



CLALLAM COUNTY DISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 29, 2021

MEETING OF THE DISTRICTING COMMISSION (DC)

Chair Teichert (in person) called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m., Monday, November 29, 2021. Also present were Commissioners Livingston, Collins, Hetrick-Oosterveld and McEntire (all appeared by video or phone) and Districting Masters (DM) Unger and Corson (appeared in person).

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Collins questioned the options to be reviewed at the meeting. Teichert noted that there are 3 options and he expects that the DM will have additional information during the meeting.

ACTION TAKEN: Hetrick-Oosterveld moved to approve as presented, Livingston seconded, motion carried

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Kenneth Reandeau, Port Angeles, commented on Carlsborg examination.
- Rod Fleck, Forks, commented Clallam County Charter 7.40 and 5% calculation.
- Gores noted written comments received prior to the meeting (see attached):
 - Ron Richards, Port Angeles
 - Betsy Robins, Port Angeles
 - Judith Parker, Sequim
 - Jennie Peterson, Sequim
 - Dale Jarvis, Sequim

Collins requested to open the public comment session to allow Ron Richards to make comment. DC agreed to open the public comment session. Richards did not respond. Teichert closed the public comment session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes for November 18, 2021

ACTION TAKEN: McEntire moved to approve as presented, Hetrick-Oosterveld seconded, motion carried

REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

- Chair report

Teichert provided a brief summary of the redistricting process.

BUSINESS ITEMS

- Review of the 3 options presented at the public hearing meetings of 11/16 and 11/18/2021
- Review the public comments from these meetings
- Discuss the advantages of the three options using the 4 County Charter criteria
- Select a Preferred Alternative for Redistricting

DM Corson and Unger briefed the DC and public on the background, analysis and preliminary recommendations for Clallam County redistricting.

Teichert provided a summary of the public comments received by email from Richards, Robins, Parker, Peterson and Jarvis.

CLALLAM COUNTY DISTRICTING COMMISSION
MINUTES of November 29, 2021
Page 2

DM Corson and Unger continued discussing the background, analysis and preliminary recommendations for Clallam County redistricting. Unger further reported on consideration and additional alternatives regarding existing populations, A, B, C and D. DC provided feedback and held discussion on the alternatives.

ACTION TAKEN: Hetrick-Oosterveld moved modify the agenda to add an additional public comment session and continue to hold a public comment session at the end of the agenda, McEntire seconded, motion carried

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Kenneth Reandeau, Port Angeles, commented on the refinement of the methodology.
- Jennie Peterson, Sequim, commented on public testimony issues and the process timeline. She noted it has been difficult to participate with the lack of information provided before the meetings.
- Ron Richards, Port Angeles, commented on the technical difficulties and the proposed alternatives.

DC held discussion on the alternatives.

ACTION TAKEN: McEntire moved that Alternative C is selected as the preferred alternative of the Districting Commission prior to the final public hearing at the next meeting AND further that Alternative C and all the associated analytical material be placed on the Districting Commission website after today's meeting so the public has sufficient access to form whatever opinion they may have by the time the next meeting occurs, Hetrick-Oosterveld seconded, motion carried

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Ed Bowen, Clallam Bay, commented that his participation through the process has been educational for him. He addressed posting the alternative to the website.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- Next meeting date – December 13, 2021 at 1 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting concluded at 2:23 p.m.

ACTION TAKEN: Livingston moved to adjourn, Hetrick-Oosterveld seconded, motion carried

Respectfully submitted,



Lohi Gores, CMC

Clerk to the Districting Commission

Approved: December 13, 2021

Districting Commission

**Comments received prior to the
November 29, 2021 meeting**

Gores, Alanna

From: Ron Richards <ronaldrichards@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 9:07 PM
To: Gores, Alanna; Ozias, Mark; Johnson, Randy; Peach, Bill
Cc: pgottlieb@peninsuladailynews.
Subject: Clallam County Redistricting

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL *** This message was sent from outside our County network.

To the Clallam County Redistricting Commission
and
To whom it may concern:

Re: Redistricting

None of the proposed Clallam County Redistricting Alternatives meet the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter and all the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented on the Board of Clallam County Commissioners.

The following explains the situation.

