

House Committee on Legislative Rules & Reapportionment Subcommittee on Reapportionment March 28, 1991 - Page

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks

report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RULES AND REAPPORTIONMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT

March 28, 1991 Room 350 8:00 a.m. Tapes 23 - 25

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Greg Walden, Chair Rep. Peter Courtney, Vice-Chair Rep. Ray Baum Rep. Margaret Carter Rep. Bill Markham Rep. Tom Mason Rep. Randy Miller

VISITING MEMBER: Rep. Ron Cease Rep. Carl Hosticka

STAFF PRESENT: Adrienne Sexton, Committee Administrator Carol Wilder, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2001 - PH

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 23, SIDE A

006 CHAIR WALDEN: Calls the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

012 BONNIE L. HAYS, CHAIRMAN, WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS: Speaks in favor of the proposal of keeping legislative districts whole, within congressional districts, and more specifically of keeping Washington County whole. Asks that Washington County be a focus of legislative and congressional intent.

In Washington County, things are going on that are of significance to the state and nation. The proposal that you have before you, specifically referencing the Walden Plan, preserves the county

boundaries in Washington and Columbia Counties and within those two counties in total we have some common community characteristics. In Washington County, I have already portrayed that as a high-growth area. Columbia County has that potential of high growth and has been constantly seeking additional benefits for economic development. The proposal also includes the high-growth area of Clackamas County. Because of the geographic configuration of Washington and Clackamas Counties, there's been oftentimes more of a sense of community with southeast Clackamas County and Washington County as opposed to the other areas of Clackamas County.

We also have a very concentrated Hispanic population in Washington County. We find that also surprisingly in the Lake Oswego area. Those populations again by the rules that have been promulgated for consideration of redistricting should try to maintain their political voting consistency or their voting potential. If we are indeed going to try to empower minority populations, this perhaps does a better job as opposed to causing one minority population to not necessarily be in conflict with another but at least allowing them their own specific areas of interest because of community designation.

Also by the rules, we have to look at transportation linkages within a district. Again Washington County has demonstrated adequately the transportation needs and we would hope that any particular redistricting would cause the state legislative concentration and congressional representation to be able to assist us in directing those transportation needs. As it is, within Washington County 70% of our trips originate and terminate within our jurisdictional boundary, but we are heavily reliant upon the state highway system, Highway 26 to 17 and the interstate system of I-5 and I-205. Those again are major linkages for not only Columbia County but that area of Clackamas County and the area of Multnomah County that is in the proposal.

I noted in the reference sheet the considerations for this particular proposal insist that we are the suburban bedroom communities. I would hope that sometime in the future we would be able to find another term for this particular trait. We used to be a traditional bedroom community where a typical family included a wife and a husband and 2.4 children, etc. That has changed, but we are still suburbia and there's no getting around that. Again with the potential configuration of Columbia and Clackamas maintaining its fullness and with the addition of the area of growth of Clackamas County and that piece of Multnomah County, I believe you'll find more emphasis on the jobs within the region itself. The Trojan Nuclear Plant is a major employer, and the Port of St. Helens in Columbia County. Clackamas County has a major concentration of job opportunities in Kruse Way and the Lake Oswego area. Washington County is very proud to be able to offer job opportunities to the metropolitan area. In fact, we are an importer of labor. We are a suburban bedroom community; we are, however, finding that we are a community that has the housing and the job opportunities within itself and can indeed be self-supporting.

Washington County has the most excellent working relationships with the other counties within our congressional district--Clatsop, Tillamook, Yamhill, Marion, Polk, and Lincoln. I do not see that by potential redistricting those relationships are going to change, that they're going to be weakened in any way. What I would suggest is that if this proposal is accepted, we'll see the work of the congressional representation focused. Right now, that congressperson, whomever that may be, has to be an expert in areas ranging from agriculture,

timber--both on the private, state, and federal levels--coastal issues, ports, and water quality. Then you start getting into some conflicts on the desirability of economic development. You've got in my own county a growing conflict between growth and no-growth attitudes. That should be enough to take the attention of one person without also having to be expert on all of the other issues in the current representation district.

We are certainly not here to suggest any dissatisfaction with the current district nor any dissatisfaction with our current congressman. Congressman AuCoin has been extremely accessible to us and I would even put in a plug for Bernie Bottomley as also being extremely accessible to Washington County. However, I think the proposal that is before us could actually become a better opportunity of representation. We think again that the focusing of issues on a smaller geographic area and a geographic area of continuity is an opportunity that we would ask you not to dismiss lightly.

