FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DRAFT – Sept. 23, 2021

Contact: Abbi Russell, Consultant
360-787-3328 (cell)
arussell@maulfoster.com

Spokane County redistricting committee hosting final public information session Sept. 30 in Cheney
Committee expects to consider adopting final redistricting plan in early October

SPOKANE, Washington – The Spokane County Independent Redistricting Committee is hosting the last of four public information sessions on Thursday, Sept. 30, in Cheney.

What: Spokane County Redistricting Public Information Session #4
When: Sept. 30, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Where: Cheney Public Library, 610 First St., Cheney, WA 99004
Virtual option: https://zoom.us/j/98342866965?pwd=TFc4cFM0STM1QVp1TjQ0ZzQzYXVqQT09
Call in number: 253-215-8782
(Meeting ID: 983 4286 6965 | Passcode: 171862)

Other information: On-site parking is available.

This is the last of four public information sessions the committee has hosted since July. Attendees at this informal public meeting can expect to see the committee’s draft redistricting plan, hear an update on the process of developing a final plan, and talk with committee members.

The committee will host its fourth and final public hearing to share information and receive formal public comment on Oct. 7, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m., at Northern Quest Resort & Casino in Airway Heights. Visit www.RedistrictSpokaneCo.com for meeting information.

The committee expects to consider a final plan for adoption after the Oct. 7 public hearing. Residents, businesses, and organizations across Spokane County are encouraged to provide public comment on the draft plan and any revised plans; comments will be accepted through Oct. 12. The final redistricting plan must be submitted to the Spokane County Auditor’s Office by Oct. 23, 2021.

Public comment can be submitted via public meetings, the website comment form at www.RedistrictSpokaneCo.com, email at info@redistrictspokaneco.com, or mail at PO Box 31508, Spokane, WA 99223.
The Spokane County Independent Redistricting Committee consists of four voting members and a non-voting chair. The voting members were appointed by local Republican and Democrat legislators. The Republican members of the redistricting committee are Robin Ball and Jim McDevitt. The Democrat members of the redistricting committee are Natasha Hill and Brian McClatchey. The Spokane County Board of Commissioners selected retired Providence Health Care executive Elaine Couture as non-voting chair to lead the IRC. For more information, visit www.RedistrictSpokaneCo.com.
Vote for Map D

Bob West <refman50@comcast.net>
Thu 9/16/2021 2:54 PM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

To Whom it May Concern:

I concur with the assessments of the Spokane Republican party in reference to redistricting for 5 County Commissioners within the area of Spokane County.

The City of Spokane has its own government and mayor while the county board of commissioners is the only government for rural areas. Don’t allow the City of Spokane to control county government. All people whether living in urban, suburban or rural areas need a say in the county government. I support Map D.

-Splitting up the lower south hill, the U-district and the downtown into three different districts as shown on map C is not fair. The downtown core of Spokane as a community of interest should be together. I support map D.

-The City of Spokane should have a north district and a south district. People in Spokane County live "North," "South," "in the Valley," or "West Plains." These are the natural large communities of interest for the area.

-The City of Spokane has just over 40% of the County’s population – it should not have a supermajority of votes in three of the five districts. Spokane should be split up many ways or put into primarily two districts like they did in Clark County with Vancouver, Pierce County with Tacoma and Snohomish County with Everett. The largest city should not also control the regional commission.

Thank you,

Bob West
19117 E. Indiana Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99016
509-992-2939 c
refman50@comcast.net
The City of Spokane has just over 40% of the County’s population – it should not have a supermajority of votes in three of the five districts. Spokane should be split up many ways or put into primarily two districts like they did in Clark County with Vancouver, Pierce County with Tacoma and Snohomish County with Everett. The largest city should not also control the regional commission.

-Breanna Crapo
The City of Spokane has 42.2% of the county's population, it should not control three of the districts. Maps B and C split the City of Spokane into almost three equal parts – giving city residents about 70% of the population in a majority of the proposed Countywide districts. Since the City does not have a majority of the population and should not have a majority voice on the County Board of Commissioners. We need a Board of County Commissioners who will look out for small towns and unincorporated areas also, representing the interests of all county residents, not just those in the biggest city.

The greater Valley area has half the population of the City of Spokane. The City of Spokane should be split more ways than the greater Valley area. The City of Spokane should have a north district and a south district. People in Spokane County live "North," "South," "in the Valley," or "West Plains." These are the natural large communities of interest for the area. One way to do this is to split Spokane into north and south districts using I-90.

