Are connected by transportation links” and confirmed that there are no Mass transit programs connecting Western Oregon to Central, Eastern, and southern Oregon, just the upper Willamette Valley by rail, bus, and major highway.

I did keep in mind items a and b from ORS188.010 but felt Items c. d. and e. held more weight when reviewing all three plans submitted for discussion. I immediately determined that both Plan A and Plan C submitted by the democrats failed to consider my reviewing criteria from ORS 188.010 listed above and seemed to focus on political boundaries as opposed to physical and commonality of interest. I found Plan B to adhere to my analysis the closest. I then looked at previously submitted written testimony and found Eric Hofeld’s reasoning and explanation very well done and follows my established rules for redistricting. I urge you to review his written testimony, yes it does have a political slant for CD2, but I found all three plans do to! But the best explanation and comparison is Eric Hofelt’s testimony and Plan B.

I urge you to think about my reasoning and to minimize the political boundaries (Democratic vs Republican and Independent) and focus more on physical and commonality of interest as the primary criteria and support Plan B.

(S)

Rick Coufal

Colonel, US Army (Ret)

Retired Oregon Law Enforcement

## Testimony for Redistricting of Congressional Districts