147 REP. MASON: One of the things I'm interested in is your reference to the representation of minorities in the various congressional plans, is that correct?

154 HAYS: Yes.

155 REP. MASON: And you are concerned that there will be a significant representation of minorities in what will be the future 1st Congressional District, is this correct?

157 HAYS: If the district should be reconfigured, there would be more of an emphasis on _____ Hispanic population as is shared with Lake Oswego.

166 REP. MASON: You think the 1st Congressional District under the Walden Plan would do better?

168 CHAIR WALDEN: Maybe we should share with her the numbers that we've been provided this morning (see EXHIBIT A - WALDEN PLAN, and EXHIBIT B - MASON PLAN submitted by staff) to show that overall in the 1st District both plans are within a couple of hundred or less than a thousand in terms of Hispanic, overall numbers.

170 REP. MASON: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to point out that when you compare the percentages of ethnicity in the two plans it's interesting because under the Walden Plan, which I believe you're supporting, there is a .386 black population. Under the Mason Plan there's .519 black population, so we come out with a greater figure on that. Vis-a-vis the American Indians under the Walden Plan there's .475 and under the Mason Plan there's .596. For Asian Americans under the Walden Plan there's 2.163%; under the Mason Plan there's 2.309%. The most interesting figure is that the percentage of Hispanics under the Walden Plan actually drops to 2.163 and under the original Mason Plan it's higher at 2.87. So I was a little chagrined by your testimony that you thought that the Walden proposal gives more representation to ethnics because that's not what the figures we have before us seem to show.

190 CHAIR WALDEN: The population statistics that are being cited are for the over 18 population. I think relatively they are the same in many respects.

197 HAYS: I appreciate your point. If I would have an opportunity to refocus my testimony relative to my interest in minority populations it would merely be that focus spreading the minority population over five, six, seven pieces of counties as opposed to looking at for all practical purposes that same number of population within a very small geographic area. As you're pointing out, the numbers and the percentages are practically a wash but having them again as we know their point of origin also looking at that as one smaller geographic unit that I believe may have some positive political power for those groups.

210 REP. MASON: Even though we can play number games here, the actual numbers we're working with are so close that it's tit for tat and as we go through here we get a few surprises. But in actual numbers the differences are a wash. There's nothing big here between these plans in ethnicity.

220 REP. BAUM: I want to make sure I understand what's she's saying. She's saying that the Walden Plan has some coloration of ethnic populations, but when you get the two plans compared, the numbers are within 1,000 bodies of each other. But you're saying that because they're more concentrated in certain areas of the Walden Plan it's better to keep those communities together versus a more scattered approach which takes in the coastal areas of Washington County, but the minorities are more scattered. They aren't in communities as they are in the Walden?

240 HAYS: If, indeed, the shaded areas on the Walden Plan are the point of origin for the ethnic populations, looking at the Mason Plan for political empowerment purposes if we have the same point of origin relative to the density, relative to places, etc., and if you're also suggesting the numbers are a wash relative to either plan, I am only suggesting because of a smaller geographical area that there would be more focus and more visibility of that same population as opposed to a larger geographic distribution.

258 REP. MASON: The other side of the coin is that what you have will be concentrated into a smaller geographic area for your area, that the people in the 5th will undergo the reverse effect. Their geographic area will be dissipated way out. Is that not the way it happens? What goes to your benefit in concentration will be to the detriment of the other district.

271 CHAIR WALDEN: I think there's another difference there too in that some of the population she's referring to is a concentrated area between Washington and Clackamas Counties. Under the Mason Plan it would actually be split into three sections.

276 REP. MASON: I was trying to get the answer from the witness.

277 HAYS: Obviously, I'm missing the point of the questions here. I'm a Swede. If I'm going to live in an area that would then be considered a Swedish community and yet I know that over the additional five counties in my political area there's also a smattering. I'm only suggesting that my highly concentrated Swedish community is probably going to get more visibility as a minority representation as opposed to trying to encompass a larger geographic area. I am not overly concerned about how any minority population is going to be represented by any of our congressional seats because that representation has been that of advocacy for all of the minority groupings. I am very happy with the Oregon manner of true representation of minority and ethnic races. But

I'm also suggesting that as opposed to a Swedish population in Oregon, I've got the Swedish community in Washington County, I think I'm going to have a little more political clout when I stand up and talk to my congressman if he's got a major geographic voting block within his district as opposed to a scattered representation of the voters.

