

From: [Joy Marshall](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT FOR 06/26/2024
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2024 6:05:13 PM
Attachments: [County Commission district testimony 6-26-24.docx](#)

[EXTERNAL]

June 26, 2024

To the County Commissioners:

Thank you for taking our public testimony.

I've lived in Lane County for 34 years. I've been an active volunteer for schools, libraries, and other causes. I'm writing because I'm very concerned about some decisions Commissioners are considering, concerning our County voting districts.

I've done some research to learn more. Here is my perspective: Every decade, election districts around the country have to use new census data to update their boundaries, because populations grow and shrink, and the districts need to be balanced out and equal. That makes sense.

It's important to adjust the boundaries in a fair and honest way. After the 2010 census, Lane County had a lot of conflict over our redistricting, so – to your credit – the County came up with a system that was more transparent and representative. The commissioners appointed a citizen committee of 15 people to review the boundaries. The citizens were from across the political spectrum, and were required to work transparently, robustly seek public input, and present their proposal to the Commissioners. The citizens' committee worked hard for many months, and took their outreach seriously – more than 600 people participated in the public process.

The proposed maps were approved, and have been in use for 2 years. This is an example of good government. Not everyone got their way, and some folks are still complaining, but it was a good process.

Now, our once-a-decade review of our County Charter, is an entirely different matter. Again, an appointed, independent group of citizen volunteers came together to do the research, worked for a year, and presented their proposals to you. Again, this looks like good, transparent government.

Suddenly, out of the blue, on May 24, the County Commissioners get a letter from a local lawyer proposing we change the County Districts - aka draw new maps – even though this is NOT the task of the Charter committee. The Charter review committee is NOT charged with re-drawing maps.

This is not just last minute – this is TWO years after the maps were drawn. Some of you wanted to pass it without public input or even a review by County Staff, but fortunately you took a second look and paused. I appreciate that very much.

There may be some proposals in the attorney's letter that are relevant to the Charter review discussion, such as whether to rename the 5 districts. But I can discern NO legitimate reason to undo the election district boundaries and undermine the work of our transparent, democratically appointed committee. Those 600 people gave their input in good faith that they would be listened to.

I can see no reason great enough to suddenly re-do our election maps after two years. It is

particularly concerning that it almost happened with no public input

I hope that our County Commissioners will not proceed with this attempt to circumvent our democratic process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joy Marshall
Eugene, OR

From: [Peter Mead](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Cc: [*LC Board of County Commissioners](#)
Subject: CHARTER REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 6/26/2024
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 1:05:27 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Honorable Lane County Commissioners,

For the record, my name is Peter Mead, and I live in Eugene.

Thank you for scheduling a public hearing regarding amendments to the Lane County Charter.

My testimony calls on the Commissioners to correct the gerrymandering of the District boundaries by the "Independent" Redistricting Committee (IRC) in 2021 and its adoption by the Commissioners.

The Independent Redistricting Committee was anything but independent. It was dominated by Democrat political consultants, lobbyists, donors, and public employees whose employment is at the pleasure of the Commissioners.

Not surprisingly, one redistricting proposal by the IRC was a Democrat's dream: sections of Eugene were added to rural districts with enough voters to affect election outcomes.

It has always been the intent of the Lane County Charter that each geographic community in the County have a representative for their needs and concerns. But with the redistricting plan by the IRC that the Commissioners adopted, the West Lane, East Lane, and Springfield Districts all received substantial transplants of Eugene voters.

This diminishes or even eliminates the voice of rural Lane County residents. By transplanting Eugene voters into rural and Springfield Districts, the Commissioners ensured that Eugene candidates can be elected to serve people living in Springfield, East and West Lane County.

I urge the Commissioners not to approve the Charter Review Committee's version of IRC modeled after the 2021 IRC and forward a charter amendment to the voters for approval in November that will correct this anti-Democratic districting scheme. This would be a bold step in democracy to allow for the people to decide and not our politicians.

