

Chair Taylor, Vice-Chair Knopp, Co-Chairs Boshart-Davis and Salinas, and Members of Committees:

My name is Michael S Berry. I am an Oregonian residing in U.S. Congressional District 4 (CD4), Senate District 1 (SD1), and House District 2 (HD2). Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

Previously, I submitted written testimony focused on redistricting as it pertains specifically to CD4. For this hearing designated for "statewide" public input, I'd like to expand upon that and add testimony pertaining to redistricting proposals for Oregon Senate and House.

I support the adoption of U.S. Congressional Plan B, House Plan B, and Senate Plan B to define new district boundaries. I request that you either advance these three plans to a vote of the full legislature, or at least let these plans serve as the bases of final versions of district maps.

CONGRESSIONAL PLANS

As I see it, Plan B is the better of the 2 proposals. As proposed, Congressional Plan B would keep communities of interest together. It would better represent constituencies. It would not further disenfranchise rural voters. It would not divide Southern Oregon tribes. It would not unfairly protect an incumbent party or congressperson.

Congressional Plan A is a good example of a partisan gerrymandered map. The Portland Metro area would be like a hub from which spokes reach out to four Congressional Districts (CD1, CD3, CD5, and CD6). Plan A would introduce a new, unnatural boundary that would divide Douglas County, which currently is wholly contained within CD4. Plan A appears to violate some of the statutory rules that guide redistricting, by

- a) unnecessarily dividing communities of interest (including Southern Oregon tribes), and
- b) favoring a political party and its incumbent.

OREGON HOUSE PLANS

Current house districts are less than optimal. For one thing- they have provided for oversized representation of the Eugene area in the state legislature. This inequity ought to be corrected. It definitely should not be made worse.

In my opinion, House Plan B is the best of the three proposals currently on the table for new House districts.

Although it's deeply flawed, House Plan C looks like the next best option. At least the University of Oregon community in Eugene would (properly) not be included in a district with rural residents. But- like House Plan A, Plan C unnecessarily pairs urban areas to rural areas in other locales. This disenfranchises rural voters. A better plan would not split the population of Bend between multiple districts like this one does.

House Plan A is the worst option, in my opinion. It is a good example of a partisan gerrymandered map. The Salem area would be like a hub from which spokes reach out to five House districts. The population of the University of Oregon community in Eugene should not be included in a district with rural residents, but this plan would do exactly that. A better plan would not split the population of Bend between multiple districts like this one does.

OREGON SENATE PLANS

If good plans are put together for redistricting of the Oregon House, then the state Senate districts should fall in to place.

Senate Plan B is the best of the three proposals, in my opinion.

Senate Plan C is next best option, in my opinion.

Senate Plan A is the worst option, in my opinion.

Please do not ignore public input. I realize that this is a difficult task, but it is important to do the best job possible. Thank you for your efforts and your time, and thanks again for the opportunity to provide testimony here.

Signed,

Michael S. (Mike) Berry

Concerned resident of Douglas County, Oregon