310 ANNABELLE JARAMILLO, HISPANIC COMMISSION'S TASK FORCE ON REDISTRICTING AND REAPPORTIONMENT: Submits and summarizes written testimony (EXHIBIT C) in favor of the Mason Plan and opposition to the Walden Plan.

360 CHAIR WALDEN: You said that the Walden Plan would pit urban areas like Lake Oswego against rural areas?

363 JARAMILLO: This is an example of looking at the high rapid growth areas that are characterized in Lake Oswego, West Linn, the southeastern metropolitan area in terms of where the largest percentage of Hispanics reside in rural Washington County. The remarks made earlier saying that there would be representation for the Hispanic community, obviously the numbers we have shared this morning are showing that there are not distinctive differences in numbers; however, there are distinctive differences in socioeconomic status. We're looking at Washington County towards the western end of the county, having more commonality with the Hispanic community with other counties to the west of Washington County in terms of socioeconomic status. To me, that lends greater strength in representation.

377 CHAIR WALDEN: You point out Lake Oswego as an example of a community that was a rapidly growing big city that would conflict with the rural areas. This is the Mason Plan. Based on your testimony then I think you actually may be arguing for the Walden Plan because Beaverton's population is 53,000 and Lake Oswego is 30,000, so actually Beaverton is a much bigger community and Washington County is the most rapidly growing county in the state.

388 JARAMILLO: In the urban areas, yes.

389 CHAIR WALDEN: In the state.

390 JARAMILLO: In the suburban areas of Washington County, yes.

392 CHAIR WALDEN: What concerns me is that if Beaverton is a bigger city than Lake Oswego and if Washington County is a more rapidly growing county than Clackamas, then your argument really would be that you would not want to link either of those to the coastal area.

396 JARAMILLO: I think, Rep. Walden, with all due respect, what I'm referring to is the fact that many of the lower socioeconomic groups reside in rural Washington County, have more commonality with similar communities in the coastal areas. In addition, Washington County, in the rural areas has some of the poorest pockets in the state. So what I'm saying is making the shift over where you have a larger suburban-urban population would not help my community. The constituency group that would be served would be a higher socioeconomic status that would, I believe, drown out the voices of those rural areas.

408 CHAIR WALDEN: This represents Hispanic population here and here. Doesn't this area have a lot in common with the people who live in this rural Yamhill, Polk, Marion, Woodburn, Mt. Angel, McMinnville, Monmouth, and the Dallas area?

418 JARAMILLO: It certainly has a lot in common, but I believe that is covered under the Mason Plan in terms of commonality between Yamhill and Polk Counties.

420 CHAIR WALDEN: But they're not tied into rural Washington County so you're splitting...

422 JARAMILLO: I think we're splitting hairs, Rep. Walden. I don't believe there is splitting of population there at all.

425 CHAIR WALDEN: If what you're saying is that the people who live in this area (inaudible)

427 JARAMILLO: The communities in western Washington County are far larger than in that small area that you're talking about in the Lake Oswego-West Linn area.

428 CHAIR WALDEN: This says 78 percent of minorities in Washington County reside in this area, according to the census data, which goes out to Hillsboro, Aloha, and down to the southern boundary.

442 JARAMILLO: You're counting all minorities. I still maintain that those 4,000+ Hispanics in Hillsboro have very little in common with 748 Hispanics in Lake Oswego.

TAPE 24, SIDE A

022 ANTHONY FERNANDEZ, PRESIDENT, CENTRO CHICANO CULTURAL: Submits and summarizes written testimony (EXHIBIT D) in favor of the Walden Plan.

178 REP. MASON: That's very forceful testimony. You made somewhat of a categorical statement that the Mason Plan (Plan II) dilutes Hispanic power. Referring to the actual statistics that have been given to us today, where do you find that actual dilution of Hispanic power? That's not what the statistics show. You have access to those statistics, don't you?

197 FERNANDEZ: I think if you look in terms of the Mason Plan, what I called the flagpole district, that line that cuts across Oregon City to the left, on the edge of the gray and yellow district, if you follow that district line to the left and continue going west on that map, if you begin to look at the significant numbers of Hispanics who are in that area that is one major area where your disenfranchisement begins because if you look at that whole area that is primarily rural so that's one community of interest. But if you cut it between Hispanics and rural and agricultural, that's another community of interest. I think those two together have a very powerful voice in the future if we keep them together. The way you have that drawn now you split the Hispanics from Marion, Yamhill, and Polk Counties from Washington County northward.