Medical Lake, Airway Heights and Fairchild should be together with Cheney. The West Plains should not be broken up like in Map B, with Airway Heights in one district, Fairchild in another with Medical Lake, and Cheney in a third district. Keep the West Plains together.

Regional perspective needs to be a key factor in district considerations. The City of Spokane has its own Mayor and Council. The County is the only government with a regional viewpoint – the city should not control the County Board of Commissioners.

We need a Board of County Commissioners who will look out for small towns and unincorporated areas also, representing the interests of all county residents, not just the city. Map D does the best at using the commonly referred to descriptions of our area (the North Side, the South Hill, the Valley area, or the West Plains). Please use Map D for fair representation. those in the biggest city.

They seem to be based on the City’s council districts, adding in a few more voters to get to the required number of people. They then gather most of the rural areas into just two districts, minimizing the number of commissioners focusing on rural and unincorporated needs. The County government is the ONLY government for unincorporated residents, and the representation should be commensurate with this so that the county gets appropriate representation.

In summary, the City should have two districts, north and south, and the other 3 districts should be the Valley and West Plains, and possibly using I-395 as a divider. There is no reason to make any of the current Commissioners run against each other, they currently live in and represent very different areas.

sincerely,
Connie King
At the meeting it was mentioned that perhaps you should look at Spokane Valley as a starting point for drawing the final map. As I indicated in my remarks at the meeting, the citizens of Spokane Valley see Sprague Avenue (and Appleway where Sprague is one way) as a dividing line in the city. And you should draw the dividing line all the way to the city limits. To compensate for the population numbers when making that change, some precincts that are outside the Spokane City limits could be added back into the pink district on map D.

With regard to the discussion about most of the population being in the cities, please remember that the cities have their own government but the rural areas only have county government to handle any of their issues.

Thank you for consideration of my suggestions regarding the City of Spokane Valley.

Diana Wilhite
Former Mayor of the City of Spokane Valley
After studying the re-districting maps and reading related materials, I feel strongly that map D is the map that makes the most sense. I live in Mead and want to be confident that my vote will not be dismissed by areas that do not share my concerns is the various issues that are subject to being voted on.

I definitely endorse Map D.

Gregory Kranich
Mead, WA
775-997-5855
Thoughts on the plans

Jennifer Hicks <greece333@gmail.com>
Fri 9/17/2021 10:52 AM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

Hello,
Thanks for engaging with the public and a big thanks for the volunteers who are deciding these boundaries.

I live in the County, just across the street from the City of Spokane boundaries.

I am extremely frustrated that I am being charged double for water that people across the street pay.

This is an example of the City running roughshod over the citizens in the county.

That is why I am supporting Map D. I don’t want the city of Spokane to be “running” the county!

Map D is the best option for the entire county to be fairly represented.

I am looking forward to having five county commissioners. I think this will be a positive thing for our county if Map D is selected.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hicks
Glenrose Area
The Board of County Commissioners plays an integral role in assessing and meeting the needs and concerns of the unincorporated regions and surrounding outlying communities. Commuting the vested interests of these communities to the City of Spokane is the wrong way forward.
Support Map D. No Spokane City Meddling in Rural Areas!

Judy Luce <jlluce@hotmail.com>
Thu 9/16/2021 3:25 PM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

Dear Committee Members,

I support Map D.

A. Rural areas and their government by commissioners need to be respected as such. City of Spokane should not intrude on county government
   (1) Spokane County with their commissioners represent a group with significant shared interests and should be kept separate from the city of Spokane.
   (2) The City of Spokane has its own government and mayor, while the county board of commissioners is the only government for rural areas.
   (3) Don't allow the City of Spokane to intrude and control county government. All people whether living in urban, suburban or rural areas need a say in their own government.

B. The Downtown Core of Spokane is one community of interest and should not be splintered into 3 different districts.
Splitting up this small community into smaller pieces doesn't make sense.

SUPPORT MAP D

Sincerely,

Judy Luce
Medical Lake
Option D is what we believe is best.

First, option D would allow for population distributions close to the target and would keep smaller towns and the area surrounding these towns in the same district. In addition, communities of interest (U-District, East Central, West Central, Hillyard etc.) would be kept intact.

