

JUNE 7, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, notetaker: K.Kubas

Short hand for speakers -

GM: Commissioner Galambos Malloy

FW: Commissioner Filkins Webber

A: Ana Henderson – Q2

AW: Alex Woods – Q2

N: Nicole Boyle – Q2

J: Jaime Clark – Q2

K: Karin Mac Donald – Q2

T: Tamina Alon (via phone) – Q2

W: Commissioner Ward (though often referred to by his whole name)

| IDENTIFIER | DESCRIPTION | NOTES/QUESTIONS | ACCEPTED? | FINAL DIRECTIONS |
|---|--|---|-----------|--|
| | <u>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</u> | | | |
| public name: REG IV assembly, interaction one : Antelope Victor Valleys / Assembly LA county | 0 – deviation , 0 % - deviation, 30% - latino CVAP, black - 14%, API - 4% previously: city of Casic was split but now we have put it in Santa Clarita, and we extended this district to the east. Hesperia is split. Non-populated part (non contiguous area) got cut out. | | yes | |
| Santa Clarita / Asembly | Is extended further north. Casic is wholly within the disctrict now. | <i>Barabba</i> - Does this cut across neighborhoods? N – It is possible, I did not see that layer and would like to normalize the boundaries. <i>GM</i> - Thinking about different COI, I hope we are looking at COI and how they are represented across Senate, Assembly and Congressional maps. For instance, if there was a COI that was preserved across all three at the expense of another COI, we should spread that so that at least the second COI gets something too. <i>Barabba</i> – We should wait until maps come out. <i>Dai</i> – There are certain communities we seem to protect at all costs so I would like to flag COI that were split multiple times. <i>DiGulio</i> - If you see a trend that one area is being kept whole and the other is being split we need to draw attention to that. | yes | Flag COI that are split multiple times and COI split at the expense of other COI |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| San Gabriel Mountain Foothills / Assembly | Rearranged district. Removed extension to Sherman Oaks, added Pasadena back in, fixed splits , only Azuza is split and mayflower is split with 43% in district and rancho cucomonga is split with 18% in district. | <i>Diguilio</i> – I see integrity of those in mountain region. How do we do NW city hopping? I see that is based on COI but are we hopping over cities. <i>Raya</i> – this is an improvement! By reducing the splits. <i>Yao</i> – it looks like we fixed a lot of splits. Did we split Rcucamunga E/W or N/S? A- in current plan it is split 3 ways. We will talk about it in the next district. <i>Yao</i> – North of Foothill Blvd. Included, it is okay if we are dividing it. | | <i>Yao</i> - North of Foothill Blvd. as divide, cut off whatever population reach your criteria if it doesn't go all the way to I-15. |
| San Fernanado Valley East. (EastSFV) / Assembly | Stayed the same as Thursday. | <i>FW</i> – We are looking at the assembly so I don't know if it is that important, but I though the testimony said they wanted the mountain area connected with their district. Area above San Fernando I thought the district would encompass those foothills. I also understand that there is a national forest, but could we split area where there isn't population? <i>Raya</i> – Also thought about foothill concept. We really got this idea of the foothill COI and in the process I think we have split cities that we are going to have to take another look at. <i>Barabba</i> – we didn't get much testimony from San Fernando. Just from Eastern part. A- this could be potential Section 2 district. <i>Kolkey</i> – iInfo we got from you is that in creating this district visual, you split a number of neighborhoods on the West side of the district and in some cases used as neighborhoods city council districts. Have you minimized city splits and neighborhood splits as opposed to just city council lines? <i>N</i> – I would like to get my hands on the VICA layer to use. A- Only city split here is LA, San Fernando is in tact. Also a lot of this is based on COI testimony about E vs. W SFValley, we were told it was okay to split Granada Hills. Can we get specific instruction as to what to use as a layer for neighborhoods? <i>Dai</i> – Community orgs and city might have different ideas about what neighborhoods are. We got a positive response about using city council boundaries before. <i>Yao</i> – we should defer this map at this time to wait for later adjustment. We should accept input and deal with it at appropriate time. <i>Ancheta</i> – Which official neighborhoods were divided in this district? A – Granada Hills (according to neighborhood | Yes for now as first draft | Taken under advisory, reconcile neighborhood/city council layers |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-----|--|
| | | council boundary) we will get back to you with a whole list. <i>Diguilio</i> – Is this acceptable for a first draft map? <i>Kolkey</i> – I just want to make sure boundaries that are followed are city council boundaries. A- These are not city council boundaries, these are NEIGHBORHOOD council boundaries. <i>Kolkey</i> – Oh, I am much more comfortable with that. <i>Ontai</i> – Are we talking about neighborhood boundaries or city council ? <i>Barabba</i> – We need to reconcile the two. <i>Ontai</i> – is this map ad hoc? <i>Dai</i> – If Ms. Boyle can point out where there are discrepancies are between these. We should go with what we have and see what the public thinks. <i>Ontai</i> - Agreed | | |
| West SFV / Assembly | North Hills, Van Nuyes, Valley Glen, Juaneca (sp?) | | yes | |
| Burbank – Glendale / Assembly | South part of Pasadena, part of North Hollywood (south protion) | <i>FW</i> : Thumbs up | yes | |
| West San Gabriel Valley / Assembly | Cleaned up fingers. Additional population was added to bottom right area. | <i>Dai</i> – what is the API CVAP? A – 50 even. <i>Kolkey</i> – Potential section 2. We need the racially polarized voting analysis if it is section 2. That can be avoided if district was made using not racially based criteria (neutral). We have to see how cities were split. <i>Dai</i> – Did you get the racially polarized voting info? <i>Kolkey</i> – No. <i>Acheta</i> – I reviewed it and it looks like sufficient evidence of polarized voting. Within proposed district. <i>Ontai</i> – This district is flagged but who is monitoring it? Who is doing that? <i>FW</i> – Ancheta and I have been doing it since Northridge. <i>Yao</i> – I know we split El Monte, what else did we split? A - Arcadia, E Pasadena, Mayflower Village, South El Monte, South Pasadena, etc. Also A CVAP is 49.95. | yes | |
| East SGV, Covina / Assembly | Splits arcadia splits Azusa. El Monte 46 % is in district (also a split) but 90+ % of Industry, West Covina is also split. 942 ppl under for pop. -.2% deviation. Latino 57%, 2000 ppl from Avocado Hieghts. | <i>Forbes</i> - The boxes above Vincent? To add them to Covina to get it cleaner and deal with the 900 population short <i>N</i> - the boxes have to do with Citrus. We could put them all in Azusa. A- it will increase the split on Azusa. <i>Kolkey</i> – If Arcadia is only split by 16. <i>Diguilio</i> – Do we keep the tail or take it out? I think to avoid city split we should include those 16 ppl. <i>FW</i> – We should respect the city lines. <i>Forbes</i> – Tail in Pasadena is a city boundary. <i>Barabba</i> – Are we | | Keep Arcadia whole. Don't keep Azusa's tails. Split Azusa don't split Arcadia. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-----|--|