I also urge the Commissioners to reject any proposal that would replace geographic District names with simple District numbers. It is inevitable that Eugene, being the population center in the County, will have an enlarged voice. But let's not eliminate the community identity and representation of County voters in West Lane, East Lane and Springfield.

Peter Mead

From: [350EUG Coordinator](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public meeting comment for June 26, 2024
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 11:12:19 AM

[EXTERNAL]

Good morning Commissioners,

I have heard that there is a proposal to redraw the political boundaries for Lane County Commissioners. The Charter Review Committee ended its year-long work last October. Neither they, nor the standing 15 member independent Redistricting Commission have reviewed the new proposal.

Three commissioners have just gone ahead and introduced this redistricting proposal, completely outside the normal procedure.

The process is out of protocol and unacceptable to your constituents who need to know that our political process is neutral and above board. We do not need any hint of gerrymandering present.

You must adhere to established protocol and allow the normal process to be followed. We do not want commissioners with personal agendas to dictate our political boundaries. FOLLOW THE RULES SET IN PLACE, THEY ARE THERE FOR A REASON. Please remedy this "oversight".

Linda Kelley
Eugene Resident

--

Linda Kelley (*she/her/hers*)
Steering Committee Coordinator
350 Eugene
email: coordinator@350eugene.org



From: [Sue Barnhart](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Gerrymandering
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 9:24:53 AM

[EXTERNAL]

Dear County Commissioners,

Thank you for your service and thank you for reading my email. I am very concerned about gerrymandering, a real problem in many parts of our country. I was relieved when a new and hopefully fair process to review potential changes to which district a person is in for voting purposes was developed. I understand that on Wednesday you will be considering changes to voting districts that did not come from this new committee.

I have lived in the same neighborhood for 35 years and in the same house for 27 years. Though my address hasn't changed, my voting district has changed multiple times. Sometimes without my knowledge until I open up my ballot!

I understand changes need to happen as more voters move into an area, but these changes must be done in a democratic way, not in a way to influence whether more conservatives or liberals get elected.

Please do not make changes to voting districts outside of the plan that was developed.

Susan Barnhart
1439 West 4th Ave
Eugene, OR 97402
541-731-1189

From: [Elizabeth Chandler](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Meeting Comment for June 26th
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 6:25:21 AM

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Members of the Board:

I am writing to support the recommendations of the Charter Review Committee and to oppose the proposals made by Mr. Stan Long. My opposition to Long's proposals are made on both a process and content basis.

On the process side, these proposals from one person are coming from outside the Charter Review Committee process and are being treated with equal weight as the Committee's recommendations, rather than as a public comment on the Charter Review Committee recommendation. Mr. Long had ample opportunity to present this package to the Committee but chose not to do so. So these last-minute proposals, involving serious amendments to the Charter, and requiring a vote of the people to change, have not been vetted with the same rigor as those of the Charter Review Committee. Also, making a mapping adjustment now is not transparent and does not respect a year's worth of dialog by the Charter Review Committee and the hard work of our very first independent redistricting committee. On the content side, a most concerning aspect of the mapping proposal is that Roosevelt Boulevard and the Willamette River would be enshrined in the County Charter as a hard North/South District boundary. The present consequence would remove the Whitaker area from the North District and add it to the South District, thus "packing" more liberal leaning voters into the South District and making the North District easier for conservatives to win. Future consequences are unknown, but could easily require a public vote to amend the Charter in order to meet other requirements of redistricting—a needless, time-consuming and confusing consequence. The mapping proposal also retains names for the district, rather than numbers, as recommended by the Charter Review Committee. Providing names for different districts creates confusion, since Eugene must be included in most of the districts in order to fulfill the requirement for equal representation. Numbers reinforce the idea that the Commissioner represents everyone in his or her district, regardless of whether they live in a city or in an unincorporated area. You can look at the East Lane map, which wraps north and south of the central districts and includes City residents, to see how silly this is.

