August 29, 2016

Hon. Alex Padilla
California Secretary of State
1500 11th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Padilla:

The State Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of California hereby notifies you of the following:

California has nearly 40 million people and at the same time has a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000.

We are informed and have information to show that the initial representation for California was 16 Senators and 36 Assembly members for about 92,000 people. The number of representatives in the Senate and the Assembly increased as the population increased until 1862 when the size of the Senate and Assembly reached its current size and the state population was about 400,000 people. This means that the Assembly seats began with about 2,500 people per representative on average and the Senate began with just less than 6,000 people on average. It is also notable that each county had a representative. When the legislature stopped increasing in size, the Senators had an average of 10,000 people and the Assembly had an average of 5,000 people. So, the fact that the population keeps growing and the number of representatives does not has resulted in a massive material effect on the voters and us as Libertarians.

As the leaders of the Libertarian Party of California, we represent the 120,000 or so registered Libertarians in California. We have a material interest in our constituents, particularly those who have registered as Libertarians in maintaining the value of their vote. The static level of representation with 40 Senators and 80 Assembly Members and the continuously growing population devalues the vote of each Libertarian.

We as Libertarians also have an interest in competitive elections and for the districts to have reasonably-sized constituencies. Finally, the Libertarian Party has a material interest in smaller districts with smaller constituencies that would give candidates who run as Libertarians a better chance of being elected to office. The larger the district, the more expensive it is for those running for office. This has a decisive advantage for the incumbent who holds office and has votes in the legislature, but the challengers do not.
On behalf of the membership of the Libertarian Party, I hereby demand that the number of Assembly members and State Senators in the California Legislature be increased.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ted Brown
Chair, Libertarian Party of California
tbrown@ca.lp.org
May 6, 2017

Markham Robinson
American Independent Party of California
476 Deodara Street
Vacaville, CA 95688-2637

Hon. Alex Padilla
California Secretary of State
1500 11th Street,
Sacramento, CA 95814

To the Honorable Secretary of State:

I am the Chairman of the American Independent Party of These United States (AIPOTUS), the national party with which the American Independent Party of California (AIPCA) is affiliated. The American Independent Party is the third largest party with 510,486 registered voters in the Report of Registration of February 10, 2017, published by you, the California Secretary of State. I am the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the AIPCA. I am also a past party Chairman of the AIPCA (2008-2010).

California currently has approximately 40 million residents, and we have a State Senate formed of just 40 members and an Assembly of a mere 80 members—making vast districts for members of both houses of the State Legislature. The ratio of size of Federal to State districts started out with the Federal many times greater than the State, but now State districts are comparable in size to those of our national legislature’s most numerous branch.

I, and the registered members of my party, have a material interest in maintaining the value of our votes. The static level of representation and our growing population has diminished the value of our votes as citizens of the State. So not only is our vote worth very little, but it continues to decline in value as our population grows.

As a ballot-qualified political party since 1968, we have a collective interest in a fair chance at electing representatives of our party to the State Legislature. It is quite apparent that if the districts were smaller, members of my party could more competitively run for these seats. Even at the outset, with a very well-known national candidate for President and a well-funded and vigorous registration effort which qualified our party for ballot status in record time, and even at the pinnacle of public interest in our party, we failed to elect a single member to either state-wide office or to the State Legislature. This was due to two factors: 1. Even then the size of districts made it a formidable and expensive task to acquaint registered voters in these districts with the virtues of our candidates. 2. The “lesser of two evils” argument was very persuasive and logical against the election of any minor party candidates, ours included.

Two factors offer our party a substantial chance to elect some of our number to the State Legislature, if district size were to be reduced to a size fitted to adequate representation of their inhabitants: 1. The increasing disaffection with the state of representation and governance in the population of the State, as evinced by the choice of No Party Preference or American Independent Party, which together bulk larger in registration than the second largest party in the
State, the Republican Party. 2. The elimination of partisan primaries for virtually all elections in the State, save for the quadrennial Presidential Primaries.

Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution states: “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.”

The State of California has failed to provide an effective mechanism of self-government, which I believe is identical to a republican form of government. As is usual, the United States Constitution does not define its terms, however I do not believe it will be controversial to declare that the following elements are central to an effective “republican form of government” suitable for a free people’s self-governance, namely the following:

- The rule of law,
- The equal protection of the said laws for the inhabitants,
- The use of due processes for the application of said law.
- An effective representative mechanism for the origination of said laws.