| | | bieng consistent? <i>Forbes</i> – I think for 16 ppl they can be kept together more tolerantly. The other split is so large , like 9000. <i>Ward</i> – We can’t just point it out because it looks bad. <i>Dai</i> – We will get COI testimony to figure this out in order to get the population for congressionals. | | |
| Whittier – Norwalk / Assembly | Picked up S. El Monte and got rid of Cerritos and Artesia. Splits Avocado Heights, it has 87% of Avocado Heights 20% of Pico Rivera, 73% of South El Monte. | <i>Yao</i> – What area of Industry do you have? <i>FW</i> – I have talked with Alex. We have not received any COI testimony about pulling buena park into LA county. Cerritos and Artesia there was a lot of COI testimony about keeping that area together. Was it necessary for them to be pulled into Orange County? Maybe we can maintain them in the LA county district so that we don’t pull Buena Park into LA county. Keep Buena Park in Orange County and put Artesia and Cerritos in LA. <i>AW</i> – Nicole and I are working it out, but we are going to look at it when we get to Orange County. <i>A</i> – There has been conflicting directions about if we could split Buena Park, we will get to it during <i>AW</i> presentation. | | Respect Cerritos and Artesia in LA and keep Buena Park in with Orange County. (will be addressed in <i>AW</i> ’s presentation) |
| South Gate – Lakewood / Assembly | Splits Downy, splits part of Long Beach. Got rid of Lynwood. | <i>Kolkey</i> – Has district been reformed on neutral criteria, population? <i>Dai</i> – Why Lbeach is split now? It was whole before? <i>N</i> – Lbeach is too big for one district. <i>Yao</i> – We took Cerritos and Artesia out of here and it was a good tradeoff. | Yes | |
| Compton – Carson / Assembly | Lynwood is back in, portions of West Carson and LA are out. Also removed portions of Harbor City. | <i>FW</i> – Were we trying to keep the LA port? Why did it change? <i>N</i> – Changed for population reasons, added Inglewood and Westmont so to balance I had to add Wilmington area. I felt this was consistent with reports of traffic mentioned from community. <i>Kolkey</i> – Were neutral criteria used to form the district? <i>A</i> – This is based on neutral criteria, COI testimony during wrap up and hearings. <i>Yao</i> – Aan you comment on city splits? <i>A</i> - Only splits city of LA | Yes | |
| Inglewood – Harbor City / Assembly | Add Inglewood. End the bottom of district at Harbor City. | <i>Kolkey</i> – If there is no racially polarized voting than it is not section 2. Then we mantain COI and cities and forming the district with neutral criteria. Avoid splits of COI. <i>Ancheta</i> – Should we conduct analysis here to cover ourselves for section 2 liability? <i>Kolkey</i> – Yes it would be ideal. George | yes | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|--|
| | | found it significant that the African American presentation acknowledged lack of racial polarized voting. ****break** | | |
| Palos Verdes E – Beach Cities / Assembly | | <i>N</i> - there is 0 population in split part of Lomita that is in Inglewood city. <i>Barabba</i> – Where is San Pedro? <i>N</i> – It is split but port on one side, population on other. | Yes | |
| Culver City – Crenshaw/ Assembly | Removed Inglewood, extended it NW and to avoid downtown area that we got a lot of testimony about keeping in tact. Goes up to UCLA | <i>FW</i> – I am concerned of inconsistency with COI. <i>A</i> – that is Beverly Hills boundary. <i>FW</i> – So it is all of Miracle Mile? <i>Yao</i> – Is Westwood split? <i>A</i> – No. <i>DiGuilio</i> – We have to take population into consideration. <i>A</i> – Then we need to extend district somewhere else. Where should it be extended? <i>FW</i> - West LA area, not Playa del Rey nor any further north than Westwood. | | <i>FW</i> - Pulling down West side Santa Monica district to include Miracle Mile. Miracle Mile runs south. <i>Yao</i> –you can include as much of the student housing area as possible if you need to add population. <i>FW</i> – district can be extended to West LA area if you need to (population), NOT Playa del Rey or any further north than Westwood |
| West Side – Santa Monica / Assembly | Included Hollywood Hills and West Hollywood, removed Westwood. | | yes | |
| Thousand Oaks – Santa Monica Mtn / Assembly | In order to get Pasadena into Burbank I pushed Sherman Oaks into ... | <i>DiGuilio</i> - How much of Thousand Oaks is in this district? <i>A</i> - 56 percent. <i>Aguirre</i> - What was the split, a road or something? <i>A</i> - Using Census tracts. <i>Dia</i> – Something to look at is that Thousands Oaks and Simi Valley have been split badly on every district so we should consider the “sharing the pain” idea in the future. <i>DiGuilio</i> – I agree. We should flag this area. There are east county splits, west county splits. | yes | Area should be flagged as an area where Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks get split too much across all districts |
| East LA / Assembly | | <i>FW</i> – We went over this quickly but we might have to flag | yes | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----|---|
| | | this because there isn't much COI testimony to support its current interation | | |
| Downtown / Assembly | Removed a few areas based on testimony received to keep this area in tact as much as possible | <i>Forbes</i> – Pico Rivera has a 79 LCVAT. <i>Kolkey</i> – If 79 CVAT could be reduced it would be better and reduce risk of a claim. <i>Forbes</i> – Only district next to 79 that has capacity available. <i>Yao</i> – This is most compact in highest density district. <i>N</i> – Yes it is. Similar to West San Fernando Valley district. <i>Yao</i> – Is Chinatown in tact? <i>A</i> - <i>Yes</i> | yes | |
| Pico Rivera – S.E. LA / Assembly | | <i>GM</i> – Can you clarify Boyle Heights and East LA boundary? <i>N</i> – It is the boundary of East LA. <i>Kolkey</i> – What are splits if any of neighborhoods or COI? <i>A</i> – Artists district, Boyle Heights, Vermont Central might be split. Census area of Vernon, Bell Gardens, Downey is split (2.3% of city is here). Montevideo is split. 80% of Pico Rivera is in this district. | yes | Look into breaking up the 79 % latino CVAT if possible. Downtown district might be able to absorb some? |
| Vermont Sq – Florence Firestone / Assembly | Neighborhoods south of downtown including West Vernon, VT Nolls, Grammercy Place, Florence Graham, etc. | | yes | |
| Monosbkn / Assembly | Additional portion of Hesperia | <i>FW</i> - looking at portion of Kern county. Is that Edwards? <i>A</i> – Yes, Ridgecrest is to the north. <i>FW</i> – Why did Edwards get included? <i>DiGuilio</i> – Edwards could be included to the South with LA county, we heard testimony. | yes | <i>FW</i> – this should be flagged to see if are the communities more included with Lancaster than Kern? |
| Region 2 assembly san bernadino riverside border | | | | |