I urge you to keep faith with the process you initiated, consider only the Charter Review Committee Recommendations, and invite Mr. Long to participate in the next iteration of the Charter Review Committee.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Chandler
427 Stonewood Dr
Eugene, OR 97405

From: [Connor Thompson](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Cc: [*LC Board of County Commissioners](#)
Subject: CHARTER REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 6/26/2024
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 4:56:51 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Lane County Commissioners,

My wife informed me that the Lane County Board of Commissioners was going to be reviewing possible charter amendments and wanted feedback from the public on them. She pointed out to me that one of the amendments they wanted feedback on was an independent redistricting committee that previously resulted in commissioner districts where all 5 commissioners could be elected from Eugene. That is a problem! I am a scientist, and when I look at something, I tend to look at it from an analytical perspective. So, let me share my thoughts.

There are 5 commissioner districts. The 2020 census reported that Lane County's population was 382,971. Therefore, in order to ensure fair and equal representation among all 5 commissioner districts, each district would ideally have 76594.2 people. If we begin to calculate the 2 larger cities in Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield, we can determine how many commissioner districts (and votes) should be in each of the cities. The 2020 census had recorded Eugene's population as 176,654 and Springfield's 61,851. With those populations, Eugene should have 2.3 and Springfield 0.80 districts. So a fair redistricting process would only allow for 2.3 commissioners for the Eugene area, not what resulted, which was all 5 commissioners could be elected from Eugene. I do realize that at least 1 of the other districts needs to share .3 of a commissioner district in Eugene, but not all 3 of the other districts. Therefore, I am opposed to the Independent Redistricting Committee as mimicked in the previous redistricting.

Connor Thompson, Thurston

From: [Walter S Bartlett](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 6/26/2024
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 3:24:15 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Please Note: My public comment for Weds mtg was sent (see date sent) before noon today (i.e.11:58 AM).

inadvertent addition of "s" after 'comment')

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Walter S Bartlett** <wascobar@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 24, 2024 at 11:58 AM
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 6/26/2024
To: <publiccomments@lanecountyor.gov>

Honorable Commissioners:

It is my understanding that the Board will consider a last minute County redistricting proposal by Attorney Stan Long of Eugene. Its purported raison d'etre is to depoliticize the decennial County ReDistricting process.

It has been my privilege to have served Lane County in a volunteer capacity since the mid-1970's. In this time, I was appointed by both Republican and Democratic Commissioners, including service for 15-plus years on the County Budget Committee, including as its chair, etc.

In 2001 and, I believe, 2011 I was appointed to serve on your Redistricting Committee.

This process demands careful consideration of the demographic uniqueness of each Commissioner District. To the extent that the final product can be largely devoid of blatant gerrymander and partisanship- this is a good thing. This is apparently Mr. Long's stated purpose in crafting his very detailed and multi-tiered proposal..

I have only perused this for a brief time.

I would caution this Board to engage the Community and the residents within each District before final adoption. Further, I am confident that the Board will seek a wide range of feedback and vetting--so that unforeseen adverse consequences can be precluded. I am sure that each of you will take pains to be utterly above reproach and will exhibit complete transparency regarding any and all contacts regarding this Stan Long proposal. Doing so will instill public confidence and protect the County's credibility.

One walk down memory Lane, if I can. During one of my 2 ReDistricting Committee memberships, as I was preparing suggestions for district mapping

modifications, someone who was helping me with the map software said: 'Hey, look here..if you move this district line here to the east, you can add 12,000 Democrat." I was uneasy about this and immediately vetoed the idea.

This is a public trust and the public trusts all of us to be honest and faithful to good process.

Thank You

\

From: [Lane Families for Farms and Forests](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#); [*LC Board of County Commissioners](#)
Subject: LFFF - CHARTER REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 6/26/2024.
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 2:21:25 PM
Attachments: [Lane Families For Farms and Forests Submission- Charter Review Public Comment 6-24-2024.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Lane County Commissioners,

Please find public comment by Lane Families for Farms and Forests on 'Charter Review' for the 6/26/2024 meeting.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

LFFF Board of Directors

--

Lane Families for Farms and Forests (LFFF) is committed to harnessing support for Lane County's rich heritage of agriculture and forestry, two cornerstones of our local community.