222 REP. MASON: You are not then referring to the statistical differences between the plans.

225 FERNANDEZ: No, I'm not.

226 REP. MASON: Then it's nominal.

227 FERNANDEZ: That's right.

228 REP. MASON: So your concern is what's going to happen in the future, not so much the snapshot that was taken by the 1990 Census?

230 FERNANDEZ: I think you have to take a look at a historical trend. In 1980 when the census was taken, I believe the Hispanic population was around 32,000. Today it's 112,000. From 1985 to 1991 the Woodburn area which is, I believe, the third largest city in terms of Hispanic population in Gervais which is the first city in Oregon in terms of Hispanic population, the percentage of Hispanics from 1985 to 1991 has jumped about 29 percent, 20 percent, respectively. If we look at the trends over the next ten years that tells me that under the Mason Plan you're going to divide the numbers even more significantly.

242 REP. MASON: I realize that, but my point is that your real consideration are not so much the way the plans were drawn vis-a-vis today's census, but your real considerations are what the impact will be with further demographic population changes in the future, is that correct?

247 FERNANDEZ: I think we have to take both into consideration. I'm concerned about the way they are drawn up today. My concern with the Mason Plan as they're drawn today where I was talking about the division between Marion, Yamhill, Washington, and Polk Counties, I think that automatically disenfranchises the Hispanic community in both sides of that boundary today.

254 REP. MASON: What about the 1st Congressional District where my plan has a greater number of Hispanics in the 1st Congressional District, does that concern you at all? Under the Mason Plan, the Hispanic portion of the population is 3.584 percent and the Walden Plan, which you deemed Plan I, the Hispanic population is 3.45 percent, so the Mason Plan actually has a bigger number and percentage of Hispanics in the 1st Congressional District than the Walden Plan. Does that concern you at all?

259 FERNANDEZ: Yes it does. I think you're making a fatal error if you put urban Hispanics and rural Hispanics in the same district. Even though we share a common culture and in some cases even a language, Spanish, that doesn't necessarily mean that the needs are identical. The needs of the urban Hispanics are slightly different from the rural Hispanics whether you talk about education, housing, employment, socioeconomic status. I suggest to you the subtitle category of Hispanics in the urban areas are unique and have a self interest, that the Walden Plan addresses that unique need.

279 REP. MASON: Where are the urban Hispanics in the Mason Plan in the 1st Congressional District that you were speaking of?

282 FERNANDEZ: The way it's drawn now, my personal bias is that I wish the Walden Plan would have drawn the Yamhill-Washington County line a little bit higher. From the northern part of Hillsboro up, Beaverton, and that whole section, I would consider to be urban Hispanics.

292 REP. WALDEN: Are you talking about the western part of Washington County?

293 FERNANDEZ: Correct.

294 REP. MASON: When you say urban Hispanics, you're not talking about on the west side of Portland?

295 FERNANDEZ: Yes, I would include that whole area from HillSB oro, Beaverton, west Portland, up to the Columbia River, and from Highway 217-Lake Oswego area up.

302 REP. COURTNEY: Is it your testimony that in terms of ethnicity and culture and roots there's a difference between urban Hispanic and rural Hispanic?

305 FERNANDEZ: No, I'm saying that there's a lot of commonalities there. Two of the most common attributes are culture and language. But as a subset of that, there are a lot of Hispanics in the urban areas who for example may share the culture but not necessarily the language.

310 REP. COURTNEY: Do you know in terms of first generation versus second generation versus native if there's a difference between rural Hispanic and urban Hispanic?

316 FERNANDEZ: Let me give a very clear example. I was at a meeting that was called together by some Hispanics, urban primarily, some of them are in this room today. We met at the Sylvania Campus. The population was split evenly between urban Hispanics and rural Hispanics and unfortunately because I had my three boys with me I ended up being about twenty minutes late. So I walked into the room and not wanting to make any disturbance in the room I came in and I gave what I thought was a very cultural salutation. After the meeting concluded, some of the urban Hispanics came up to me and said that I was being very rude because I didn't say hello to anyone. The rural Hispanics came up to me and said, "We saw your salutation." Is there a difference? Yes.

330 REP. COURTNEY: Of the 112,000, most of that's been the last ten years, right?

331 FERNANDEZ: Within the last six years.

332 REP. COURTNEY: Which is about 5 percent of the Oregon population?

333 FERNANDEZ: It's growing, yes.

335 REP. COURTNEY: What percentage of that 112,000 is in the rural versus urban?

337 FERNANDEZ: I believe about 16 percent of the Hispanics are in the urban area. The remainder are in rural areas.

339 REP. COURTNEY: Have the Hispanics in the rural areas recently come here as opposed to the urban individuals that have been here awhile?