| SBCUCA | Crestline small split, Highland, Loma Linda, part of Rancho Cucamonga, part of San Burnaduno, Redlands | <i>A</i> – LCVAP would be increased over 50 percent if Rancho Cucamonga is split only once. <i>Kolkey</i> – How did you determine boundaries? <i>A</i> – City of Fontana boundaries. <i>Kolkey</i> – If it reduces a split it conforms to constitution criteria. <i>Kolkey</i> – To reduce split of Rcuca is a higher ranked priority under constitution than compactness. This does not bypass a nearby area for a more distant area. This seems to comply with criteria | | <i>Dai</i> – add unincorporated area of Fontanta out of Pomona valley into SBCUCA so that Rcuca is not split as much. <i>FW</i> – Geographically there are issues between Rcuca and |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----|--|
| | | | | Redlands. We have not heard COI testimony but would like to <i>Yao</i> – Try to do to N. Foothill split or N/S split will have to work <i>DiGuilio</i> – Did we receive testimony about a large African American population there? We should look at that. <i>AW</i> – Inland empire African American group ... I will look at their documentation |
| RIVJUR | Corona, Norco, El Cerrito, split Riverside along river | <i>FW</i> – Splitting along river is good. | yes | |
| METROMV | | | yes | |
| MURTEM | Canyon Lake, El Sobrante, Temecult, Murrieta, WoodCrest, 98% of Temescal Valley (split), Freemakers, Winchester. Ends at county boarder with San Diego | | yes | Take closer look to avoid split of Temescal Valley (it currently has 98% of TV) |
| MORONGOBAN / Assembly | Hemet, Valley Vista, Banning, etc. | | yes | Look into small split of 6 ppl |
| COACH / Assembly | Cochella valley, palo verde, west to idlenwild, etc. | | yes | |
| IMSAND / Assembly | Imperial, Potrero, etc. | <i>Forbes</i> – Can't that thing that sticks down be left out because it is national forest. <i>Dai</i> – we got COI testimony in that part of San Diego that they didn't want to be lumped in with Imperial Valley because of the Sunrise Power. | | Get rid of national forest finger in east. <i>Dai and Ontai</i> – flagged for second round because COI |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|-----|---|
| | | | | testimony mentioned at left |
| South San Diego / Assembly | South San Diego, south of Chula Vista, Paradise Hills, Shelltown, part of Logan Heights, Golden Hill, Mountainview, South Crest, etc. Splits Chula Vista and San Diego. | | yes | |
| LMSANT / Assembly | Encanto, Spring Valley, El Cerro, Oakpark, etc. Splits Chula Vista and San Diego | AW – Any cities that should be changed along the boundaries? | yes | Put neighborhood boundaries in color other than red/pink. |
| CRNOSAND / Assembly | Coronado, Downtown SD, Midway district, Mission Beach, Ocean Beach, Hillcrest, La Jolla, Del Mar, Torrey Pines, Rancho Santa Fe | | yes | |
| RANCHOBMM | Poway is outside. But included for a different district | | yes | |
| NESAND / Assembly | Poway, Ramona, Julian, Borego Springs, Escondido, Hidden Meadows, Rainbow, and up to along the San Diego/Riverside border. | | yes | |
| NCOASTSAND / Assembly | | | yes | |
| SOUTHOC / Assembly | Splits Dana Point | Ward – Thank you, a really nice improvement. DiGuilio – There was something about San Julian being cut off from other coastal communities? Raya – All the development there is East. FW – That is consistent with a woman who spoke in Santa Ana. GM – We had instructed to have coastal district. AW – Yes we have that for congressional. | yes | |
| TUST / Assembly | Villa Park, split Orange (includes 43% of Orange), etc. | | yes | |
| COASTALOC / Assembly | Norht to Laguna Beach, Newport Beach, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Rossmore, Seal Beach, the other part of Dana Point | | yes | |
| SANTAANA / Assembly | Part of Orange, most of Santa Ana, part of Garden Grove | AW- e were directed to look at the latino CVAP and the extended boundary of little Saigon. I kept it the same with the smaller borders of little Saigon | yes | |
| WEST / Assembly | Includes part of Garden Grove and Cerritos and Artesia | FW - Is there another interation to look at Buena Park? <u>2nd interation</u> : AW – Move Buena Park into a district with Fullerton and part of Anaheim, it would cause la Jabra and | | Likes second version |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|-------|--|
| | | la Jabra Heights to be moved. <i>Dai</i> – How do you feel about swapping la Jabra for Buena Park, Commissioner Ward? Ward - Cerritos and Artesia back to LA because there isn't significant testimony to add them to Orange County. <i>Yao</i> – Moving Cerritos Artesia and La Palma into Downey/Norwalk district. If we keep Artesia and Cerritos and add La Palma to it and swap it out with Baldwin Park then we will keep most of the places in LA and move Baldwin Park to OC. <i>FW</i> – Looking at population south of 95 and swapping it for La Jabra. <i>FW</i> likes 2nd interation . We are respecting many COIs here. Anaheim Hills move south into TUST. Irvine could go to COASTAL. | | |
| ***** | <i>SWITCH TO CONGRESSIONAL</i> ** | ***** | ***** | ***** |
| ** | | | | ***** |
| Antelope Valley – Santa Clarita | No change | | yes | |
| San Gabriel Mtn Foothill | Splits: .2% of Azusa, Duarte 35%, Glendora, Monrovia, San Dimas 7%, part of LA | | yes | |
| East SFV | No change | | yes | |
| West SFV – Eastern Ventura Co | Splits Thousand Oaks (70% in this district) and LA | <i>Dai</i> – Is there anyway to keep Thousand Oaks whole by taking out the split with LA. <i>N</i> – Yes, we could do that but I will have to discuss with Jaime as it affects her work higher up. | yes | Maybe try to keep Thousand Oaks whole if possible? |
| Santa Monica Mtn | Removed area toward Marina del Rey and added area toward Hollywood | | yes | |
| West LA | The district has moved NE. | | yes | |
| Florence Firestone | Inglewood, Huntington Park, South Park , Gremmercy Place, Westmont | <i>Kolkey</i> – Since there is 51.02 % LCVAP and a 43.79% Black CVAP, was this drawn neutrally? <i>A</i> – We drew this assuming there was no racially polarized voting, with COI testimony taken into account. <i>Blanco</i> – We made this more horizontal? <i>N</i> – Yes we made this district new. <i>Blanco</i> – I don't know if it was COI or commissioner feedback where we discussed Southgate, Downey, that whole area that is commercial and connected. I just wanted to point out that this was originally more vertical. <i>N</i> – I chose these cities so as to not have to split | yes | <i>Blanco</i> – I don't know if it was COI or commissioner feedback where we discussed Southgate, Downey, that whole area that is commercial and connected. I just wanted to point out |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------|---|
| | | them | | that this was originally more vertical. |
| Palos Verdes Est – Beach Cities | Removed West Carson, extended to Santa Monica city boundary | | yes | |
| Hawthorne – Compton | Removed Inglewood, Westmont, Added Bellaire, West Carson and parts of LA. Based on testimony of keeping these communities together | | yes | |
| Long Beach | Los Alamitos and part of Cyprus were incorporated here. Included Cerritos, excluded Bellflower. | <i>Yao</i> – That seperates Cerritos from Artesia. <i>N</i> – I may have to split Paramount to add Artesia | yes | <i>Yao</i> – that seperates Cerritos from Artesia |
| Whittier - Downey | Pico Rivera is split and added. Moved Lynwood out. Bellflower in, Cerritos out. | | yes | |
| Downtown | Excluded Pico Rivera | | yes | |