Here are the words of the Charter in regard to the required population of commissioner districts

"Districts shall be approximately equal in population so that the population of the largest does not exceed that of the smallest by more than 5 percent."

To determine compliance of the existing districts or proposed districts these are the mathematical steps that must be taken:

1. Subtract the population of the smallest district from the population of the largest district;
2. Multiply the population of the smallest district by 5%.
3. If the number determined from 1 above is less than the number determined in 2 above, the requirement of the Charter is met. If the number determined from 1 is more than the number determined in 2 above the requirement of the Charter is not met.

In the document prepared by the Redistricting Masters for the November 16 and November 17 hearings (Hearings Document), it is stated that the populations of the current county commissioner districts are as follows:

District 1: 28,132
District 2: 24,351
District 3: 24,672

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the existing commissioner districts with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $28,132 - 24,351 = 3,781$

2. $24,351 * 0.05 = 1,218$
3. 3,782 is not less than 1,218 so the requirement of the Charter is not met with the existing commissioner districts because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

The “Maximum Percent Difference” figures presented on page five of the Hearings Document are in no way relevant to a determination of whether the existing commissioner districts meet the Charter population requirement. Those numbers being less than 5% mean nothing in regard to whether the requirements of the Charter are met.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative I with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,928 = 1,423$
2. $24,928 * 0.05 = 1,246$
3. 1,423 is not less than 1,246 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative I because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative II with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $27,382 - 24,672 = 2,710$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$
3. 2,710 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative II because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative III with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,672 = 1,679$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$
3. 1,679 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative III because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

It should be noted that for the past many years the population of Commissioner District 1 has been very much under-represented on the County Commission and the population of Commissioner District 3 has been very much over-represented. One could think that the erroneous method used in the Hearings Document in determining consistency of the redistricting alternatives with the Clallam County Charter was intended to maintain these disparities in favor of Commissioner District 3.

This thought is buttressed by the fact that all three proposed alternatives continue the under-representation of Commissioner District 1 by putting more people in Commissioner District 1 to begin with, which under-representation will only get worse because of the faster growth of Commissioner District 1. Coupled with this is the fact that two of the three proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 3 in an over-represented position by assigning fewer people to that District.

Simply put, erroneous methods have been used in the Hearings Document to calculate the consistency of the proposed redistricting alternatives with the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter, and the

people in Commissioner District 1 are bearing the brunt of the situation. None of the proposed alternatives meet the population requirements of the Charter and all of the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented.

A copy of the Hearings Document can be found here: [2021-11-16_192305_11-18-21_Districting_Commission_agenda.pdf \(clallam.net\)](#)

Ron Richards
360-477-5367

Gores, Alanna

From: Ron Richards <ronaldrichards@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 20, 2021 6:39 AM
To: Gores, Alanna; Ozias, Mark; Johnson, Randy; Peach, Bill
Cc: pgottlieb@peninsuladailynews.
Subject: Re: Clallam County Redistricting

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL *** This message was sent from outside our County network.

To The Clallam County Redistricting Commission
and
To whom it may concern

Having shown you in my last email why the existing redistricting proposals do not meet the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter, I submit the following proposal that would meet all the requirements of the Charter. More precision is difficult to achieve with the existing precinct structure. It's another issue, but the discrepancies in the size of the precincts gives the smaller precincts disproportionate representation in the political structures that are based on representation by precinct, as well as making more precision in redistricting difficult. The precincts need to be revised so they are more equal in population.

County Population

28,132
24,351
24,672
77,155

$77155 / 3 = 25,718$

Existing District 1 Population 28,132

Less Lost Mountain -750
Less Riverside -1,031
Less Carlsborg -1,171

Revised District 1 Population 25,180

Existing District 2 Population 24,351

Plus Lost Mountain 750
Plus Riverside 1,031
Plus Carlsborg 1,171

Less PA 106 -1,204

Revised District 2 Population 26,099

Existing District 3 Population 24,672

Plus PA 106 1,204

Revised District 3 Population 25,876

Step 1: Largest Revised District Population less Smallest District Population:

Largest Revised District Population: 26,099
Smallest Revised District Population: -25,180

Largest less Smallest: 919

Step 2: 5% of Smallest Revised District Population

Smallest Revised District Population: 25,180

5% of Smallest 1,259

Step 3: Does the population of the largest revised district NOT exceed the population of the smallest revised district by more than 5 percent.