340 FERNANDEZ: No, in fact rural Oregon was probably the first part to be settled. If you look back to World War II, for example, there were a lot of Hispanics who were brought to work in the Hermiston area and there were quite a few Hispanics in the early 50's who came up and worked as agricultural workers in the Willamette valley. It wasn't until the early 70's that a lot of urban Hispanics, and I was one of those, were brought up by the Department of Education or the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Recognizing that Oregon was beginning to have a problem, they brought a lot of highly educated Hispanics from the southwest.

352 REP. COURTNEY: So most of the dramatic increase in the last six years has been Hispanics who moved into Oregon in the urban areas?

354 FERNANDEZ: No, into the rural areas.

355 REP. CARTER: Because of the number of Hispanics in Washington County presently, has there ever been a commissioner or mayor in any of the cities in Washington County?

362 FERNANDEZ: I believe there is a woman by the name of Linda Clark who is Spanish or claims to be Spanish who is a school board member.

368 REP. CARTER: I'm looking at talking about personal empowerment because I think that's important and what I'm trying to get at is to see whether there's empowerment there now. You're saying that the changing of the district gives you a greater level of empowerment?

373 FERNANDEZ: Correct.

375 REP. CARTER: So there is none there now and you feel as if the Mason Plan further deviates from that in terms of numbers?

376 FERNANDEZ: That's correct.

377 REP. CARTER: Do you see a difference in terms of the Hispanic community in Washington County and those in Lake Oswego?

380 FERNANDEZ: I heard the testimony of the lady that was here before me. There are quite a few Hispanics in Lake Oswego who do not fit her description. There are a lot of Hispanics in that area who are upper middle class Hispanics. As to the exact number I couldn't tell you. I know that I have the third largest day care center for Hispanics in Oregon. I would suspect that in the last year we have provided services to migratory workers only of over 300. For middle class Hispanics, meaning people who are earning above poverty level to about \$25,000, one out of every 50 clientele I have is from the Wilsonville-Lake Oswego area.

397 REP. MASON: On the statistical reports submitted by staff, the description on page 1 of the Walden Plan under "Considerations" it does say that the 1st Congressional District includes Portland State University. No, it doesn't. Under your plan, Mr. Chairman, Portland State University's in the 3rd, isn't it?

408 CHAIR WALDEN: That's correct, I believe.

409 REP. MASON: It's also been pointed out to me, and these are corrections for the record, that in the 4th Congressional District on the Mason Plan there should be parts of Josephine County in there. I believe that as per our earlier committee meetings the 2nd District in both plans should probably be identical. The figures don't quite match up.

423 CHAIR WALDEN: The Committee Administrator says that they are not identical.

425 REP. MASON: That's my point. I thought we had reached agreement that the 2nd should be identical. If there's any difference between these two summations, it's inadvertent and not intentional.

430 CHAIR WALDEN: Would it be your intention when we do the technical cleanup for the record that your plan would match the Walden Plan on the 2nd District? Adrienne informs me that apparently under your plan there's an area somewhere down in Merlin that's not identical.

440 REP. MASON: Yes.

TAPE 23, SIDE B

002 REP. CEASE, DISTRICT #19, N.E. PORTLAND: After listening Tuesday to the testimony of Mr. Ragsdale, I thought it might be useful for me to give some testimony for the record because I was chair of the commission that put the Metro organization proposal together before the proposal was approved by statute and then was sent to the voters in the metropolitan area. Compliments Mike Ragsdale for his excellent testimony.

The proposal that went to the Legislature originally was to include the three counties in the Metro organization -- Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah Counties. The proposal as it hit the Legislature went first to the House IGA Committee then chaired by Sen. Otto. A member of that committee was Rep. Ragsdale. Before the bill came out of the committee the committee changed the boundaries, those two individuals took a plane ride over the metropolitan area to try to get a sense where the urban growth was and what was urban and what was not. They ended up drawing the boundaries essentially what you have today and those boundaries have within them the urban and urbanizing portions of the three counties. It would be fair to say that those boundaries probably are not currently coterminous with urban growth although there is a lot of growth along those boundaries so that probably if you're going to draw the boundaries strictly in reference to urban growth it would be somewhat different than the current metro boundary.