| San Gabriel Valley – Diamond Bar | Same as previous | <i>Kolkey</i> – What accounts for this unusual shape? <i>A</i> – COI testimony around San Gabriel and also around Diamond Bar both the areas being significant to Asian populations. It also is for population. Nearby East LA county might be Section 2. <i>FW</i> – I don’t know if San Gabriel tied itself to Diamond Bar, I thought it was Diamond Bar, Chino Hills + one other. <i>Raya</i> – If these are defined as 2 seperate COI but related, would that be sufficient explanation? <i>Kolkey</i> – That is correct. However this looks narrow and elongated. It is contiguous, but is it compact? I could see a compactness issue. You can justify a district like this if surrounding districts had specific reasons they had to be that way. But without justification, I raise that as a concern. <i>Ancheta</i> – the COI testimony should not just be ethnicity base. Look further into predicates. Most of the testimony was just about ethnicity. <i>DiGuilio</i> – What are our other options? <i>Ontai</i> – Let’s discuss it next round | Yes for now | |
| East LA County | Same as before | | yes | |
| Region 2 Congressional San Bernadino County | Unchanged, Monoinyo and San Bernadino county, Redlands is only split | | yes | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|-----|---|
| Region 2 San Bernadino/Ontario | Part of Fontana, Loma Linda, city of San Bernadino | AW – I could not add all of Fontana which was what the Commission had wanted previously because of population | yes | |
| ONT | unchanged | AW – Commission asked if I could put in Upland instead of split with Chino Hills. But it made it too much of a sliver and commission said the split of Chino Hills is okay. | yes | |
| RVMV | Same, Corona is city split | FW – Where is split in Corona and why there instead of Morino Valley? AW – I had it in my notes to look there. | yes | FW – We can move along but we might have some neighborhood issues around the Corona split |
| PRS | unchanged | AW – I know we received testimony about Temecula and Rainbow and that Temecula is split but it just isn't possible | yes | |
| COACH | unchanged | | yes | |
| IMSAND | Unchanged, includes SD south of Chula Vista, Imperial City | <i>Ontai</i> – What is that street at the top? AW – El Cajon. <i>Blanco</i> – I just wanted to see the Eastern part. OK. <i>Kolkey</i> – this district seem to bypass closer by areas to further away areas. Compliance with compactness criteria? Unless there is a contiguous group of COIs that would override that. <i>Dai</i> – we got a lot of testimony about a border district, and I think this addresses the COI better (not as far north). <i>Kolkey</i> – Criteria says go with compactness before seperate non contiguous COIs. <i>Forbes</i> – If we were to address this by making that Chula Vista area shorter, that would dilute the LCVAP, how would that play off? <i>Kolkey</i> – Since you don't have a single compact latino community, you don't have the obligation to form a section 2 district so compactness takes prority. <i>Blanco</i> – What if you cleaned it up? Those are mountains and I don't think there are a lot of people below Descanso. If you included Chula Vista, it might not mess with the LCVAP because that is a latino population. A – adding in Chula Vista decreases the LCVAP. <i>Dai</i> – Eastside community action group talked about la mesa, etc and didn't want to be with Imperial City. <i>Blanco</i> – What if we bring down the line so it is more like a border district. The population is small though, so it might not be enough for a | yes | <i>Blanco</i> – What if you cleaned it up? Those are mountains and I don't think there are a lot of people below Descanso. If you included Chula Vista, it might not mess with the LCVAP because that is a latino population. A – Adding in Chula Vista decreases the LCVAP. <i>Dai</i> – Eastside Community Action Group talked about La Mesa, etc and didn't want to be with Imperial City. <i>Blanco</i> – What if we bring down the line |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|-----|--|
| | | congressional district. | | so it is more like a border district. The population is small though, so it might not be enough for a congressional district. – LEAVE AS IS FOR FRIDAY AND LEAVE FOR ROUND TWO, A- We can still look taking out Eastern San Diego country and rounding things out before then though |
| CHNC | Comission had directed for Poway to be included with Rancho Bernardo. So now there is a split with El Cajon | <i>Dai</i> – If we make Chula Vista whole, this district will come down further south? <i>AW</i> – Since El Cajon is split already, we could make Chula Vista whole and then balance out around (this all depends on what happens with IMSAND) | Yes | |
| NMRB | Includes whole park, following I-5 | | yes | |
| NESAND | Poway was taken out and added to Rancho Bernardo district. Part of El Cajon was added. | | yes | |
| COASTALSAND | La Jolla, Torrey, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano. Laguna Miguel is split. | <i>DiGuilio</i> – Do we have to cross county line? <i>AW</i> – yes. <i>DiGuilio</i> – If we bump things further south by Imperial will that work. <i>AW</i> – no. | yes | Laguna Miguel for second round. |
| OCCOAST | Starts at Laguna Miguel split to LA county border. To reach population included Irvine. | <i>Blanco</i> – Santa Ana is very urban, not coastal. I read testimony where Santa Ana is best with Anaheim. <i>AW</i> – In this Santa Ana is with Garden Grove and Westminster. And Anaheim is split. <i>GM</i> – I wonder if Irvine would prefer to stay whole and then Orange County pulls further South. <i>A</i> – San Diego’s population is part of what’s driving it. Orange County by itself might work but there are these other things driving it. <i>AW</i> – When you add Imperial to San Diego, you just have to push that population somewhere. <i>A</i> – It’s the | yes | Fine for Friday, flagged for future |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|-------|--|
| | | hard line between Riverside and ? (<i>sorry I missed the note</i>). | | |
| SOUTHOC | | <i>FW</i> – In last iteration was Irvine whole? <i>A</i> –yes. | yes | |
| WEST GG | Commission asked to add Santa Ana and this resulted | | yes | |
| LHYL | Splits Anahiem | | yes | <i>Yao</i> – I want it to be flagged if a city has been split more than twice. |
| ***** | ***** | SWITCH TO SENATE ***** | ***** | ***** |
| ** | | | | ***** |
| Region 2 Senate MIKSBAV | | | Yes | |
| SBSJ | | <i>Blanco</i> – When we are nesting, does that pose concerns, like this one that swings around like horseshoe? <i>Kolkey</i> – I think the nesting compliance mitigates the shape. The area that you are bypassing is by Lake Arrowhead. <i>FW</i> – Those are mountains and the rest of that area is flat. | Yes | |
| POMVAL | Fontana, Rialto and part of San Bernadino, Rancho Cucamongo is split in 2 | | Yes | |
| RIVMV | Riverside and Merino Valley districts nested together | | Yes | |
| COACHTEM | Temescal valley is split but 98% whole | | Yes | Look into Temescal Valley split (it's 98%) |
| IMPSAND | | <i>GM</i> – We provided direction around the finger. | Yes | |