Thank you,
Scott & Becky Davis
Map for redistricting commissioners. PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Peterson <mayorstevepeterson@yahoo.com>
Thu 9/16/2021 12:01 PM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

I prefer map D. I like City of Spokane Valley split into 2 districts and the City of Spokane into 2 districts. The west area becomes the tie breaker at the meetings or one of the Spokane Districts.

Thanks you

Steve Peterson
719 N Lancashire Lane
Liberty Lake, WA 99019
(509) 990-0509
Redistricting

Timothy Schwering <tschwering@mac.com>  
Thu 9/16/2021 1:26 PM  
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

To Whom it May Concern:

In regard to the Spokane County redistricting plan, the City of Spokane has its own government and mayor while the county board of commissioners is the only government for rural areas. Please don’t allow the City of Spokane to control county government. All people whether living in urban, suburban or rural areas need a say in the county government. I support Map D.

With appreciation.

Tim and Sarah Schwering  
4924 S Pittsburg Street  
Spokane, Washington 99223
Redistricting Spokane

Will Gassman <wagjr64@yahoo.com>
Thu 9/16/2021 3:26 PM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

Good Afternoon,

Regarding the redistricting of Spokane, the City of Spokane has its own government and mayor, while the county board of commissioners is the only government for rural areas.

In looking at Scenario C, this map does not allow the people living in urban, suburban or rural areas to have a say in the county government. This map is giving control to the city, by splitting up the lower south hill, the U-district and the downtown into three different districts.

Scenario D would be the most fair. It is the best choice to allow the county to continue to have a say what goes on in their area and not be controlled by the city.

I am just sharing my thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely,

Will Gassman
Dear redistricting committee members,

Thank you for your work on redistricting committee for Spokane County.

I strongly urge you to consider map presented by Community Redistricting workgroup (supported by 26 community organizations) on 9/16/21 by Ann Murphy. We need fair, equitable and competitive districts so voices of all Spokane County residents are heard, and issues addressed.

At the public/information meetings in past, I have heard comment by a committee member and members of community that Spokane city has a mayor and city council and county commissioners are for rest of the areas. I am sure all of you are aware 70% of county’s budget is spent on criminal justice and safety that impacts city as well as county. Additionally Spokane Regional health district also impacts Spokane city. Districts need to be drawn so issues of entire County are addressed equitably.

Aruna
The attached pdfs include an outline map, WFS3, and five pages of metrics, all generated using Dave's Redistricting, https://davesredistricting.org/maps#home. As you no doubt know, this web site is available to all without cost. The map was generated using unmodified 2020 census data. Its basic geographic units are voter precincts, making it impossible to exactly follow such boundaries as E Sprague Avenue and I90. This seems more logical than using census blocks, since precincts are the irreducible units for all our elections, and changes are generally made by splitting or joining existing precincts without altering boundaries.

The map itself may be found in editable form at https://davesredistricting.org/join/925cf517-242f-44db-85e7-c8e502426964. It has 1.54% population deviation and consists of two large suburban-rural districts surrounding three compact urban-suburban districts. Based on recent partisan voting data, the two suburban-rural districts would be solidly Republican, while the three urban-suburban districts include one solidly Democratic, one comparatively Democratic, and one comparatively Republican.

Judging from several references during your meetings, the “33% of county population residing outside incorporated areas are an important “community of interest,” but one with no specific spokesperson on the Redistricting Commission. We should all be concerned that agriculture, as an economic and social force, be represented on the new five-member County Commission. As evidence of the uncertainty of how to deal with this issue I offer the numbers of Districts with significant rural land in your four scenarios: 4 in A, 2 in B, and 3 in both C and D.

Given that each District must contain 20% of Spokane County’s population, and that not all the 33% of County population outside incorporated areas is engaged in agriculture, the strongest way to achieve agricultural representation would be one donut-shaped rural District surrounding a four-district donut hole of urban-suburban Districts. Such a scenario would probably not pass muster for compactness, so the next best solution would be two rural Districts, as in scenario B. There is a further benefit in that the two districts are largely dominated by different landscapes: the SW rural by Palouse hills, and the NE rural by forest.