Answer: 919 is less than 1,259 so this proposal meets the population requirement of the Charter

Sincerely,

Ron Richards
360-477-5367

On Fri, Nov 19, 2021 at 9:06 PM Ron Richards <ronaldnrichards@gmail.com> wrote:
To the Clallam County Redistricting Commission
and
To whom it may concern:

Re: Redistricting

None of the proposed Clallam County Redistricting Alternatives meet the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter and all the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented on the Board of Clallam County Commissioners.

The following explains the situation.

Here are the words of the Charter in regard to the required population of commissioner districts

"Districts shall be approximately equal in population so that the population of the largest does not exceed that of the smallest by more than 5 percent."

To determine compliance of the existing districts or proposed districts these are the mathematical steps that must be taken:

1. Subtract the population of the smallest district from the population of the largest district;
2. Multiply the population of the smallest district by 5%.
3. If the number determined from 1 above is less than the number determined in 2 above, the requirement of the Charter is met. If the number determined from 1 is more than the number determined in 2 above the requirement of the Charter is not met.

In the document prepared by the Redistricting Masters for the November 16 and November 17 hearings (Hearings Document), it is stated that the populations of the current county commissioner districts are as follows:

- District 1: 28,132
- District 2: 24,351
- District 3: 24,672

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the existing commissioner districts with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $28,132 - 24,351 = 3,781$
2. $24,351 * 0.05 = 1,218$
3. 3,782 is not less than 1,218 so the requirement of the Charter is not met with the existing commissioner districts because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

The "Maximum Percent Difference" figures presented on page five of the Hearings Document are in no way relevant to a determination of whether the existing commissioner districts meet the Charter population requirement. Those numbers being less than 5% mean nothing in regard to whether the requirements of the Charter are met.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative I with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,928 = 1,423$
2. $24,928 * 0.05 = 1,246$
3. 1,423 is not less than 1,246 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative I because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative II with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $27,382 - 24,672 = 2,710$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$
3. 2,710 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative II because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative III with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,672 = 1,679$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$
3. 1,679 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative III because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

It should be noted that for the past many years the population of Commissioner District 1 has been very much under-represented on the County Commission and the population of Commissioner District 3 has been very much over-represented. One could think that the erroneous method used in the Hearings Document in determining consistency of the redistricting alternatives with the Clallam County Charter was intended to maintain these disparities in favor of Commissioner District 3.

This thought is buttressed by the fact that all three proposed alternatives continue the under-representation of Commissioner District 1 by putting more people in Commissioner District 1 to begin with, which under-representation will only get worse because of the faster growth of Commissioner District 1. Coupled with this is the fact that two of the three proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 3 in an over-represented position by assigning fewer people to that District.

Simply put, erroneous methods have been used in the Hearings Document to calculate the consistency of the proposed redistricting alternatives with the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter, and the people in Commissioner District 1 are bearing the brunt of the situation. None of the proposed alternatives meet the population requirements of the Charter and all of the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented.

A copy of the Hearings Document can be found here: [2021-11-16_192305_11-18-21_Districting_Commission_agenda.pdf \(clallam.net\)](#)

Ron Richards
360-477-5367

Gores, Alanna

From: Betsy Robins <brobins@wavecable.com>
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 2:20 PM
To: Gores, Alanna
Subject: Districting Commission

To: agores@co.clallam.wa.us (Clerk of the Board of Commissioners)

This message was sent via the Clallam Website Email Form 11-22-2021.

Name: Betsy Robins

Email: brobins@wavecable.com

Subject: Districting Commission

Comments: First, thank you for your service to the citizens of Clallam County.

I would like to suggest an additional alternative to those already submitted. The population in D-1 is most likely to grow in the next 10 years faster than in D-3.

Please consider moving Lost Mountain, Riverside and Carlsborg to D-2 and moving 106 or 107 to D-3. 107 has a greater number of registered voters than 106. I think the population would likely balance out within a few years.

Thank you for giving my idea some consideration.