| SANDCNDO | Splits Chula Vista and SD | <i>Kolkey</i> – It has lobster claw at bottom. I understand you combined two assembly districts but why does it look like this? <i>AW</i> – These are the options in terms of nested assembly districts. There is an opportunity to put the IMPSAND district more North. The border district would extend North but then not all the way along the border to the coast. <i>Blanco</i> – I think this compounds the problems of the two assembly districts. <i>Yao</i> – Combining the two “coastal” would make more sense as compared to trying to keep the border district. Border is important for congressional but not as much so for state. <i>Barabba</i> – Seconded. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Do | | IMPSAND will add “lobster claw” and then SANDCNDO will continue down the coast . or put a different way by <i>AW</i> : Put Spring Valley with Imperial district. |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----|---|
| | | we ask mappers to change it for now? | | |
| NESAND | North SD district and North district of Rancho Bernardo and into San Deigo | | Yes | |
| NSANDSOUTHOC | | <i>DiGuilio</i> – It crosses that OC line for both assembly and senate? <i>A</i> – yes. | Yes | |
| COSTALOCIRV | | <i>FW</i> – I’m concerned about SOUTHOC, nesting south OC with Tustin/Irvine but I think that’s not possible. <i>Dai</i> – You might want to not nest them and change it later. <i>AW</i> – If you were to do a coastal district and a SE district there might be a population issue. <i>Yao</i> – Once you are inland more than 10 miles or so, no one can identify with the beach community. Anyone living close to the 405 will not think they live in a beach community. <i>DiGuilio</i> – How much was strictly nesting and how much maneuvering was there? <i>AW</i> – Strictly nesting because we didn’t get to it last week. <i>FW</i> – Putting something from OC with San Diego speaks poorly to the nesting. | | Flagged look at possibility of coastal district |
| WESTSANTAANA | | | yes | |
| DBRHCH | | | yes | |
| Santa Clarita – S Ventura County | | <i>A</i> – all Senate districts are from nesting currently. <i>Blanco</i> – How did you choose which two to nest? <i>N</i> – In LA since we have certain places with Section 2 districts that limits it. Also, Alex chose certain districts to nest so I had less to choose from. <i>Ancheta</i> – did you nest all of them? <i>N</i> – Yes but they could be blended or hybridized. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Have you run any of those hybrids? <i>N</i> – This is purely nested. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Some of these don’t make sense like Beverly Hills to San Pedro. There are some that make sense. Do we have the opportunity now? <i>N</i> – That specific district will be hard to blend but Palos Verdes will be easier. <i>DiGuilio</i> – With exception of Malibu I think the others could be argued. I would be happy for you to blend/hybridize where you can. | | Have Malibu included with Santa Monica and pull down Eastern border of Santa Clarita. Blend and hybridized wherever possible in these Senate districts |
| | | | | Pico Rivera and East LA blending for LVAP. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|-----|---|
| | | | | San Fernando stays as is. |
| | | | | Opportunities to blend instead of nest wherever possible. |
| West Side – Santa Monica | | <i>DiGuilio</i> – Inglewood/Harbor city seems to be matched up as a boundary. Maybe we could include more of Culver City oh I guess not due to Beverley Hills placement. | yes | |
| Long Beach | | | yes | |
| East SGV - Corvina | | | yes | |
| San Gabriel Mtn Foothills | Pasadena Burbank Glendale district as well as San Gabriel district | | yes | |
| | <u>NORTHERN / CENTRAL CALIFORNIA</u> | <u>Assembly</u> | | |
| RixdelMendo / Assembly | Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendicino, split in Sonoma along 101. Western Siskiyou | <i>Barabba</i> – Do you have to drive over a mountain to get to the far part of Siskiyou county? What is the reason for that? <i>Dai</i> – Native American testimony we received | Yes | |
| RIXMTCAP / Assembly | | | Yes | |
| RIXYUBA/ Assembly | unchanged | <i>Forbes</i> – I think it’s good. Redding is in one district and Butte in another is a good thing. | Yes | |
| FOOTHILLS/ Assembly | Central Placer, El Dorado, Madera county. I looked at trying to split E and W Madera county, but most population is in W Madera so it couldn’t been done while keeping integrity of Section 5. | | Yes | |
| WPLACERNSAC/ Assembly | Changed southwestern dip into Sacramento county to other side for continuity. Citrus Heights is split. | | Yes | |
| RVIWESTSAC/ Assembly | West Sacrament, Davis, UC Davis | | Yes | |
| RVIELDORADO/ Assembly | | <i>DiGuilio</i> - El Dorado has 2 splits – but it within integrity of El Dorado county? <i>J</i> - yes | Yes | |
| RVISSACELKGR/ Assembly | Heard testimony from API COI | <i>Forbes</i> – Should river be border not the 5? That’s the county line. <i>J</i> – We’d have to cross the bay... <i>Forbes</i> – Is | Yes | OK for Friday but for future: <i>Forbes</i> – Is |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | there much population between I5 and the river? If not maybe we can include that area (it is mostly agriculture?). | | there much population between I5 and the river? If not maybe we can include that area (it is mostly agriculture?). |
| ECONTRACOSTA/ Assembly | COI between Gault and Lodi coming down into East CC, picking up Oakely | <i>DiGuilio</i> – Concern about Lodi being taken from Stockton, San Jaoquin area. Did you try to get that ino Stockton? <i>J</i> – we would need to move Tracy into E Contra Costa. <i>DiGuilio</i> – I jsut feel like that community has been sliced out of San J. Valley. <i>J</i> – I can work on reinterations with Tracy in E CC. So ACTUALLY THERE WAS CONFUSION because the interation that <i>J</i> has currently is with Tracy in Stannis county. | | Explore this in Senate district: Keeping Tracy with Stockton and looking into moving Lodi with Solano |
| RVIESTANESJ/ Assembly | | | | |
| MARIN/ Assembly | Fairfield is split but less so. We need to hear COI testimony about how best to split it. | <i>Forbes</i> - How much is in Solano? <i>Blanco</i> – Those are very dissimilar communities, this flows from us trying to keep the wine area together right? <i>J</i> – Yes and the Ggate bridge. <i>Dai</i> – I think the Eastern communities are too different from the coast and North bay. I think we have to revist how far down the North coast district comes. <i>Barabba</i> – The community rejected this idea. <i>GM</i> – I’m convinced that this will change. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Should we throw something out now or wait? <i>Barabba</i> – We could move North Coast district to the East. Lake was considered a possibility to be added to North Coast (RIXDELMENDO). <i>FW</i> – The handout we got from public testimony doesn’t show Napa’s desire for “wine country” district. <i>GM</i> – I think Vallejo and Benecia should not be in there. <i>Blanco</i> – If not the bridge at least the 12. <i>Forbes</i> – You could move Lake to Mendo and pull Solano west and could take care of the Fairfield split. <i>GM</i> – I’d like to take care of everything from Vallejo, Benecia, everything east of Marin. Putting Vallejo in with Pinole maybe? We discussed that before. <i>J</i> – Vallejo and Benecia are 25% of this district so things will have to change a lot if they get taken out. <i>K</i> - Tamina says that | | <i>GM</i> - District goes too far east into dissimilar communities. Create hardline east in Solano county. Take out Vallejo and Benecia. <i>J</i> – Move rest of Solano county into Napa district, move Lake county and Eastern Sonoma where it splits east of 101 into North Coast and then move as much population as needed south from 101 corridor -- |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|-----|--|