To produce two substantially rural Districts containing 40% of Spokane County’s population, it is necessary to include significant amounts of suburban area, but hopefully with agricultural orientation. The Airway Heights – Fairchild AFB area has no strong interest in agriculture, but Spokane Valley, as former farmland with a “not Spokane city” attitude, does. The WFS3 scenario follows scenario D, and the judgement of a former Spokane Valley mayor expressed at a recent Commission meeting, in dividing the Valley along the E Sprague Avenue axis as closely as possible.

The three urban-suburban Districts are bounded as near as possible by I90 and N Division Avenue.
3:2 Three Urban/Suburban and Two Suburban/Rural County Commissioner Districts

This scenario starts by dividing Spokane Valley between Districts 1 and 2, with Sprague Avenue roughly as the dividing line. This is probably in accord with the desires of residents of Spokane Valley and Liberty Lake, but the preferences of Medical Lake, Deer Park, and rural populations are not known. However, having rural land in two Districts rather than three will increase the likelihood that the Commissioners will be motivated by rural concerns (e.g. agriculture). The three urban/suburban Districts are divided roughly by I90 and N Division Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>107,186</td>
<td>-0.63%</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>61.77%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>83,176</td>
<td>86.14%</td>
<td>15.86%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>107,499</td>
<td>-0.35%</td>
<td>38.23%</td>
<td>59.84%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>82,586</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>108,052</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>55.35%</td>
<td>41.72%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>86,053</td>
<td>81.99%</td>
<td>18.01%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>107,944</td>
<td>-0.35%</td>
<td>48.54%</td>
<td>49.49%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>84,298</td>
<td>78.55%</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>108,318</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>51.86%</td>
<td>46.01%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>85,441</td>
<td>79.86%</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107,868</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>46.10%</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>84,318</td>
<td>82.47%</td>
<td>17.53%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
- The 1.54% population deviation is within the 10% threshold tolerated by the courts.
- Two districts lean Republicans, one leans Democratic, and two fall in the 45–55% competitive range.

![Ratings: SpokaneCCdistricts_WF33](image)

Bigger is better, for the ratings above.
Requirements

Redistricting maps must typically satisfy four constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>All precincts are assigned to districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous</td>
<td>All precincts in districts are connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free of holes</td>
<td>No districts are embedded in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal population</td>
<td>Districts have roughly equal populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating

- This map meets basic requirements.

Notes

- The 1.54% population deviation is within the 10% threshold tolerated by the courts.

Proportionality

All else equal, prefer maps that are more proportional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionality</td>
<td>The deviation from the number of whole seats closest to proportional. Smaller is better. By convention, positive values of bias metrics favor Republicans &amp; negative values favor Democrats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating

![Rating Scale]

Notes

- The average map-wide Democratic two-party vote share is 47.04%, the Republican 52.96%.
- The number of Democratic seats closest to proportional is two. The likely number of Democratic seats is 2.20. The likely number of unexpected Democratic seats (won) lost is -0.20.
- In contrast, experts would judge partisan bias to be 68 of 100. See [How to Rate Partisan Bias](https://ballotpedia.org/How_to_Rate_Partisan_Bias) for details.
Competitiveness

All else equal, prefer maps that are more competitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>36.59%    The percentage of competitive districts. Bigger is better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

- Unlike the partisan lean note in district statistics that simply counts the number of districts in the 45–55% range, this competitiveness metric uses a probability distribution with the tails approaching zero at 40% and 60%. Hence, an ideally competitive set of districts has a ~75% competitiveness.

Minority Representation

No minority group is populous enough overall to warrant an opportunity district.

Compactness

All else equal, prefer maps with districts that are more compact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knecht</td>
<td>0.4318  Measures how dispersed district shapes are. Bigger is better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polsby-Popper</td>
<td>0.3312      Measures how indented district shapes are. Bigger is better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

- In contrast, using a common “know it when you see it” understanding of compactness (KIVYSi), people intuitively judge the compactness of these districts to be 60 of 100. See How to Measure Legislative District Compactness If You Only Know It When You See It for details.
- Compact districts aren't always fair. To the extent that a state's political geography has a significant urban-rural political divide, maps with more compact districts tend to be less proportional, and maps that are more proportional
Map D is the most fair

Felisha Elmer <felishaelmer@gmail.com>
Sat 9/18/2021 9:11 PM
To: Redistricting Spokane County, WA <info@redistrictspokaneco.com>

1 attachments (15 KB)
redistricting 1.docx;
Hello, my name is Felisha Elmer. I am a resident of Spokane, WA. Out of all the maps that was presented, Plan D is the fairest to the residents who live in Spokane county. Here is why:

- Plan C has allowed certain business involved that do not have the best interest in the American people, it should automatically be dismissed.
- Downtown Spokane contains a denser number of residents compared to the out skirts of the city.
- By Spokane having its own district, which is mostly democratic party, will allow them to still hold a voice and not be suppressed by the republican party.
- The City of Spokane has its own city council and mayor. While the county board of commissioners is the only government for rural areas. We ask you to please not allow the City of Spokane to control county government. All people whether living in urban, suburban or rural areas need a say in the county government. Map A & Map B will allow overreach, including suppress the voices that live outside the city lines. We should still follow a check and balance style that way everyone is heard.
- Map D is the closest as we can get to making each district equal as far as population numbers.

I am asking you to please make a decision that would be best for the residents living in the county. Your choice will hold an affect on those who live in the rural areas and should not be impacted on those who live in the city. Thank you for your time.
### Date and Time: 9/16/2021, 9:34 p.m.

**Share your comments here:**
To Whom It May Concern,
I would like to say I prefer Plan D at this time. It is important to me and to Spokane County that the City of Spokane not have a supermajority of votes in three of the five districts or control the regional commission. The plan is considered long term and must be implemented in that way. All of Spokane County needs a voice. The City should not be that voice. All areas whether they be rural, suburban or urban need to be able to participate with an equal voice. Equality seems to be an important subject these days so let’s make sure we have that in redistricting. Plan D provides for that. Thank you!

**Optional - First and Last Name:** Carolyn Williams

**Optional - Email Address:** craewill@comcast.net

---

### Date and Time: 9/16/2021, 9:55 p.m.

**Share your comments here:**
Map D does the best at using the commonly referred to descriptions of our area (the North Side, the South Hill, the Valley area, or the West Plains). Please use Map D for fair representation.

**Optional - First and Last Name:** Sandra Paulsen

**Optional - Email Address:** Sandra.a.paulsen@gmail.com

---

### Date and Time: 9/16/2021, 10:48 p.m.

**Share your comments here:**
I am writing because I am unable to attend this evening’s meeting (9/16) and because I want to speak in favor of Map "D". As our area continues to grow, West Plains and Spokane Valley have emerged as distinct communities. It would be a mistake if their voices were to be subsumed into the larger City of Spokane. People who have chosen to live in these areas would lose their influence in county government because their voice would be overwhelmed by the citizens of City of Spokane. Such homogenization does not allow for different points of view to prevail in public discourse.

**Optional - First and Last Name:** Bill Norman
Splitting up the lower south hill, the U-district and the downtown into three different districts as shown on map C is not appropriate. The downtown core of Spokane is a community of interest and should be kept together. I support map D.

Optional - First and Last Name: Dave Lucas
Optional - Email Address: Dave.lucas.radio@gmail.com

Spokane county voters are 55% conservative and rest progressive. Redistricting of Spokane county needs to be such that issues/voices of all voters are heard and addressed. So, 2 districts for conservative voices, 2 for progressive voters and 1 conservative and conservative combined. Also committee members need to be cognizant of precinct lines.
In July meeting Map was presented by community organizations APIC, Scar, planned parenthood etc based on 2019 census data, I would urge committee to consider their proposed map based on 2020 census data.

Optional - First and Last Name: Aruna Bhuta
Optional - Email Address: abhuta2010@gmail.com

Please don’t district to favor conservative voters or candidates. We need a balanced districting scheme.

Optional - First and Last Name: Neal Schindler
Optional - Email Address: neal.e.schindler@gmail.com
Since I live in the City and County of Spokane, I was disturbed by the comments of several members of the redistricting committee which indicates that they are interested in creating districts which dilute my vote. I don't understand why living in the City of Spokane means that I should get less representation. We also live in the County and are impacted tremendously by the actions of the county commissioners. The proposed districts which divide up the City between 2 or more districts are attempts of dilute our votes. I also assume that it is an attempt to dilute the largely democratic votes within the City. Whether the City has its own form of local government as do the City of Spokane Valley, Cheney, Liberty Lake and Airway Heights, is irrelevant. I've never understood this attitude that somehow, since we live in the City of Spokane we don't count as far as the county is concerned.

Optional - First and Last Name: N/A

Optional - Email Address: l.connelly@comcast.net