

JULY 7, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, note taker: K.Kubas

Short hand for speakers -
GM: Commissioner Galambos Malloy
DG: Commissioner DiGuilio
FW: Commissioner Filkins Webber
T: Tamina Alon
J: Jaime Clark
K: Karin Mac Donald

**** dotted lines signify breaks or when the discussion went on to the next issue and then returned to prior topic

IDENTIFIER	DESCRIPTION	NOTES/QUESTIONS	FINAL DIRECTIONS
	<i>NOR CAL ADs</i>		
DMNDO	Includes Rohnert Park. Santa Rosa cannot be included in North Coast unless we want to make an E/W district		Discussed below
MARIN	Grabs Santa Rosa and Sebastopol		Discussed below
NAPA (discusses MARIN, and PTANT)	Petaluma and part of So. Sonoma. Napa and Lake together and whole. Vallejo and Benicia. Fairfield is split. American Canyon with Napa.	<i>GM</i> – What is population of Fairfield split? <i>J</i> – I think there is less population in NAPA. To avoid that split we would have to take pop from near Antioch area or from Yolo county. Other option is to have Colusa included and have Petaluma included with Glen county and Colusa. <i>Dai</i> – Fairfield pop? <i>J</i> – 115k. <i>Blanco</i> – Vallejo and Benicia being in with Napa, is that their county currently? Are Vallejo and Benicia in Napa county? <i>J</i> – No, they are in Solano. <i>Blanco</i> – Ok, we had a lot of comments early on that we had understood the 80 corridor and I am pointing out that we have put 2 cities that don’t have much to do with Napa in Napa. <i>Forbes</i> – I think 80 corridor is still in CD. <i>J</i> - Other options include putting Yolo with Lake and Napa and try to move southern part of Solano county. <i>GM</i> – Fairfield is a fairly small city that I’d like to keep intact. It is more important to me because Vallejo and Benicia are intact and together. <i>J</i> – 40k of Fairfield are in Napa district. We would have to split Davis or Woodland off from rest of Yolo. We could also include Glen Colusa and	Move Penngrove, Petaluma, Cotati into MARIN. Move Sonoma Rohnert Park, Glen Ellen, Kenwood and part of Santa Rosa into NAPA. And majority of Santa Rosa with Sonoma. Keep Fairfield split and work with <i>Forbes</i> re: the split.

part of Tehama. We could also pick up Martinez and balance between PTANT and Solano district *GM* – Last option sounded best. *Dai* – I think Benicia and Martinez have a link and that would be better than slitting Fairfield. *Blanco* – I agree with *Dai*, *GM*, for Martinez to go with Benicia. Fairfield with Solano district? *Forbes* – Yes. *GM* – We’d have to split Antioch, so we are just trading splits. *J* – Antioch split would be smaller than Fairfield split. We would put Brentwood back together. Also, the shape of Fairfield is long, to put it in ECC. *Raya* – Even within Fairfield, are the two parts the same or have different interests (along the split). *Forbes* – Far left side is largely undeveloped and still open, west of current proposal line. *J* – The block that is more densely populated. *DG* – You’d have to have some clean up with Martinez (due to shape) and what would happen with Brentwood? Total pop of Brentwood? You could pull in all of Brentwood to Solano district and split Antioch. *FW* – Narrow stretch near Pleasant Hill to connect PTANT district would look bad. *Blanco* – Martinez is county seat for Contra Costa. It does concern me that we’d take it out of Contra Costa and put it with another. *Barabba* – It sounds like Fairfield split is less painful than anything else. *Forbes* – All of Travis Air Force base in one district please. It is south of Fairfield and east. *J* – Ok we will look into it and make sure it is all together in same district.