| | | <p>going across the Ggbridge would undo everything she has done so far. <i>GW</i> - Don't go east of the 12, or if it is possible, 780.</p> <p><i>Forbes</i> – The need to move Lake county in coastal district making more population available to Marin district. Perhaps adding Solano area back to Napa district.</p> <p><i>T</i> – Vallejo, Benecia south would mean a lot more city splits. When you move south you run into 2 Monterey districts. Where would you want that to go? You'd have to push East somewhere?</p> <p><i>Forbes</i> – To make Marin smaller we will capture more of North Coast.</p> <p><i>J</i>- Petaluma and Roher Park and adding American Canyon and city of Sonoma to make up for population.</p> <p><i>Forbes</i> – Pull Solano over to 780</p> <p><i>J</i>- Take about 65k ppl on east end of Marin and move to Napa and put lake in North Coast, and push that into Marin</p> | | <p>If population needs to come from split in Santra Rosa?</p> <p><i>DiGuilio</i> – Keep Santa Rosa WHOLE in Napa</p> |
| RVISTOCKTON/ Assembly | | | | See above |
| NAPALAKE/ Assembly | | | | See above |
| EAST SF/ Assembly | unchanged | <p><i>Ancheta</i> – I was looking at a different idea for the SF split and the current lines split about 4 or 5 neighborhoods. Not quite consistent with low income API populations in South city. Maybe a line between Bay View and Visitation Valley neighborhoods. Maybe running the line further to the West. Still mostly N/S. <i>Barabba</i> – I would be willing to ask Q2 to make the change that <i>Ancheta</i> suggests. <i>FW</i> – On what info are you basing the neighborhood boundaries? <i>Ancheta</i> – SF planning commission neighborhood boundaries. I'm not positive that they are the “right” boundaries. You can have either 40 neighborhoods or 125 depending on how you define them.</p> | Yes | <i>Dai</i> and <i>Ancheta</i> will send Q2 alternative interation for SF split line. |
| WESTSFDALY/ Assembly | unchanged | See above | Yes | See above |
| NSANMATEO/ | Reunited Half Moon Bay, mostly the same | <i>Forbes</i> – In SoCal we kept tails to keep cities whole. <i>Dai</i> – | Yes | Keep Redwood City |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|-----|---|
| Assembly | except for small Redwood City split. | Yes I think we should keep this as well. | | whole |
| SSANMATEO/ Assembly | There is a split in Redwood City that is very small, less than 200 people to make it look better. | | Yes | Keep Redwood City whole in NSANMATEO district |
| SILICONVAL/ Assembly | Cupertino is moved here to be kept together, a little bit of San Jose to clean up appearance of district. | | Yes | |
| SANJOSE/ Assembly | Directed to clean it up and make it look better for compactness. | <i>GM</i> – Can you remind us of the NE portion ? <i>T</i> – Those are the two Section 5 districts of Monterey. | Yes | |
| RVIIMONT/ Assembly | Unchanged. Aloe Rock taken for population. | <i>GM</i> – It is a bad looking district. <i>Blanco</i> – How many counties are we splitting up with SiliconVal, SanJose and RvIIMont? <i>T</i> – Not really that many, Santa Clara and San Mateo. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Can we take the part of San Jose out of the Monterey one? Is there anyway to take those “scoops” out? <i>T</i> – On E side there is Merced which is another section 5. I tried splitting Gilroy, San Martin and Morgan Hill, but then Monterey would have to reach up to get population from San Jose. <i>Barabba</i> – I think this is the least worst way of doing it. <i>Dai</i> – agree. <i>Barabba</i> – I think this is an improvement on the old districts. | Yes | |
| MILPBERRY/ Assembly | Newark, Fremont split 50%, Milpitas | <i>Dai</i> – The public testimony prioritized congressional for a united Fremont. <i>T</i> – Fremont is very difficult. In the senate it is whole. <i>GM</i> – Can we bring Fremont into Alameda county? (discussions for congressional) <i>Forbes</i> – Is Union City included in senate district with Fremont? <i>J</i> – Yes. <i>Dai</i> – We need to know if Fremont would prefer to be kept whole but not with the other tri-cities. <i>GM</i> – Maybe we should explore keeping it whole because it will have more power whole than split. <i>Yao</i> – If we split them 75/25? To give them an advantage in one district. <i>Dai</i> – The suggestion is to exchange population of Newark for Fremont. <i>K</i> – Keep Newark whole into Hayward district and keep Fremont as whole as possible? <i>Commissioners:</i> yes. <i>Dai</i> – This is different than the prior map the public | Yes | Leave as is |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|-----|--|
| | | saw so let's put this out there and see how they respond <i>GM</i> – When a city split occurs we should make sure the majority of the population stays in one district. | | |
| HAYWARD/ Assembly | Reunited Catro Valley into this district. San Leandro is whole but in Oakland now. Northern Fremont split 50% is only split | <i>GM</i> – In regards to Senol, what if we pushed Sunol out to district to the East and went up farther North with Hayward district. <i>T</i> – That would push into EAlameda and split part of Walnut Creek and you wanted me to keep WC whole. <i>GM</i> – Okay, fine for now. | Yes | |
| OAKLAND/ Assembly | San Leandro is whole and so is Alameda. And Oakland is split with a cleaner line. Piedmont and Emeryville are excluded, not split. | | Yes | |
| EALAMEDA/ Assembly | Puts Walnut Creek back together | <i>T</i> – Deviation comes from keeping Walnut Creek whole. | Yes | |
| WCONTRACOSTA/ Assembly | Piedmont, Emeryville, Berkeley, Richmond, Rodeo, Port Costa up to Carquinas bridge | <i>DiGuilio</i> - 2.21 deviation is high. <i>GM</i> – Great district! <i>Dai</i> – I agree. Also, sidenote, the tighter we keep to deviation, the more city splits we will have so we need to inform public of this. | Yes | |
| PITTSANTIOCH/ Assembly | Was directed to put Brentwood in | | Yes | |
| | | | | |
| RVISTOCKTON / Assembly | New version option: tracy in south | <i>Barabba</i> – I like the San Jaoquin County line. <i>J</i> – We cross that line. <i>DiGuilio</i> – It is making up population from E Stanislaus county. <i>Dai</i> – There was testimony for Gault and Lodi together. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Tracy with Stockton or Manteca and East County with Stockton. Let the public make that comment. | Yes | |
| RVISTANESJ/ Assembly | Manteca is included and Tracy is excluded. Less of city of Modesto. | <i>J</i> – To boost API and Black VAP I had to grab areas in Modesto which I traded for the city of Turlock. <i>Kolkey</i> – You have a little retrogression in Black VAP so I think the issue here is with the AVAP. Is there a way of improving the AVAP? <i>J</i> – This very question came up last time which is why I moved the boundaries in Modesto to boost APIVAP as much as possible. The benchmark numbers were based on the Stockton finger that the commission has decided not to explore. <i>Barabba</i> – Can we get the characteristics of the Asian pop. in the Stanislaus finger | Yes | <i>DiGuilio</i> – If we look at the Asian pop. without that finger if it was similar to what we have here as a means to get a better comparison. Go forward with what we have now |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|-----|--|