Gores, Alanna

From: judith parker <jrypins@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Gores, Alanna; Johnson, Randy; Peach, Bill; Ozias, Mark; pgottlieb@peninsuladailynews.
Cc: Ronald N Richards
Subject: Fwd: Clallam County Redistricting
Attachments: proposed redistricting options.docx

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL *** This message was sent from outside our County network.

All of you have received the complaint (below) from Ron Richards. ATTACHED is my letter of strong support for a correct recalculation of the district maps. Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

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

From: Ron Richards <ronaldrichards@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 19, 2021 at 9:06 PM
Subject: Clallam County Redistricting
To: Gores, Alanna <agores@co.clallam.wa.us>, Ozias, Mark <mozias@co.clallam.wa.us>, <rjohnson@co.clallam.wa.us>, <bpeach@co.clallam.wa.us>
Cc: Paul Gottlieb <pgottlieb@peninsuladailynews.com>

To the Clallam County Redistricting Commission
and
To whom it may concern:

Re: Redistricting

None of the proposed Clallam County Redistricting Alternatives meet the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter and all the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented on the Board of Clallam County Commissioners.

The following explains the situation.

Here are the words of the Charter in regard to the required population of commissioner districts

"Districts shall be approximately equal in population so that the population of the largest does not exceed that of the smallest by more than 5 percent."

To determine compliance of the existing districts or proposed districts these are the mathematical steps that must be taken:

1. Subtract the population of the smallest district from the population of the largest district;

2. Multiply the population of the smallest district by 5%.
3. If the number determined from 1 above is less than the number determined in 2 above, the requirement of the Charter is met. If the number determined from 1 is more than the number determined in 2 above the requirement of the Charter is not met.

In the document prepared by the Redistricting Masters for the November 16 and November 17 hearings (Hearings Document), it is stated that the populations of the current county commissioner districts are as follows:

District 1: 28,132
District 2: 24,351
District 3: 24,672

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the existing commissioner districts with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $28,132 - 24,351 = 3,781$
2. $24,351 * 0.05 = 1,218$
3. 3,782 is not less than 1,218 so the requirement of the Charter is not met with the existing commissioner districts because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

The “Maximum Percent Difference” figures presented on page five of the Hearings Document are in no way relevant to a determination of whether the existing commissioner districts meet the Charter population requirement. Those numbers being less than 5% mean nothing in regard to whether the requirements of the Charter are met.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative I with the Charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,928 = 1,423$
2. $24,928 * 0.05 = 1,246$
3. 1,423 is not less than 1,246 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative I because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative II with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $27,382 - 24,672 = 2,710$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$
3. 2,710 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative II because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

Applying the 3 steps referred to above to determine the consistency of the Redistricting Alternative III with the charter, these numbers are obtained:

1. $26,351 - 24,672 = 1,679$
2. $24,672 * 0.05 = 1,234$

3. 1,679 is not less than 1,234 so the requirement of the Charter is not met by Redistricting Alternative III because the population of the largest commissioner district exceeds the population of the smallest by more than 5%.

It should be noted that for the past many years the population of Commissioner District 1 has been very much under-represented on the County Commission and the population of Commissioner District 3 has been very much over-represented. One could think that the erroneous method used in the Hearings Document in determining consistency of the redistricting alternatives with the Clallam County Charter was intended to maintain these disparities in favor of Commissioner District 3.

This thought is buttressed by the fact that all three proposed alternatives continue the under-representation of Commissioner District 1 by putting more people in Commissioner District 1 to begin with, which under-representation will only get worse because of the faster growth of Commissioner District 1. Coupled with this is the fact that two of the three proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 3 in an over-represented position by assigning fewer people to that District.

Simply put, erroneous methods have been used in the Hearings Document to calculate the consistency of the proposed redistricting alternatives with the population requirements of the Clallam County Charter, and the people in Commissioner District 1 are bearing the brunt of the situation. None of the proposed alternatives meet the population requirements of the Charter and all of the proposed alternatives leave Commissioner District 1 under-represented.

A copy of the Hearings Document can be found here: [2021-11-16_192305_11-18-21_Districting_Commission_agenda.pdf \(clallam.net\)](https://www.clallam.net/2021-11-16_192305_11-18-21_Districting_Commission_agenda.pdf)

Ron Richards
360-477-5367

I am a resident of Sequim, District 1, and I have reviewed the complaint (below) from Ron Richards, a long-time resident of Port Angeles and a former Clallam Commissioner.