Within the Metro organization, the statute made clear under then Secretary of State Norma Paulus who followed that pretty closely and that was that the district lines of the Council seats would clearly avoid existing government boundaries in existing communities of interest. The purpose of that was to make sure that those new Council seats would be elected not from traditional communities but from something else. If you look at the issue of the community of interest between Clackamas and Washington Counties I think it is clear that what basically connects those communities obviously is the core area which is Portland. When you remove the core area in reference to boundaries for Congressional districts you are left with a pretty weak argument in maintaining a strong community of interest between Washington and Clackamas Counties. Mr. Ragsdale made much of that. I would say that over time it would be my hope and the hope of others that the community of interest between those two counties would grow and I think maybe over time that will happen.

One other point that I think might be worth mentioning and we've had a lot of comments this morning about that, and it's really the first time we've had very much reference and discussion about the proposed boundaries of Congressional District 5. I was advised early in this process and I think others were and that is as we proceeded to look at the boundaries of our own legislative districts to make sure that we look at the districts on either side, west, east, north, and south because you could not put together the boundaries of your own district

and expect to have any merit in terms of what would eventually happen. I think that's also true as you look at either one of these proposals. We have spent most of our time talking about the proposed boundaries of District 1, particularly in the Walden Plan, without very much reference to District 5. If you look at what ended up in terms of the boundaries of District 5 under that plan it seems to me what really is proposed here is what's left over. I find it difficult to know what a community of interest is between the north coast and Astoria and Salem, other than the fact that Salem is the capital for the whole state and that means we all have some community of interest with what goes on here. In terms of much else, it really doesn't hold; there isn't any community of interest there. What you have in the proposed District 5 are two large areas with a lot of other things in between, and those two large areas are the coast and the area immediately to the east that is inland in the Salem area starting from the southern boundary of Metro south.

Let me emphasize in selecting the Metro boundary, clearly you draw a line which in your view separates urban from something else, but again I would say that boundary is not currently identical with the distinction between urban and suburban. But I think in summation I would say that we need to spend more time looking at what is being proposed here with District 5. At least with the one plan I think we've put some pieces together that simply don't fit, along with almost any definition.

095 CHAIR WALDEN: The 5th District stretching from the Cascades to the coast is the question you're raising which doesn't fit. Does that mean the 4th District doesn't fit because it stretches as well with major population centers, much like Salem is to the 5th, Eugene is to the 4th.

097 REP. CEASE: I'm not raising the question so much of Salem to the Coast. There is obviously some transportation community of interest there. I'm talking about the north coast. What you've really got is a right angle starting with Astoria on the north end coming down and at one point moving east. What we've done here is to create two new districts and the point I wanted to make is that we spent most of our time arguing about the merits of whether Clackamas and Washington Counties fit together in reference to District 1 and not really have gotten into the question of what are the communities of interest that pull Salem and the North Coast. The North Coast certainly has a lot of community of interest in terms of transportation with Portland, Washington County, and the whole metropolitan area. I think the testimony we've had has made that perfectly clear. That community of interest even in terms of transportation between the North Coast and Salem-- I'm sure you could drive from Astoria down the coast then turn eastward to Salem. A lot of people coming from Astoria to Salem would not go that way.

118 CHAIR WALDEN: I guess we would agree that Oregon is a very diverse state and this is a challenge. I guess you could make the same comment about the relationship between Brookings and Albany, for example. It does in the south kind of what Clatsop County does in the north, and it's a population-driven exercise.

127 REP. CEASE: Indeed the population does drive it, but if you talk about the deviation from one district to another, you could end up dividing up the state probably in a thousand configurations and get a zero deviation if all you wanted was a zero deviation or close to zero deviation and weren't worried about anything else. Clearly you've got five districts to deal with and not ten. If you had ten you probably wouldn't have Albany in with Brookings or any of those configurations.

It is also important where you start from; it is normally the appropriate process that you start from where you left off. Where you left off are the districts that are currently in place. Do you then make major, major changes to satisfy whatever the criteria or do you try to satisfy those criteria with making as little disruption as you possibly can? Again, if you start from the suburban area and draw a line that puts Clackamas and Washington in one district, it is going to affect, if not all the rest of them, at least part of them. My point is, in trying to justify that piece, and I think there's some argument for it though I believe it's weak, you have a problem in justifying the pieces that go into District 5.

155 REP. MASON: When Metro drew its own internal boundaries for their Metro districts, didn't they deliberately avoid existing political boundaries?