| | | <p>versus the group you just discussed, either by surname or whatever. <i>DiGuilio</i> – If we look at the Asian pop without that finger if it was similar to what we have here as a means to get a better comparison. <i>Kolkey</i> – Unclear area with a minority population with this low level as your benchmark. We need to do a political analysis, or an easier way would be to see if there is a way we can boost APIVAP. <i>Dai</i> – Benchmark is on current district lines, on current population. <i>J</i> – 2010 Census data compared to 2000 lines. <i>DiGuilio</i> – There are probably other commissioners who want to hear about J & K – there was overwhelming COI to get rid of Stockton finger. There isn't a whole lot more that we can do. <i>Yao</i> – Do we really want to spend this sort of energy and effort if we might not have a chance of winning, maybe we should keep the finger? <i>FW</i> – That is the only area of API pop to add to this district. So we need to wait for the clear legal mandate for the finger if we are going to reinstate it. Let's keep this version and wait for Mr. Brown's report. <i>Kolkey</i> – It is possible that there is no other way and it should be backed up with evidence to the public. <i>Barabba</i> – I would want to be ordered by the Justice Dept. to not do it. Because I think it is anathema to what the state of CA is asking us to do. <i>Blanco</i> – What is the possibility of a coalition district? The 35% latino CVAP. Should be included in the report from Mr. Brown.</p> | | and revisit the finger issue after second round. |
| RVIMERCED/ Assembly | | | Yes | |
| RVISECTION2/ Assembly | Still city split of Fresno (south Fresno based on COI testimony) | <i>Kolkey</i> – Is this the more compact alternative of the 2 possibilities? <i>J</i> – Yes. <i>Kolkey</i> - Then we need a racial polarizing profile of the area. <i>Blanco</i> – Wouldn't this district have to be like this anyway? <i>Kolkey</i> – We could take population from this district to the section 5 districts if needed. <i>FW</i> – I think this is good. <i>Blanco</i> – I don't think we will have to alter this. Even without an RPV. <i>FW</i> - We will have to identify this type of district to the expert. | Yes | |
| FRESNO/ Assembly | Small changes on West Fresno district boundary. City and county of Fresno is split | | Yes | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|-----|---|
| KINGS/ Assembly | Unchanged. | <i>Kolkey</i> – Could you find any more compact situation, or less regression? <i>J</i> – No. | Yes | |
| TULARE/ Assembly | Unchanged. Northern regions of Kern county for populations and Tulare county. | | Yes | |
| BAKERS/ Assembly | Bakersfield is split on southeastern area | <i>Barabba</i> – What is total population of Kern county? <i>J</i> – 840,000 aprox. | Yes | |
| SLOSB/ Assembly | Hardline between SLO and Monterey. Santa Maria, Longpoc is split. | <i>Forbes</i> – You have too many people as far a population goes in many of these districts, any thoughts as how to fix this? <i>J</i> – If SLO/Monterey hard line stays, then everything will have to shift down to Ventura county. | | |
| SBWVENT/ Assembly | El Rio is now included. Majority of Oxnard is kept in tact. | <i>Aguirre</i> – Is Oxnard split in Congressional as well. <i>J</i> – No. | Yes | |
| ***** ** | CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS | ***** | | |
| NORTHCOAST | Split in Sonoma. Marin is in tact. | <i>Dai</i> – Could we move Siskyou over as we did in assembly? <i>J</i> – One option is to move Rohner Park over? <i>Ontai</i> – Is it a Federally registered tribe that is up there? <i>Forbes</i> – yes. <i>J</i> - If direction is to add Western Siskyou to this county but we have to split a city, what should we do? <i>Yao</i> – Leave it how it is if it has to split a city. <i>Blanco</i> – Santa Rosa and Windsor is usual thought of as the same area. <i>Dai</i> – do you know the population of Western Siskyou. <i>Blanco</i> – I think Windsor should be with Santa Rosa. | Yes | Look to see if there are options available for keeping Windsor and Santa Rosa together and bring in population from West Siskyou county. Do not make changes if you have to split a city. |
| RXIMTCAP | Includes a small amount of Glen County to keep district as compact as possible | | Yes | |
| YUBA | Parts of Napa county, Yolo county, etc. | | Yes | |
| SACCITY | In tact city of Sacramento and Elk Grove as well as West Sacramento | | Yes | |
| SACCOUNTY | Everything East of Sacramento, Gault included this time for population | | Yes | |
| YOLOSDLNAP | Includes SW area of Sacramento county and moves along Delta and grabs Port Costa and some of NW Contra Costa county. | <i>Forbes</i> – That is a good district | Yes | |
| SANJOAQUIN | City of Stockton and the rest of San Joaquin county. Lathrop, Manteca, and Tracy are split. | | Yes | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|-----|---|
| | Antioch | | | |
| SF | Taking as much of county as possible to bring it down to 0 deviation without going into hardline of Marin. | <i>Ancheta</i> – Neighborhood maps. <i>J</i> – Sunset is in tact which there was COI testimony about. <i>Ancheta</i> – I recommend the city neighborhood maps. The 280 split divides naturally. <i>Dai</i> – Because it is a congressional district, some of the neighborhoods will be split. | Yes | Ancheta and Dai will provide neighborhood lines to Q2 (SF planning commission’s neighborhood lines) |
| SAN MATEO | Bottom right is the county line. City split in Redwood city. | | Yes | |
| SAN MATEO SC | Silicon Valley District including Scotts Valley area. Santa Clara, Saratoga, Cupertino are in tact. | | Yes | |
| SSANTA CLARA | | | Yes | |
| SAN JOSE | | <i>Dai</i> – What can we do to keep the tri-city area together? <i>T</i> – It is hard because we have the Monterey areas coming up. Going E you run into Merced. It is a population issues. <i>Dai</i> – To keep the tri-city area together would we have to break the Ggbridge barrier. Union City 70,000, Fremont is...(sorry I lost the number) <i>GM</i> – We have kept the Ggbridge as one of the only absolutes as per COI testimony. If we are going to respect the Ggate boundary in other maps do we need to respect it in this one? <i>Forbes</i> – I don’t think we can keep 325,000 people together (of the tri-cities). <i>Dai</i> – Why are some COIs sacred cows and others not? <i>DiGuilio</i> – If we break the Ggbridge COI then how many more will we break? <i>Forbes</i> – The tri-cities have more population than all of Marin county. Maybe we should push half way into Marin county. <i>Kolkey</i> – With respect to tri-city area, many COIs who want to be together, but at crossing county line. <i>GM</i> – I don’t think it entirely works out. But you could do an 880 corridor split of some kind. <i>T</i> – There isn’t enough population on that side of the freeway. <i>Forbes</i> – If you keep Union City, Hayward, Fremont and Newark together, you cross the mountains toward Dublin? <i>GM</i> – I appreciate the suggestion but think we should break the GG bridge barrier instead. <i>Yao</i> – 300,000 as a COI is maybe too much to ask. | | Try to keep as much of Tri-cities together in this district and definitely in the senate. <i>Forbes</i> – 2 districts proposed: 1) an 880 corridor district that ends at southern end of Fremont, 2) comes out of Berryessa and goes to Livermore and Dublin and all unincorporated parts of Alameda county. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | | <i>Forbes</i> – The idea would be one district Fremont Newark Hayward San Leandro, other district is Dublin, Sunol, Livermore. <i>K</i> – If you keep Fremont whole you break the Berryessa COI. <i>Blanco</i> – People talk about the tri-city area as being very defined. <i>GM</i> – I am interested in Forbes’ idea. <i>Dai</i> – Me too. <i>DiGuilio</i> – If you push Livermore and Dublin into San Ramon’s district maybe... <i>Barabba</i> - We can live with this but if you can keep the tri-cities together that would be best. | | |