J - To clean line where NAPA, MARIN, and So. Sonoma lines meet, we’d have to split Santa Rosa, 70k ppl could go into North Coast. Or Rohnert Park could go into Marin. *GM* – There are connections between Rohnert Park and Santa Rosa, but there is also a strong argument to be made because we are keeping Santa Rosa together and linking urban parts of Marin to Santa Rosa. If we had to split Santa Rosa the split would be 60/40 or so and not give them influence in either district. I think this is the lesser of two evils. *Ancheta* – There is also a compactness issues. There might be an argument that you are bypassing Rohnert Park to grab a further city. By definition, do you bypass a closer city to go to a more distant city. *DG* – Santa Rosa is seed of Sonoma but it isn’t with Sonoma currently. I wonder if it would be better to have part of it in its county than none of all. *Forbes* – Petaluma in Marin? Rohnert Park, Glen Ellen-Sonoma part into Napa and splitting off Santa Rosa into Sonoma. *Blanco* – Rohnert Park in with Napa? *J* – What if we put Petaluma with Marin and how much of So. Sonoma would have to go into Napa. *J* – I believe that those two areas are similar in pop. Rohnert Park-Glen Ellen could be with Napa and Petaluma could be with Marin. *DG* - 60k of Santa Rosa with Sonoma and 100k

		<p>with Marin? <i>J</i> – Yes. Cotati is included in Sonoma, it is adjacent to Rohnert Park, we could include that with Petaluma but I could try to keep Santa Rosa in two districts. <i>Raya</i> – I am trying to understand how 60k ppl makes a big difference going into their own county of Sonoma, <i>GM</i> – I feel like they would have more effective representation if there were more Sonoma county citizens in their district. <i>Forbes</i> – Population problem, either here or south in Vallejo/Benicia. <i>DG</i> – Petaluma, Rohnert Park into Marin and have majority of Santa Rosa into Sonoma. It depends who we want to have in Marin? The smaller communities bear more of a brunt because Santa Rosa is with Marin. <i>Forbes</i> – What if all of south of Santa Rosa go with Marin and then Santa Rosa as much as possible goes to Sonoma? Sorry, that doesn't work re: population. <i>Blanco</i> – To me that has more integrity than having Petaluma, Penngrove, Rohnert Park in 3 different districts. People think of Rohnert Park as Santa Rosa metro. For the other little cities, they would be in an area that is much truer of how they view themselves. <i>FW</i> – Then you could pull in more pop from Fairfield into Napa. <i>DG</i> – Instead of splitting Antioch can you pull more into Discovery Bay and Byron? <i>J</i> – There is not enough pop there. What would happen would be a lot of Solano district (Rio Vista and south) would be in PTANT. <i>Dai</i> – League of Conservation testimony of leaving Santa Rosa in Sonoma and taking the rest of area south into Marin. <i>J</i> – Santa Rosa could go with Napa in another option. Similar to first draft. <i>GM</i> – I think Santa Rosa is better in Marin than Napa. I read the same testimony that <i>Dai</i> is referring to. <i>DG</i> – What are the implications of those maps (Conservation League of Voters maps) <i>Dai</i> – I like the argument that it is ok that Santa Rosa is split from Sonoma because it is a large urban area dissimilar from its county. I am having problem with 101 corridor. <i>J</i>- This map would kick Del Norte, Trinity and part of ... out of district. <i>DG</i> – Penngrove, Cotati, Rohnert Park and Petaluma into one district (keep integrity of that corridor)? <i>J</i> – Splitting Santa Rosa and picking up pop somewhere else for Napa district. <i>Forbes</i> – Where would you make up population? <i>J</i> – Majority of Fairfield could be with Napa. The issue would be with PTANT, because it would need 60k. Coming up to Isleton or going east and splitting Stockton or going North and picking up Lodi. <i>Forbes</i> – Trade out Petaluma and Penngrove into Marin and Kenwood, Glen Ellen into Napa. <i>Blanco</i> – Kenwood and Glen Ellen could go into Napa with wine industry. Unite some of the wine area and keep that corridor back in tact</p>	
PTANT			ok