But whose responsibility is this guarantee of a “republican form of government?” Section 4 says “The United States,” but this duty is not allocated to any branch, department or officer thereof! Whose then is this impressive and vital obligation? Fortunately the genius of the Framers of our Constitution has an answer to this question in Article I, Section 8, last clause in what I call the “git ‘er done” clause, commonly called the “necessary and proper” clause, an unfortunate denomination, for it shifts focus from the central purpose of this vital provision from its purpose of enabling Congress to make its own powers and those of any other part, or officer or the whole (United States in this case) effective by providing how they may be carried into execution.

Article I, Section 8 “The Congress shall have power … To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

This demand is going to the Secretary of State of California. However, where then does the Secretary of State of California or any other part of California’s government or the Court to whom a pleading is made to make this demand effective come in? I do not pretend to understand how the Secretary of State or the State Legislature can or will heed the plaintive cries of the People of the State or its organized political parties, since they are manifestly deaf to our concerns, interests & opinions, since we have as People so long lacked effective representation. Will the Congress heed these pleas? How will it even hear them? The answer to that last question finally actually does lie within the power of the Court to whom we address our plea.

If the Court makes a finding that the People of California are denied a fundamental perquisite of effective representation, a sufficiently small district size, and hence certainly denied thereby a “republican form of government,” it may order a change in district size, directed to the State as a whole, even as the United States as a whole has a duty to guarantee such a form of
government to the State, leaving to the State’s own Constitutional processes the effectuation of a provision of a reasonable district size for its legislature.

If the State continues to fail in its duty to its People to provide what the United States is obliged to guarantee, I expect that the Congress may rouse itself from its long somnolence to either legislate a remedy or propose an Amendment to the States with the same end.

I am hereby demanding that the State of California, with your able assistance, to remedy this matter by increasing the number of representatives in the California Legislature to a reasonable level. How it does so, I leave to the State of California and to a Court (should it concur in our pleadings). I will not attempt to reproduce here all the arguments for the determination of the size of these districts, but I think that the size of 50,000 per district as in the proposed first article in the original 12 Articles proposed to the States, 10 of which were immediately recognized as ratified to become our famous “Bill of Rights,” would be a reasonable choice given the advance of communication technology. If adopted at the State level this would entail about 800 Assembly Districts, and 400 State Senate Districts, which would, in my opinion, be manageable.

Respectfully Submitted,

Markham G. Robinson
Chairman, American Independent Party of these United States

Date: May 6, 2017
DECLARATION
TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE
SUPPORTING THE WITHDRAWAL OF SISKIYOU COUNTY
FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, there are times in our history when it is apparent that the political separation of one people from another becomes necessary, both for the survival of the one, as well as the continued well being of the other; and

WHEREAS, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors recognizes the lack of representation for rural and frontier counties in the California Legislature and the Board is aware of an increasing tendency by the State of California to exercise legislative and fiscal malfeasance in the form of an illegal fire tax, property rights violations, and assaults upon Second Amendment rights, as well as disregard for other unalienable rights of the Citizens of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS, agencies of the Executive Branch of the State of California are engaged in an attempt to remove four, fully-functional, well-maintained hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River over the objections of the Board of Supervisors and those of a vast majority of the Citizens of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies through aggressive regulation and reinterpretation of long-established laws have denied the County of Siskiyou, its businesses, and its citizens access to our most abundant natural resources, causing untold harm to our economy, as well as to our health and public safety; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies have, through a process commonly known as “sue and settle,” compromised longstanding principles and priorities of beneficial use and stewardship of our natural resources while sacrificing public processes and open government; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Siskiyou has come to the realization that the State of California is ungovernable in its present form and the People of Siskiyou County have asked the board to support this resolution for the Health, Welfare, and Public Safety of the people; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that soon after statehood, credible efforts were made to split the state, with 45 proposals by 1998, including the strong Jefferson State movement of 1941 and the election results of June 2, 1992, when the citizens of 27 counties by county advisory votes voted in favor of splitting the State of California.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DECLARED that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors desires, with the involvement of our citizens and, hopefully, with
the involvement of other Counties within rural California, to withdraw Siskiyou County from the State of California and start over by helping to form a new state which represents the needs, provides opportunity, and protects the rights, liberties, public health, and safety of the people of a new State of Jefferson; and

BE IT FURTHER DECLARED that, pursuant to the requirements of Section 3 of Article IV of the United States Constitution, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors requests that the California Legislature approve the withdrawal from the State of California of the lands described below, to be incorporated in a new state along with the lands of other Counties, within or without the current boundaries of the State of California, which Counties declare similar intentions:

Commencing on the northern line of the State of California at the northeast corner of Del Norte, being on the summit of a spur of the Siskiyou Range of mountains; thence southerly along the eastern line of Del Norte to the northern line of Humboldt; thence easterly and southerly along the northern and eastern line of Humboldt to the northwest corner of Trinity; thence along the northern boundary of Trinity to the northwest corner of Shasta at Castle Rock; thence due east to the range line between R. 4 and 5 E., M. D. B. & M.; thence north along said range line to the northern boundary of the State of California; thence due west along said state boundary line to the place of beginning.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors at a regular meeting of said Board held on the 3rd day of September, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Kobseff, Armstrong, Criss and Pennett
NOES: Supervisor Valenzuela
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

[Signature]
Michael N. Kobseff, Vice-Chairman
Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
COLLEEN SETZER,
COUNTY CLERK

[Signature]
Deputy
Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Secretary of State Padilla,

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000. It appears that California’s Assembly Districts are so large that they are three times larger than the next worst represented states! How can one person represent a million or half a million people? Representation should increase with the population, it should be organic and the common citizen should have access to them.

New Hampshire and Vermont have the best representation at about 3,000 and 4,000 representatives when compared to ours. Even when we consider the States with the next worse representation after our own, which includes Texas and Florida with representation in their lower chamber at about 160,000 we are three times worse! That is absolutely unacceptable.

So, as the population of California has grown, the legislative districts have grown and in this process my vote has been devalued. This should not be allowed and I believe diluting my vote is unconstitutional. Further, as the district gets larger, donations become more important than my vote does. Another effect of this current system is that I am not able to effectively meet with or petition my representative and the trend of creating more and more assistant instead of adding more representatives is simply improper.

I hereby demand you rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists.

Respectfully Submitted,  

[Signature]  
Date 8/30/16
Steven L. Baird  
21890 One Fine Place  
Colfax, CA 95713.

Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Secretary of State Padilla,

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000, far too large to be considered democratic.

I was a recent republican primary candidate for the State Senate District 1. The district is simply immense, comprised of about 1 million people and spread across 11 Counties. As a candidate, I had the option to pay a fee in each county to be listed in their voting guide; a price easily borne by the incumbent, a tremendous burden to me. As the district gets larger, donations will become more and more important.

The district is so large I could not physically meet with enough people to get elected. 1 million people is simply out of bounds and not justifiable. The current senate districts are arbitrary and make no sense, simply being twice the size of the Assembly districts when they should be based on the size of the counties. The districts size of 40 was established at Colton Hall in 1849 when California’s Population was 92,000 people. This is absurd that we are using 17th century representation in the 21st century. Those in power who can more easily amend the Constitution to expand representation will not do so because it protects their incumbency.

Another adverse effect of the current system is to force each county to hire lobbyists if they want to advance their interests in the State legislature. The counties have no choice, since they don’t have their own representatives and instead have to share them with several other counties. After Reynolds v. Sims, California simply divided the population by senate districts; a better remedy would have been to increase the number of Senators by 18 so that every County had a Senator. The largest counties should probably be divided.

I hereby demand you rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signature:  
Date 9/1/2016
DECLARATION

TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

SUPPORTING THE WITHDRAWAL OF MODOC COUNTY

FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, there are times in our history when it is apparent that the political separation of one people from another becomes necessary, both for the survival of the one, as well as, the continued well being of the other; and

WHEREAS, the Modoc County Board of Supervisors recognizes the lack of representation for rural and frontier counties in the California Legislature and the Board is aware of an increasing tendency by the State of California to exercise legislative and fiscal malfeasance in the form of an illegal fire tax, property rights violations, and assaults upon Second Amendment rights, as well as, disregard for other inalienable rights of the Citizens of Modoc County; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies have, through aggressive regulation and reinterpretation of long-established laws have denied the County of Modoc, its businesses, and its citizens access to our most abundant natural resources, causing untold harm to our economy, as well as to our health and public safety; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies have, through a process commonly known as "sue and settle", compromised longstanding principles and priorities of beneficial use and stewardship of our natural resources while sacrificing public processes and open government; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Modoc, has come to the realization that the State of California is ungovernable in its present form and the People of Modoc have asked the Board to support this resolution for the Health, Welfare, and Public Safety of the people; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that soon after statehood, credible efforts were made to split the state, with 45 proposals by 1998, including the strong Jefferson State movement of 1941 and the election results of June 2, 1992, when citizens of 27 counties by county advisory votes, voted in favor of splitting the State of California.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DECLARED that the Modoc County Board of Supervisors desires, with the involvement of our citizens, and hopefully with the involvement of other California Counties within rural California, to withdraw Modoc County from the State of California and start over by helping to form a new state which represents the needs, provides opportunity, and protects the rights, liberties, public health, and safety of the people of a new State of Jefferson; and
BE IT FURTHER DECLARED that, pursuant to the requirements of Section 3 of Article IV of the United States Constitution, the Modoc County Board of Supervisors requests that the California Legislature approve the withdrawal from the State of California of the lands described below, to be incorporated in a new state along with the lands of other Counties, within or without the current boundaries of the State of California, which Counties declare similar intentions:

The boundaries of Modoc County are as follows:

Commencing at the northeast corner of the State of California; thence west, along the northern boundary line of said State, to the range line between R. 4 and S. E., M.D.B & M.; hence due south, on said range line, to the southern boundary line of Siskiyou; thence east along an extension of said southern boundary line; to the state line; and thence north to the place the beginning.

(Added by Stats. 1947, Ch.424.)

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Modoc County Board of Supervisors at a regular meeting of said Board held on the 24th day of September 2013, by the following vote.

AYES: Supervisors Allan, Pedersen, Alves, & Byrne.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: Supervisor Wills.

ABSENT: None.

Geri Byrne, Chairman
Modoc County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Stephanie Wellemeyer
Modoc County Clerk of the Board
David Garcia  
7611 Kirby Street  
Valley Springs, CA 95252

Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Secretary of State Padilla,

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000. It appears that California’s Assembly Districts are so large that they are three times larger than the next worst represented states! How can one person represent a million or half a million people? Representation should increase with the population, it should be organic and the common citizen should have access to them.

New Hampshire and Vermont have the best representation at about 3,000 and 4,000 respectively and it is breathtaking to consider the access that those citizens have to their representatives when compared to ours. Even when we consider the States with the next worse representation after our own, which includes Texas and Florida with representation in their lower chamber at about 160,000 we are three times worse!

So, as the population of California has grown, the legislative districts have grown and in this process my vote has been devalued. This should not be allowed and I believe diluting my vote is unconstitutional. Further, as the district gets larger, donations become more important than my vote does. Another effect of this current system is that I am not able to effectively meet with or petition my representative and the trend of creating more and more assistants instead of adding more representatives is simply improper.

I believe that the current level of representation harms all minorities and in particular, the individual who doesn’t have the money to contribute to an official to have access. A person should be able to stand on his own vote and that should be enough to grant access.

I hereby demand you rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signature  
Date 9-6-16
Howard Thomas  
1065 Sierra Plum Circle  
Portola, CA 96122  

Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Secretary of State Padilla,

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000. It appears that California’s Assembly Districts are so large that they are three times larger than the next worst represented states! How can one person represent a million or half a million people? Representation should increase with the population, it should be organic and the common citizen should have access to them.

New Hampshire and Vermont have the best representation at about 3,000 and 4,000 respectively and it is breathtaking to consider the access that those citizens have to their representatives when compared to ours. Even when we consider the States with the next worse representation after our own, which includes Texas and Florida with representation in their lower chamber at about 160,000 we are three times worse! That is absolutely unacceptable.

So, as the population of California has grown, the legislative districts have grown and in this process my vote has been devalued. This should not be allowed and I believe diluting my vote is unconstitutional. Further, as the district gets larger, donations become more important than my vote does. Another effect of this current system is that I am not able to effectively meet with or petition my representative and the trend of creating more and more assistants instead of adding more representatives is simply improper.

I hereby demand you rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signature  
Howard Thomas  
Date 10/30/16
Michael Thomas  
2171 Holland Drive  
Placerville, CA 95667  

Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814  

Secretary of State Padilla,  

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000. It appears that California’s Assembly Districts are so large that they are three times larger than the next worst represented states! How can one person represent a million or half a million people? Representation should increase with the population, it should be organic and the common citizen should have access to them.  

New Hampshire and Vermont have the best representation at about 3,000 and 4,000 respectively and it is breathtaking to consider the access that those citizens have to their representatives when compared to ours. Even when we consider the States with the next worse representation after our own, which includes Texas and Florida with representation in their lower chamber at about 160,000 we are three times worse! That is absolutely unacceptable.  