You have all received this, his correction to the proposed redistricting options, basing his presentation on the clear directions within the Clallam County Charter and the application of simple arithmetic. None of you have responded to this problem of sloppy and possibly dishonest map options, as exposed here. Every one of the three options under-represents District 1 (Sequim area) and over-represents the West End. Every Clallam citizen is aware of the robust growth in District 1, yet this substantial increase is not expressed adequately in any one of your three options.

This is not the first time Commissioners and their allies have worked to minimize the voice of District 1. Before the Charter Review vote of 2018, West End representatives worked overtime in prior Charter voting periods to disallow a general county-wide voting for Commissioners, and to establish a district-only voting in the final election. This increased the influence of District 3; and more generally, disenfranchised citizens of EVERY district because 2/3 of the citizens could not vote in these final commissioner elections for the other two candidates. Over time, had this scheme prevailed for Commissioner elections, Clallam County would have become either horribly polarized about, or horribly ignorant of the common interests that exist across all three districts because the Commissioners would never have been held accountable for myopic decisions favoring only their immediate constituency.

There is no telling what the motivations were in 2021 for this poor redistricting work, but the logging interests that exist in District 2 and 3 come to mind. This dishonest scheme will never survive scrutiny

in the public square because arithmetic is arithmetic. I am asking that you work to revise a final redistricting map that expresses the real population changes in a manner fair to District 1 before November 29.

Judith Parker
823 Bakehouse Ct
Sequim, WA 98382

Gores, Alanna

From: jdp@pobox.alaska.net
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 9:15 AM
To: Gores, Alanna
Subject: Public Testimony
Attachments: ClaCoDistComm.pdf

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL *** This message was sent from outside our County network.

Please give to the Districting Commission members – I will be testifying again today. Thanks

Jennie Peterson
74a Buckhorn Dr
Sequim, WA
Comm Dist 1

Public Comments to Clallam County Districting Commission

Thank you for the opportunity to hear the presentation by the District Master on Tuesday evening. The explanation was clear and helpful.

Section 7.40 specifies that Districts shall:

Be approximately equal in population so that the largest district population does not exceed that of the smallest by more than 5 percent.

Have boundaries that run generally north-south

Be geographically compact and continuous

And be composed of whole voting precincts to the maximum extent possible.

To a great extent, the five options reviewed all meet those criteria – including Option I which is to maintain the status quo. Simply looking at the population data and percent differences between the three Commissioner Districts does not meet the intent of the Charter.

The task of the Districting Commission is to also look forward and try to maintain the optimum percent differences between the three Districts going forward. It's not specified, but I believe that's an obvious.

I have reviewed all the information available on line (past and present agenda packets). I don't see where the Commission has considered population trends going forward.

You have a strong burden to consider maintaining "whole voting precincts to the maximum extent possible." In 2010 when the three Commissioner Districts were considered last, there was only one precinct (Sequim 404) with a population over 1500.

Today there are three precincts in District 1 over 1500, six precincts in District 2 over 1500 and ten precincts in District 3 over 1500. I don't understand why the precincts boundaries have not been adjusted – were not adjusted before your own considerations began.

I understand the official federal census data was not available until late September – and as a result this process has been compressed into a few weeks instead of eight months. Section 7:40

Not having the agenda packet available *prior* of during the November 16th regular meeting was a serious problem – *especially* knowing that last minute changes were proposed and were, in fact, adopted that day. A decision was also made to reduce the planned "Special Called Meetings" from a total of three to two. I am asking that you reconsider that decision and add another Public Hearing.

Finally, I see no reason to move Lost Mountain precinct (with only 750 population) nor to move both Lost Mountain and Riverside precinct (with 1031 population). Both are rural precincts and unlikely to experience significant growth in the next ten years. In fact, Lost Mountain was at 733 population in

2010 and 750 today. I would suggest you consider instead moving Carlsborg precinct into District 2. Carlsborg has recently upgraded its sewer and water systems giving more opportunity for growth. In fact, Carlsborg has been growing – from 990 in 2010 to its current population of 1171.

Moving that one precinct would move more population to District 2 than both Lost Mountain and Riverside combined – and the north-south boundaries would be a little straighter as well.

