



Comments on Redistricting Commission's Draft Plans
November 23-28, 2011

Messages to the Commission		CD	LD
11/28/2011	When I asked for a map in my previous email, I mean one that would show street names, especially in Bellingham.		Harriet Spanel 903 Liberty St Bellingham WA 98225 spanel@nas.com
11/28/2011	At the November meeting the Senate team said they had been working on the NW corner of the state. Do you have agreement on where the 40th District lines are? If so, a map?		Harriet Spanel 903 Liberty St Bellingham WA 98225 spanel@nas.com
11/28/2011	The Ceis-Foster October 14, 2011 map for the new 32nd LD should be made compliant with: RCW 44.05.090 Redistricting plan. 2(a) District lines should be drawn so as to coincide with the boundaries of local political subdivisions and areas recognized as communities of interest. The number of counties and municipalities divided among more than one district should be as small as possible; The new 32nd LD does not comply with this provision in at least two ways that are of immediate concern to us: (1) The plan unreasonably splits the City of Shoreline between the proposed 32nd and 46th districts. This harms the political cohesiveness, cross-fertilization and mutual support of political activists in Shoreline and the potential for concerted political action and consequently political success. In sum, it politically handicaps Shoreline citizens in both the 32nd and the 46th. (2) The plan incorporates a tiny corner of NW Seattle into the new 32nd, in which the residents of Seattle would be politically a very small minority. Their urban interests would either not be adequately addressed by the LD organizations whose majorities would have suburban concerns, or the legitimate concerns of this small number would consume disproportionate time and effort of the 32LD organizations because of the complexity of the issues that face Seattle, the largest urban center in the state. Either way, this would be extremely unfair. Thank you for undertaking this immeasurably difficult task, and I hope you will try to remedy these inequities.		32 Elaine Phelps 32nd LD WSDCC State Committee Woman efphelps@earthlink.net
11/28/2011	I urge the commission to re-map the 28th District from the Democrat plan which includes areas north of SR-16 to areas south of its current border. Not only does this plan make sense for continuity of the existing population mix to remain suburban or rural. Who in his right mind would lump some of the 28th District in with Tacoma political messes?! Additionally, with a northern boundary as proposed, there is very limited growth potential whereas by leaving the northern boundary at SR-16 and adding rural areas to the 28th District in the south, redistricting in the year 2020 would cause less stretching of common sense. I urge you to thoughtfully consider adding some of the 2nd District to the 28th. It is only logical and makes so much common sense! Would you not agree?		Jerome Hull 5625 95th Ave Ct W University Place WA 98467 jhullclu@nwrain.com

PO Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

Phone: (360) 786-0770 • Fax: (360) 586-0433

E-mail: contact@redistricting.wa.gov • Web: www.redistricting.wa.gov



Comments on Redistricting Commission's Draft Plans
November 23-28, 2011

11/24/2011	it is very peculiar that the city of sammamish would be split in half and not grouped with more developing suburbs but be mixed with very rural areas	8	5	
11/22/2011	We don't want to be lost in mess of downtown Tacoma politics. The Republican plan will help keep the size of the population in the 28th more in line with the future growth of other districts. The 28th needs to add over 20,000 people, which is the most of any district in the state. Adding the areas of Roy, McKenna and areas to the east of there would add population over time during the next ten years so that it wouldn't need to add big additions of territory necessary this time in redistricting.			Donald T & Leslie Watts vitaman@seanet.com
11/22/2011	It is my belief that the 28th district should be kept towards the area south of Tacoma and not to the north. The 28th should center more to the rural and suburban areas and including the joint base area and the concerns thereof. The citizens to the south should not have their issues diluted by a completely different set of issues of areas to the north. Please keep the 28th centered on a area of like issues. Thank you			Ronald Wilson 21612 161st Ave E Graham WA ronald392@centurytel.net
11/22/2011	Dear Committee: I am opposed to moving the 28th District North of Fircrest and University Place because: 1. Residents of UP, Fircrest, Lakewood, Spanaway, Dupont consist of many retired and active duty military personnel and have a commonality with JBLM. 2. JBLM is the hub of this District and future growth is to the South of University Place and Fircrest thus adding to this commonality. 3. Residents of the 28th have very little familiarity with the issues involving a large city like Tacoma. Tacoma residents have fought hard for what they have achieved in their District and would only be impactd negatively by adding a large block of illinformed residents to their voting block. 4. One of the larger issues that would face residents should they be moved out of the current 28th District would be lack of familiarity with issues involving the Port of Tacoma. This is a competitive port. Should individuals that have had no voting issues in the past involving the Port make illinformed decisions affecting the Port for future decades? They are better informed of the issues involving the already developed and developing areas around JBLM. I hope you consider my assessment. Please allow the District to grow in a Southward direction.			Bruce M. Beatty 4602 Alameda Ave W University Place WA 98466 hibnker@live.com 253-564-0954

PO Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

Phone: (360) 786-0770 • Fax: (360) 586-0433

E-mail: contact@redistricting.wa.gov • Web: www.redistricting.wa.gov