So, as the population of California has grown, the legislative districts have grown and in this process my vote has been devalued. This should not be allowed and I believe diluting my vote is unconstitutional. Further, as the district gets larger, donations become more important than my vote does. Another effect of this current system is that I am not able to effectively meet with or petition my representative and the trend of creating more and more assistants instead of adding more representatives is simply improper.  

I hereby demand you rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists.  

Respectfully Submitted,  

Signature Michael Thomas  
Date 10-30-16
Mark Baird  
P.O. Box 842  
Fort Jones, Ca 96032  

Hon. Alex Padilla  
California Secretary of State  
1500 11th Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Secretary of State Padilla,

It has come to my attention that California has close to (or perhaps more than) 40 million people and at the same time we have a mere 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent us. This means that each Senator has approximately 1 million constituents and every Assembly member has 500,000. It appears that California’s Assembly Districts are so large that they are four hundred percent larger than the next worst represented states! How can one person represent a million or half a million people? Representation should increase with the population, it should be organic and the common citizen should have access to them. Article Eleven, Section One, of the California Constitution should be your guide. My county is taxed as a legal subdivision of the state, and yet we do not have a State Senator nor do we have an assembly member. We share what little representation we do have with ten other counties who do not share our concerns or interests. Often time counties have competing interests. Our Assemblyman and Senator must fail to represent us in order to represent another county. This is not a representative form of government. We need a Senator for each county and we demand assembly representation for each county in order to have influence over how our tax monies are spent.

New Hampshire and Vermont have the best representation at about 3,000 and 4,000 respectively and it is breathtaking to consider the access that those citizens have to their representatives when compared to ours. Even when we consider the States with the next worse representation after our own, which includes Texas and Florida with representation in their lower chamber at about 160,000 we are almost four times worse! That is absolutely unacceptable.

The framers of the California Constitution set assembly Districts at one representative for each 2500 citizens. As Population increased so did representation. At some point in the 19th century, the Government arbitrarily capped representation at 80 Assemblymen and 40 Senators As the population of California has grown, the legislative districts have grown and in this process my vote has been devalued. This should not be allowed and I believe diluting my vote is unconstitutional. Further, as the district gets larger, campaign donations have become more important to our representatives than my vote. Another effect of this current system is that I am not able to effectively meet with or petition my representative and the trend of creating more and more assistants instead of adding more representatives is simply improper.
The California government passes laws from the Urban Senators and Assemblymen which detrimentally impact my family, my business and my community. The State of California has violated the Constitution by making compacts with Oregon to remove dams in my community which would allow unchecked flooding. This was done in spite of the fact that 79.9 percent of the people in Siskiyou County voted to stop dam removal. The United States Constitution bars States from making agreements with one another unless Congress passes legislation. Los Angeles State Senators and their Union contributors have more of the majority than all of the Northern California Representatives combined. The State attacks Second Amendment rights although my community does not have full time law enforcement. Law makers from the city pass regulations which negatively impact my community and yet will not answer an email from those they subjugate. The government sends swarms of appointed officials to harass farmers and ranchers. They hold meeting regarding environmental actions and either hold the meetings far from our homes in order to prevent our attendance or in some cases have held public meetings in secret. These actions among many others are intolerable to me and I demand they be investigated and rectified.

I hereby demand that the California Legislature hold hearings into the injustice of lack of representation and immediately rectify this problem by increasing the number of representatives in the legislature so that we can all have access, not just the lobbyists. I demand that each County have equal representation in the California Senate, and population ratios in the assembly should be reduced until there is one Assembly member for each 2500 citizens so that each and every county has at least one assembly member.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signature Mark A Baird Date 2/15/2017

Mark A Baird
P.O. Box 842
Fort Jones, CA 96032
WHEREAS, there are times in our history when it is apparent that the political separation of one people from another has become necessary, both for the survival of the one, as well as the continued wellbeing of the other; and

WHEREAS, the Glenn County Board of Supervisors recognizes the lack of representation for rural and frontier counties in the California Legislature, and the Board recognizes an increasing tendency by the State of California to exercise legislative and fiscal malfeasance in the form of an illegal fire tax, the State of California’s disregard of payment in lieu of taxes owed to many rural counties, in the excesses of the California EPA with CARB regulations more suited for Urban standards, in property rights violations, and in assaults upon Second Amendment rights, as well as disregard for other inalienable rights of the Citizens of Glenn; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies, through aggressive regulation and by reinterpretation of long-established laws, have denied the County of Glenn, its businesses, and its citizens, access to our most abundant natural resources, and fishing grounds, causing untold harm to our economy, as well as to our health and public safety; and