| OAKLAND | Oakland is in tact. Pinole is not included or split. | | | |
| CONTRA COSTA | San Pablo and El Cerrito in it for population. | <i>DiGuilio</i> – What if we put Byron with San Joaquin and Discovery Bay and shave a little of Antioch? <i>J</i> – Byron’s population is 2500. <i>T</i> – We would have to split Antioch. <i>Dai</i> – I’m with DiGuilio. | Yes with the caveat next door | Move Byron into San Joaquin and to split western boundary of Antioch. Take Brentwood line SE just picking up Byron. |
| STANCOUNTY | Entire Stanislaus county intact. Escalon is split (it is a census place) | | Yes | |
| MERCED | Splits Fresno | | Yes | |
| KINGS | | | Yes | |
| FOOTHILLS | Nevada split for population, Grass Valley and Nevada City | | yes | |
| FRESNO | Grabs rest of Fresno. Picks up Vasalia and Tulare. | | yes | |
| TULARE | | | | |
| SLOSB | | <i>DiGuilio</i> – Maybe an area for community to designate. <i>Aguirre</i> – I agree. We should keep Ohi Valley together. | Yes with direction | Keep Ohi Valley together take off needed population from Western Venture |
| EASTVENT | Thousand Oaks is split | <i>Aguirre</i> – Testimony of Simi Valley to stay near Thousand Oaks but also COI of Simi Valley with Santa Clarita. <i>DiGuilio</i> – Thousand Oaks is split in all three districts so we should consider a better way in at least one. <i>DiGuilio</i> – if | Yes with direction if possible | Look at these options for keeping Thousand Oaks in tact. Ideally for this round. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|-------|--|
| | | we took all of Thousand Oaks you'd be splitting Simi Valley. Maybe we should "spread the pain" for Thousand Oaks and keep them in tact. <i>Yao</i> – Consider the coast and not getting a district that is coastal and then too inland. <i>Forbes</i> - If we include Thousand Oaks with WVENT then I don't want Bell Canyon to get cut off. | | |
| MONTEREY | Unchanged. Monterey is in tact, San Benito is in tact, Santa Cruz is split at Scotts Valley. | <i>Kolkey</i> was concerned about percent going down 1.5 for latino VAP. <i>K</i> – That is the highest she can go without going into Fresno. <i>T</i> – Could try going into Gilroy but it would split Monterey Bay. <i>Barabba</i> – Let's go with it and see what happend | Yes | |
| ***** | <i>SENATE DISTRICTS</i> ***** | ***** | ***** | ***** |
| ** | | | | ***** |
| NORTHCOAST | | <i>Dai</i> – It might make more sense to nest a different way. <i>K</i> – It is really like a puzzle if you want a nest. But we can also do clean-ups. Not much can happen before Friday. | Yes | |
| MTN CAP | | | | |
| NBAYECONTRA | | | | Put Napa District with Solano District . Put Coastal with Marin |
| SACCITY | | | Yes | |
| SFDALYCITY | | | Yes | |
| SAN MATEO | | | Yes | |
| SILICONVSANJ | | | Yes | |
| HAYWARDMILP | Tri-city area is in tact. | <i>Blanco</i> – Where is E. Foothill? <i>J</i> - East Foothill is with South Santa Clara. <i>Barabba</i> – This is much more acceptable to public testimony than congressional, maybe we can look at this in regards to congressional. | Yes | Look at the Senate District for the Congressional mapping (to see if there is a tri-city idea there) |
| MERCEDMONT | | <i>J</i> - For Merced end of things API VAP numbers are boosted in this configuration. <i>DiGuilio</i> – This is the only time we went over the mountain (for Section 5). <i>Barabba</i> – There are a lot of highways that go across there too. | Yes | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----|--|
| OAKLAND RICHMOND | | | Yes | |
| EALAWCONTRA | | | Yes | |
| STANJOAQUIN | | <i>J</i> – Cleaner break on Modesto and include Turlock in Stanislaus | | cleaner break on Modesto and include Turlock in Stanislaus <i>DiGuilio</i> - Put Delano into Stanislaus , put Modesto into San Jaoquin Stanislaus |
| KINGS | Same as before | | Yes | |
| FOOTHILLS | <i>J</i> – Couldn’t nest because of Kings. And high LVAP. Picked up rest of Fresno for population. | <i>J</i> - There is not way to not split and a lot of COI testimony advocating for the split | Yes | |
| TULAREKERN | Picks up Clovis, grabs Visalia, and remainder of Tulare county that isn’t in Kings. | | Yes | |
| CENTRALCOAST | Section 5 district that does not retrogress. | | yes | |
| SBEVENT | | | yes | |
| | <u>B.O.E</u> | | | |
| Mendocino, Lake, Marin, Solano, Sonoma, SF, ½ of Monterey, San Luis Obispo, San Benito, Oakland, Humboldt, Santa Clara, Del Norte, Trinity, ½ of Siskiyou | | <i>Ancheta</i> – I’d like to start with District 5 retrogression issue then work our way backward. <i>J</i> – If Merced is included then district must reach benchmarks of Merced. <i>Dai</i> – Unnest Merced. <i>Dai</i> – We should try not to split counties. <i>DiGuilio</i> - So we keep this framework and tweak it along county lines? <i>Ancheta</i> – Can I get the numbers? <i>K</i> – Would you like to keep as many counties together as possible while keeping benchmark? We could get some general direction from you as a starting point. <i>Barabba</i> – Why don’t we let Q2 come up with something like K mentioned and then give it to our council and see the results? <i>Yao</i> – We can’t just let it happen to make sure the population is right, that isn’t our charter. <i>Ward</i> - We’ll never be able to hear COI about this because the districts are too big. <i>Barabba</i> – Currently they have a coastal zone which is obviously a COI and they’ve tried their best with how big the districts are. <i>Dai</i> – So then | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | it looks like the Santa Clarita one has got to go in with LA. We could cut out on the LA county line, that could be some of the clean up? | | |
| San Diego, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Imperial, | | <i>Barabba</i> – How far off are the current districts with equal population? <i>J</i> - -3.83% deviation. <i>Barabba</i> – Can we take existing districts and then just modify them until they are? <i>Blanco</i> – I don't see why not as long as we follow traditional criteria. <i>Kolkey</i> – There is less risk of giving credit to incumbency in BOE than in other districts. I think that is a reasonable analysis to make. Incumbency is not asserted as one of the criteria. <i>DiGuilio</i> – BOE collects sales tax and then it comes back to the county. | | -Clean up county boundaries -total deviation 5 total. -Subject to retrogression |
| Ventura, San Bernadino, Kern | | | | |
| | | | | |