There *has* been some consideration of population trends – when it was “decided” that Option I was not actually an option (no formal vote was taken). Option I – today – meets the criteria of Section 7.40. Except we all know that District 1 will continue to grow, the disparity between the districts will increase and that is clearly not the best outcome.

If you move both Carlsborg precinct – looking at growth - and Lost Mountain – looking at stability – then Commissioner District 1 will be reduced in population enough to allow for what in the past has been the growth center to likely remain within the 5% criteria.

I have not been able to find projected population growth for District 2 nor District 3 and I am not as familiar with that area as I am Sequim where I live.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jennie Peterson
74a Buckhorn Rd
Sequim WA 98382

2020 Population by Precinct

Alternative I - a

Commissioner District 1	
	2020
Bell Hill	858
Blyn	1140
Carlsborg	1171
Cline	1152
Coyote	1135
Diamond Point	1046
Dungeness East	1073
Dungeness West	627
Eagle	1025
Elk	322
Happy Valley	811
Jamestown	807
Lost Mt ✓	
Macleay	1248
Miller Peninsula	583
Olympic	839
Port Williams	678
Prairie North	982
Prairie South	1309
<i>River Side</i>	<i>1031</i>
Sequim 401	924
Sequim 402	1642
Sequim 403	1501
Sequim 404	1671
Sequim 405	1254
Sequim 406	1032
Sunland North	921
Sunland South	600
TOTAL 2021	26,351

Commissioner District 2	
	2020
Agnew	1014
Bellevue North	1643
Blue Mountain	1491
Bluffs	801
Clark	678
Deer Park	1230
Fairview	1318
Monterra	1091
Mount Angeles	635
Mount Pleasant	1058
O'Brien	1064
Port Angeles 101	1196
Port Angeles 102	2082
Port Angeles 103	1692
Port Angeles 104	1309
Port Angeles 105	1821
<i>PA 106</i>	<i>1241</i>
Port Angeles 107	1899
Robin Hill	1125
Precincts moved from District 1 to 2	
Lost Mountain ✓	750
<i>Carlsborg</i>	<i>1171</i>
TOTAL 2021	24,928

Commissioner District 3	
	2020
Beaver	1019
Black Diamond	666
Bogachiel	838
Clallam Bay	1648
Dry Creek	1501
Elwha	344
Forks 301	1737
Forks 302	1598
Freshwater Bay	1646
Joyce	1453
Madison Creek	533
Neah Bay	1752
Port Angeles 108	1515
Port Angeles 109	1826
Port Angeles 110	786
Port Angeles 111	1680
Port Angeles 112	1436
Port Angeles 113	1514
Quileute	717
Sun	463
Precinct moved from District 2 to 3	
Port Angeles 107	1899
TOTAL 2021	25,876

District 1 34.15 %
 District 2 32.31 %
 District 3 33.54 %

1.84 % difference Dist. 1 and 2
 -1.23 % difference Dist. 2 and 3
 0.62 % difference Dist. 3 and 1

2021 Population

77,155

Gores, Alanna

From: Dale Jarvis <dale@djconsult.net>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 10:07 AM
To: agores@county.clallam.co.us
Cc: Ozias, Mark; Johnson, Randy; Peach, Bill; Gores, Alanna
Subject: Redistricting Commission Error

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL *** This message was sent from outside our County network.

There is a serious error in the calculations listed in the November 16, 2021 Redistricting Options.

The Clallam County Charter clearly states in Section 7.40: “Districts shall: be approximately equal in population so that the population of the largest does not exceed that of the smallest by more than five (5) percent.”

Note that the charter says “population”, NOT “population percent”.

Currently, the difference is well over 10%: District 1 = 28,132; District 2 = 24,351; difference = 3,781. The difference is 15.5% of District 2 is the denominator. The difference is 13.4% if District 1 is the denominator.

The report lists a difference of 4.9%, but this is the “population percent” difference, not the “population” difference.

All subsequent options in the report are well outside the charter requirements and thus illegal. Failure to address this problem will constitute a violation of the County Charter and open the county up to legal action.

Please ensure that this email is routed to the proper parties.

Thank you.

Dale Jarvis

Dale Jarvis, CPA-retired
(m) 206 714-7710
dale@djconsult.net