["Like us on Facebook"](#)

www.lanefamilies.com

Lane Families for Farms & Forests, PO Box 8214, Coburg, OR 97408

From: [Jan Bohman](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Please uphold your legitimate charter review process
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 1:06:19 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Members of the Board:

I am writing to support the recommendations of the Charter Review Committee and to oppose the proposals made by Mr Stan Long. I fear I may have missed a deadline of noon today (an hour ago) but if so, ask that you please consider my input. My opposition to Long's proposals is based on both process and content concerns.

Regarding process, these proposals from one person are coming from outside the Charter Review Committee process and are being treated with equal weight as the Committee's recommendations, rather than as a public comment on the Charter Review Committee recommendation. Mr. Long had ample opportunity to present this package to the Committee but chose not to do so. So these last-minute proposals, involving serious amendments to the Charter, and requiring a vote of the people to change, have not been vetted with the same rigor as those of the Charter Review Committee. Also, making a mapping adjustment now is not transparent and does not respect a year's worth of dialog by the Charter Review Committee and the hard work of our very first independent redistricting committee.

On the content side, a most concerning aspect of the mapping proposal is that Roosevelt Boulevard and the Willamette River would be enshrined in the County Charter as a hard North/South District boundary. The present consequence would remove the Whitaker area from the North District and add it to the South District, thus "packing" more liberal leaning voters into the South District and making the North District easier for conservatives to win. Future consequences are unknown, but could easily require a public vote to amend the Charter in order to meet other requirements of redistricting—a needless, time-consuming and confusing consequence.

We urge you to keep faith with the process you initiated, consider only the Charter Review Committee Recommendations, and invite Mr. Long to participate in the next iteration of the Charter Review Committee.

Sincerely,

Janice Bohman

From: [DeeAnn Montgomery](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Charter Review Public Comment For Meeting Date 6/26/2024
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 12:33:36 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Lane County Board of Commissioners,

I appreciate all the time you take to discuss issues of our county. I want to make sure I am on the record for these charter amendments.

Removing the names of commissioner districts undermines transparency and local identity within a county's governance structure. District names provide clarity and a sense of geographic representation, allowing residents to easily identify which areas each commissioner represents. This naming convention also fosters a connection between elected officials and their constituents, promoting accountability and understanding of local issues specific to each district. Without district names, constituents may struggle to navigate the political landscape and feel disconnected from decision-making processes that directly impact their communities. Moreover, retaining district names honors historical and cultural significance, preserving the unique identities of each area within the county. I wish more governments would have names for their districts and not just numbers.

Thank you for your service to our community.

DeeAnn Montgomery, Bethel

cc: lcbcccom@co.lane.or.us

From: [Stefan Ostrach](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Cc: [TRIEGER Laurie](#); [BUCH Heather H](#); pat.farr@lanecountyorg.gov
Subject: Charter Review Public Comment for Meeting Date 7/9/2024
Date: Sunday, July 7, 2024 9:28:26 PM
Attachments: [Directive-Redistricting-2021 \(1\).pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL]

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF STEFAN OSTRACH

Not wanting to take up more of your meeting time, I'm submitting this written testimony to clarify and expand upon a point that I was making when I ran out of time at the last public hearing and to address a comment made by Commissioner Loveall in response to the testimony.

The Harrang-Long proposal shows that they know nothing about the redistricting process.

Unless the County wants to take on the hugely expensive task of hiring its own demographer, the redistricting process is dependent on Federal census tracts. The process is like putting together five jigsaw puzzles when the pieces are census tracts. Census tracts are not bounded by roads like Roosevelt Blvd. Not building Commissioner District out of census tracts would be impossible without independent demographic expertise.

Further, the Oregon Secretary of States Directive on Redistricting (attached) says that Districts are to be connected by transportation links such as Roosevelt Blvd – not divided by them. It should also be noted that Harrang-Long apparently have no compunction about dividing a working class neighborhood like Trainsong.