WHEREAS, State and Federal Agencies have, through a process commonly known as “sue and settle”, compromised longstanding principles and priorities of beneficial use and stewardship of our natural resources while sacrificing public processes and open government; and

WHEREAS, Counties played an integral part of California history as we note that each original county had a representative in the original Constitutional Convention in 1849; that each county had a representative in 1878/1879 Convention; that each County originally had a representative in both Chambers of the legislature; and that Property Taxes for State Bonds as well as other taxes are assessed in each County; and

WHEREAS, this current State Legislature's system of leaving the number of representatives in both chambers static at 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members and most rural counties without representation, is arbitrary, and has the undesirable result that, as the population grows, it dilutes the share of each County in its governing role, whereby forcing Counties to share its Senators and Assembly members with more Counties as the decades go by, diluting and abridging the votes of the citizens and of the Counties themselves in this process; and
WHEREAS, dilution of the individual voter’s representation in California, to a ratio of almost 450,000 citizens to one representative in the Assembly and almost 950,000 to one in the Senate, has denied voters of Glenn County adequate representation; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Glenn has come to the realization that the State of California is ungovernable in its present form, and the People of Glenn have asked the Board to support this resolution for the Health, Welfare, and Public Safety of the people; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that soon after California statehood, credible efforts were made to split the state, with 45 proposals by 1998, including the strong Jefferson State movement of 1941 and the election results of June 2, 1992, when citizens of 27 Counties by county advisory votes, voted in favor of splitting the State of California.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DECLARED that the Glenn County Board of Supervisors desire, with the involvement of our citizens, and hopefully with the involvement of other California Counties within rural California, to withdraw Glenn County from the State of California and start over by forming a new state which represents the needs, provides opportunity, and protects the rights, liberties, public health, and safety of the people of a new State of Jefferson; and

BE IT FURTHER DECLARED that, pursuant to the requirements of Section 3 of Article IV of the United States Constitution, the Glenn County Board of Supervisors requests that the California Legislature redress the above grievances and or approve the withdrawal from the State of California of the lands described below, to be incorporated in a new state along with the lands of other Counties, within or without the current boundaries of the State of California, which Counties declare similar intentions:

The boundaries of Glenn County are as follows:
Beginning at a point on the eastern boundary line of Lake, at the northwest corner of the SW. 1/4 of Sec. 26, T. 18 N., R. 8 W., M. D. B. & M.; running thence east along the half section line, and one and one-half miles north of the line dividing T. 17 and 18 N., M. D. B. & M., to the range line separating T. 18 N., R. 2 W., from T. 18 N., R. 3 W.; thence running north two miles to the northeast corner of the SE. 1/4 of Sec. 13, T. 18 N., R. 3 W.; running thence east along the half section line to the center of the Sacramento River; thence down the center of the said Sacramento River, in a southeasterly course, to the point of intersection with the half section line, one and one-half miles north of the line dividing T. 17 and 18 N., M. D. B. & M.; thence east on said half section line to its
intersection with Butte Creek, said point of intersection lying on the western boundary of Butte and being the southeastern corner of Glenn and the northeastern corner of Colusa; thence northerly along the middle of the channel of said Butte Creek to the point of intersection with the line between Secs. 3 and 4 of the Aguas Frias Rancho as surveyed by La Croze; thence north along the said line between the said Secs. 3 and 4 to its point of intersection with the line between T. 19 N., R. 1 E., and T. 20 N., R. 1 E.; thence west along said line to its intersection with the southern boundary of the Llano Seco grant, on the north line of Sec. 2 in T. 19 N., R. 1 W.; thence southwest along said grant line to the southwest corner of said grant in the center of the Sacramento River; thence northerly, and following the meanderings thereof, along the center of said Sacramento River, to a point where the north line of T. 22 intersects the center of the Sacramento River, being the initial point of Tehama; thence west along the north line of T. 22 N., to the southwest corner of Tehama; thence southerly on the established line between Mendocino and Lake to the place of beginning. (Added by Stats. 1947, Ch. 424.)

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Glenn County Board of Supervisors at a regular meeting of said Board held on the 21st day of January, 2014, by the following vote.

AYES: Supervisors Foltz, McDaniel, Soeth, Viegas and Murray (Chairman)

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

MIKE MURRAY, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
Glenn County, California

ATTEST:

Jamie Cannon, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Glenn County, California

Approved as to form:

Huson T. Carlyle, County Counsel
Glenn County, California