160 REP. CEASE: The statute provided very clearly that the internal boundaries for Council seats would insofar as was possible, avoid existing subdivision lines of existing communities of interest. Clearly they were looking for something that was above and beyond that and the hope was obviously that there would be a development of a regional consensus, and the thought was that it could happen most easily if those Council lines avoided the traditional city and county lines and they are avoided all over the place. As a matter of fact in some of those council districts parts of the districts are in all three counties. Now that has obviously created some other kinds of problems but that was done deliberately and that's what the statute provided for and that's what the Secretary of State considered in drawing those lines. In reference to that, if you look at the southern Metro line, once again those boundaries were put there by the committee to essentially include within the Metro organization the urban parts. The Walden Plan uses that southern boundary, but has no reference whatsoever to the western boundary. If you looked at the western boundary, you would think it even made less sense in terms of using that for any kind of other boundary lines. It goes from Beaverton, Tigard, Aloha, Hillsboro, Cornelius, Forest Grove, etc. If you look at the line, it wouldn't make any sense to you unless you knew exactly what the urban development was in that area. Other than that, it doesn't mean anything.

190 REP. MASON: Within Metro's jurisdiction we have the Zoo, solid waste, and transportation is a major part although it has not assumed the responsibility to the major transportation institutions in the area. But beyond that, where is Metro at this moment?

202 CHAIR WALDEN: Wasn't the bond measure passed this last fall by voters statewide? Didn't that deal with funding light rail bonds in Washington County and didn't it also say next up would be Clackamas County?

205 REP. MASON: Yes, but they have not taken over Tri-Met. They also have responsibility for the Convention Center.

208 REP. CEASE: I would say, Rep. Mason, if you look at those original boundaries, they were created that way to include within them the urban and urbanizing areas. There is a rural area in there but only because it is in between an urban area and if you look at the original functions of that organization, solid waste, regional aspects of sewers (which it has never done), plus ground water. The purpose of those boundaries was to deal with what was viewed as basically proven suburban-urban issues so

that when you use that line it's an available line and it's described in statute, you have to keep in mind what that line means even if you want it to mean a line that separates urban and rural, it doesn't quite do that now because of growth patterns. It's close but not identical. I'm not quite sure what the merit is of using that southern boundary other than the fact that it's there.

232 BOB GOLDSTEIN, CITIZEN: I don't believe that any of the plans that you would draw regardless of who created them is going to be found completely absolved of dividing communities of interest. I don't even believe it's possible to do that. I do believe that the intent of both plans is positive and I think they can be attached in many different ways and I choose not to do that at this time. As the alternative which I have proposed which is Plan 3 from the citizen viewpoint, from an orbital kind of an approach, looking down at Oregon, not looking specifically at minorities because no one has addressed the Asian-American minorities and no one has addressed any other kind of minorities except the ones that have been addressed. I believe that is an inadequacy in itself. I believe there is only one way to look at this and that is in the plan which I proposed at earlier sessions. I do not have a large plot map as was requested by Rep. Markham but I do have an overall picture which I would like to submit and let the people take a look at.

In earlier testimony I made statements to the effect that county boundaries are essential political boundaries which have been in place come December 13 of this year for 75 years with no intrusions to be made in those boundaries under any circumstances except where there might be the overpopulation which would be beyond the congressional need. I begin everything in my thinking from the east of Oregon and work west.

286 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you have the statistical data on deviation? Could you tell us how each district stacks up?

287 GOLDSTEIN: I would like to begin with what I call Congressional District 1 which is the southern tier, in orange, beginning in the corner at Malheur County. The deviation is 1,878, or .33%. There would be six counties, including Crook and Deschutes and no county boundary being attacked in any way.

350 REP. CARTER: Are you proposing the elimination of two congressional seats?

352 GOLDSTEIN: The computer has some weaknesses in that the coloration up in the Multnomah County area is hard to see and that makes it very difficult for me to work properly in that area. The southern tier runs from east to west and would give a sweep to that congressman as it would to the two congressmen above it, the central tier and the northern tier with the exclusion of the tri-county. That would almost be like a congressional senatorial district, looking at the entire state. I believe that our strength in Congress is the thing that is most important. Three voices, according to the map I have, would be potentially representing the people of eastern Oregon where they only have one now. Three voices would also be representing those people on the coast where there are only two now.

370 CHAIR WALDEN: Mr. Goldstein, which district number would you assign to which color and then the population deviations for each of those?

375 GOLDSTEIN: Congressional District 1 would be the southern district

in orange, deviation .33 without disturbing any county boundaries. That would be 1,878 people.

378 CHAIR WALDEN: Is that over?

379 GOLDSTEIN: That's a plus. District #2 which would be the central district is nine counties. There we have a deviation of 3,158, .56 percent. Both of those would be over. Again no county of those nine counties and the eleven counties there below, total of twenty counties, with a deviation total of 5,036, which would have to be misused out somewhere else in the next three districts.