Commissioner Loveall's idea that Districts could vary by 10% would invite expensive litigation.

While responding to public comment on this subject, Commissioner Loveall mused that Districts could be drawn with as much as 10% variance. Hopefully that was an off the cuff comment that was not well considered. The Secretary of State's Directive (not just guidance) says that Districts shall be as much as practicable be equal in population. The last two Lane County redistricting efforts resulted in Districts that were very close to equally populated. The 10% variance referenced by Commissioner Loveall is the point at which Districts would be presumptively unconstitutional. But when Lane County has demonstrated twice that nearly equal Districts are practicable, it would not be able to withstand legal challenges to new Districts that are much more unequally populated.

Respectfully submitted,

Stefan Ostrach
110 Mayfair Lane
Unincorporated Lane County



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

ELECTIONS DIVISION

DIRECTIVE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE	SUBJECT: Redistricting	DIRECTIVE ISSUED AT THE REQUEST OF: Secretary of State	DATE: September 9, 2021	NO.: 2021-1
--	---	---	--	------------------------------

The Secretary of State, in carrying out the duties of the office, is authorized to issue detailed directives when necessary to maintain uniformity in the application, operation and interpretation of Oregon election laws. (ORS 246.110 and 246.120). The information provided below is an official directive of the Secretary of State. ORS 246.120 and 246.410 specify that a county clerk must comply with this directive. ORS 246.410 specifies that a local government or special government body, as defined in ORS 174.116 and 174.117, that fixes electoral district boundaries based on census population figures, must comply with this directive.

In an effort to promote uniform and consistent application of traditional districting principles established by the Oregon Constitution, Oregon statute and court precedent, in the drawing and redrawing of electoral districts and precincts, the Secretary of State issues this directive to each county clerk and to any local government, as defined in ORS 174.116, or special government body, as defined in ORS 174.117, that fixes or modifies electoral district boundaries based on population. More uniform and consistent application of traditional districting principles will assist the efficient and cost-effective administration of elections, reduce the probability of administrative errors and promote easily understandable boundaries for voters, analysts and election officials.

Each county clerk, and any local governments or special government bodies that fix electoral district boundaries based on population, shall consider the following when drawing district or precinct boundaries:

Each district or precinct, as nearly as practicable, shall:

- Be contiguous;
- Utilize existing geographic or political boundaries;
- Not divide communities of common interest; and
- Be connected by transportation links.
- For districts, be of equal population.

No district shall be drawn for the purpose of favoring any political party, incumbent elected official or other person.

No district shall be drawn for the purpose of diluting the voting strength of any language or ethnic minority group.

Each county clerk and any local government, as defined in ORS 174.116, or special government body, as defined in ORS 174.117, that fixes or modifies electoral district boundaries based on population shall, to the greatest extent practicable, consider newly drawn legislative and congressional district boundaries as well as the boundaries of neighboring jurisdictions when drawing districts. When drawing new district boundaries, the Secretary of State recommends close consultation with relevant county clerks for advice on meeting the election administration goals of this directive.

When drawing or altering precinct boundaries, county clerks shall, as nearly as practicable, contain precincts wholly within one state House district and one Congressional district, and must seek to minimize the change to current precincts. County clerks must also, to the extent possible, consider forecasted population trends to reduce the necessity for new precincts prior to the next decennial census. As soon as practicable after creating new precincts or altering existing precinct boundaries, county clerks shall notify the State Elections Division.

The timelines and processes associated with the apportionment of legislative districts is described in Appendix 2 of [*State ex rel Kotek v. Fagan*](#), 367 Or. 803 (2021). The timelines and processes associated with the apportionment of congressional districts is described in Chapter 419, Oregon Laws 2021 ([Enrolled Senate Bill 259](#)). Redistricting shall be completed with enough time for all candidates to file to appear on the ballot for all offices, including new or reapportioned districts. If events necessitate an update to this directive, further information will be provided.