388 CHAIR WALDEN: Three would be the green then?

390 GOLDSTEIN: District #3 would be the green, beginning in Wallowa County and working east all the way to the coast. Each of those three districts follow the same pattern. The deviation in the thirteen counties would be 42,309 which is considerably out of line. Because that would basically be rural and not suburban or urban that could be made up in my mind in the original concept by those people in eastern Clackamas County who were definitely rural and have much in common with the people of District #3.

415 CHAIR WALDEN: What was the deviation percentage and the population difference?

417 GOLDSTEIN: By the time I got through with reducing what I considered the blue section, which would be congressional #4 that would be basically suburban Clackamas County and the western portions of Washington County. By the time you get through with reducing Clackamas and Washington Counties into two separate areas, rural and suburban basically, and reducing the 5th Congressional District in the completely urban area by adding those people in eastern Multnomah County in the Corbett and eastern area and the northwestern portion towards Scappoose and St. Helens, I believe that we could come down to a figure if it were balanced properly. As it was given to me today, Congressional District #3 winds up -2,953 people or -.52 in deviation. The 4th Congressional District which is the suburban Clackamas, Washington remainder is -1,889 with a -.33 deviation. The 5th Congressional District which would be urban Multnomah County, and I do not believe that this is complete, it could be reduced even more, comes out to -.03, or 193 below. That could certainly be refined and my whole idea of that was to take those people who are outside of Gresham and beyond the Sandy River in basically unincorporated areas in eastern Multnomah County

TAPE 24, SIDE B

028 but the computer does not have the information to show the incorporated areas and the unincorporated areas. That could be refined and I believe it could be stretched out to the point where it would be maximum overall range in deviation and would be below 1%. The figures that I have been given say that the largest positive deviation which I cannot disagree with in Congressional District #2, the yellow portion, is 3,158 people, .56 deviation, the largest deviation. Congressional District #3 is -2,953, in green, and that could be evened out much better as well as Congressional Districts 4 and 5. I know that the intent of both Mr. Mason and yourself, Mr. Walden, are in the highest values in looking to have us best represented in Congress. I believe the most important factor here would be after clarification of basically the inner city, Congressional Districts 4 and 5, that we could come to

something well below 1% deviation overall. The main thing is that Rep. Bob Smith currently represents eastern Oregon. He is the one voice in eastern Oregon and does not have an opportunity to represent the Port on the coast of the U.S. and with my plan would give him the opportunity to have the broadness I believe that he would need in that district and would be a wide view in the best interests of Oregon in all three stripes across Oregon as the option. The plans that you gentlemen have submitted and the battles that I hear going on, and the differences, and I hear the Hispanics want one thing, the African-Americans want another thing, the people from the Port of Portland or the union people in the metropolitan area shout, "We must have two congressional representatives". With the ability that you have to go into the computer and spend more time than I have because my time had been limited, I believe that you could arrive at something that would move us into the 21st century in a quantum step. I believe ten years from now that we would benefit in the long run by using this kind of an attitude. I believe it's progressive. I believe Oregon should not be stuck in the mud, and as I had commented in prior testimony I believe that the last redistricting that was done for Congress ten years ago was close to being like a wild surgeon who likes to cut up Oregon's counties and they were violated many ways.

The committee takes a short break.

HB 2001 - WORK SESSION

114 MOTION: Rep. Markham moves the amendments entitled the Walden Plan as presented on March 21st into HB 2001.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, the Motion carries with Reps. Carter, Mason, and Courtney voting NAY.

168 MOTION: Rep. Miller moves HB 2001 as amended to the full committee with a Do Pass recommendation.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, the Motion carries with Reps. Carter, Mason, and Courtney voting NAY.

175 REP. MASON: I will serve notice of a minority report now, but I will formally serve in Full and I think I'll be talking to Rep. Courtney at that time.

178 CHAIR WALDEN: The meeting of the full committee will be tonight at 5:00 in Hearing Room E for purposes of Work Session only on HB 2001 and any possible minority reports that might be served.

The meeting is adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Carol Wilder Adrienne Sexton Assistant Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

- A - Walden Plan Statistics - Submitted by Staff - 5 pages.
- B - Mason Plan Statistics - Submitted by Staff - 5 pages.
- C - Testimony on HB 2001 - Annabelle Jaramillo - 2 pages.
- D - Testimony on HB 2001 - Anthony Fernandez - 3 pages.