From: [RICHARD CHARTOFF](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Meeting Date 07/09/2024
Date: Sunday, July 7, 2024 4:13:51 PM

[EXTERNAL]

I support the recommendation of the majority of Lane County's Charter Review Committee giving an Independent Redistricting Committee the final say on redistricting maps and elevating this authority to the charter. This allows average citizens greater input to the process and helps to minimize gerrymandering. The "Long" proposal is based on a very restricted viewpoint and includes elements of gerrymandering which will not make the process more equitable.

Richard Chartoff
3787 N Shasta Loop
Eugene OR 97405

541-912-2667

From: [Linda Kelley](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Tuesday July 9, 2024
Date: Monday, July 8, 2024 7:33:45 AM

[EXTERNAL]

--

Good morning Commissioners,

I have heard that there is a proposal to redraw the political boundaries for Lane County Commissioners. The Charter Review Committee ended its year-long work last October. Neither they, nor the standing 15 member independent Redistricting Commission have reviewed the new proposal.

Three commissioners have introduced this redistricting proposal, completely outside the normal procedure.

The process is out of protocol and unacceptable to your constituents who need to know that our political process is neutral and above board. We do not need any hint of gerrymandering present.

You must adhere to established protocol and allow the normal process to be followed. We do not want commissioners with personal agendas to dictate our political boundaries. You must follow the rules set in place, they are there for a reason. Please remedy this "oversight".

Linda Kelley

Eugene Resident

Hope = Goals + Roadmap

From: [Charcie Kaylor](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: CHARTER REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 7/9/2024
Date: Sunday, July 7, 2024 8:12:57 AM
Attachments: [7-5-24 BCC Redistricting.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL]

On behalf of Terry Parker, President, who speaks for our League, I am forwarding the further comments for the July 9th hearing on the proposed charter amendments.

Many thanks for your and the staff's continuing service to the people of Lane County.

--

Charcie Kaylor, Vice President
vicepresident@lwvlc.org Office 541-343-7917





July 5, 2024

The Honorable Laurie Trieger and Commissioners Buch, Ceniga, Farr, and Loveall
125 East 8th Street
Eugene, OR 97401

Dear Chair Trieger and Commissioners:

The League of Women Voters of Lane County would like to stress again our appreciation for the work done by staff and volunteers over many months and again express our support for the Charter amendments recommended by your Charter Review Committee.

The League was cited by others during the June 26 public hearing on proposed Charter amendments as an organization supportive of independent redistricting committees. While this is correct, the proposal brought to you from Stan Long and Bill Gary creates an off-cycle short term committee, whose work is half done by the mandated boundaries written into the proposal. It would be an error to conclude that such a committee would actually be "independent."

Further, including or defining commission district boundaries in the Charter is unprecedented. The concept of "one person/one vote" is the foundation on which the districts are created. The next census is now just five and a half years away and will likely result in changes to current district boundaries. Complying with the over-riding "one person/one vote" goal could result in violating your own Charter's proposed detailed boundaries.

The League constantly advocates for transparency in government decision making. The opportunities for people to participate in the redistricting process and in the Charter review were numerous. There is no compelling legal reason to rewrite the adopted boundaries at this time. Directing a short-term committee to produce a new map, already partially described, then hold just two hearings on that map, definitely lacks transparency. We join others in asking why, why now, and why put boundaries in the Charter?

Thank you for considering the League's position. We urge you to forward to the voters the recommendations of your Charter Review Committee.

Sincerely,

Terry Parker, President

From: [TGF](#)
To: [Lane County Public Comment](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING DATE 7-9-24
Date: Saturday, July 6, 2024 1:00:07 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Vote no on the proposal to redraw redistricting maps once again. The proposal was "motioned through without consulting the CRC or county counsel" which is not how the process is supposed to work. Looks to have been slipped in, in an effort to get it on the agenda without review. That's not how to conduct Lane County Commission business. Vote no on this proposal to mess with redistricting maps. The public is tired of this bickering and lack of transparency. Vote no.

Sue Mandeville

Springfield, OR