ECC	Oakley, Discovery Bay, Delta area of Sacramento, Solano county – Fairfield split, about 60-70k on this side. All of Yolo except for Sacramento. Moved into Sutter county because it is larger than Colusa.	<p><i>DG</i> – This is not my favorite due to length but it is a lot of smaller areas, except for Davis, there is not one dominating community. It is different but at least there isn't anyone dominating. <i>Forbes</i> – I think keeping Delta together is good. What is pop. In Sutter finger? <i>J</i> – 12k. <i>Forbes</i> – I would rather keep Sutter complete with Yuba. <i>J</i> - And split Colusa 50/50. <i>Forbes</i> – Yes. <i>Yao</i> – We were considering size when choosing to split and Sutter is 5xs larger than Colusa. So we aren't being consistent if we split Colusa instead. Given a choice Sutter should be considered first prior to Colusa. <i>Blanco</i> – We talked about how we went to Sutter to get population, but for people that are familiar with this area (I am not), I would like to ask about Criteria 4: COIs, instead of just grabbing population. <i>Dai</i> – <i>Forbes</i> could you speak to this. I assume you suggested Colusa because the agriculture is similar. <i>Forbes</i> – The Sutter part is the same, as the Colusa part. The Sutter finger doesn't have any N/S connection to the southern district but Colusa does because of the 5. <i>DG</i> – Used to be 99 corridor, that corridor is different than the 5. Colusa is more the integrity of Westside of valley as opposed to Eastside. <i>Forbes</i> – All of Colusa and trade out Sutter finger. But we'll be 9k people short.</p>	<p>Keep Sutter whole with Yuba district and instead to split Colusa.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – We are doing that based on better transportation corridors, even though it is smaller. Different crops.</p> <p><i>Forbes</i> – And keeping Westside of Valley together.</p>
YUBA	Part of Butte (split for pop). Colusa, Glenn, Tehama.		ok
MTCAP	Eastern Butte, Nevada, Tahoe Basin, Sierra, Plumas, Lassen.	<p><i>J</i> – If we include Tahoe Basin with Foothills, we'd have to take much of Placer county and split it in 3 districts and Placer would not be with El Dorado county. Can put Tahoe with Foothills in SD and CD. <i>DG</i> – I find it problematic to put Tahoe in a district that runs to Modoc. <i>Forbes</i> – Lake Tahoe finger is a problem because a lot of economic activity is people going through Placer to Lake Tahoe. <i>DG</i> – But you could do it if you swapped out most of Placer. <i>J</i> – Central Placer (with city of Auburn) would go with MTCAP and maybe El Dorado too. <i>Dai</i> – Since Placer is already in 3, we could put Tahoe with Foothills. <i>Forbes</i> – What about putting everything North of 50 into MTCAP? <i>Dai</i> – It would have to take part of 50 corridor? <i>Forbes</i> – It would still be better. <i>J</i> – What if all of Placer with in MTCAP, and part of Amador county in MTCAP too? <i>Forbes</i> – That is too far down. <i>DG</i> – Can we put El Dorado and Placer into MTCAP and add western part of MTCAP district into Sacramento area? El Dorado and Placer are already split 3 times? <i>J</i> – Yes. We'd have to pull in and pick up Lincoln, Sheridan, and Loomis. <i>DG</i> – I was looking at a three way change from the northern part. Drop part of Western part of Placer into NSAC. <i>J</i> – NSAC would have to move east to pick up pop. <i>Dai</i> – What if</p>	Split Lake Tahoe. Move south into Placer county to make up population in MTCAP.

		we split Lake Tahoe? There is N and S Lake? <i>Forbes</i> – I was going to make that suggestion too... <i>J</i> – Split at county line? <i>Forbes</i> – MTCAP can pick up Placer that makes up for loosing South Lake Tahoe. <i>Blanco</i> - We try to keep natural resources together but sometimes that makes us split surrounding areas. <i>Dai</i> - And the corridors are different, 50 to South Lake Tahoe, 80 to N. <i>FW</i> – And we'd keep them whole in SD and CD. <i>Forbes</i> – Federal level is more important.	
NSAC	Citrus Heights is removed. Folsom Dam area is intact.	<i>Dai</i> – Testimony for swapping El Dorado Hills for Citrus Heights. <i>J</i> - Yes so that it could be with Rancho Cordova. <i>Dai</i> – Good.	ok
WSAC	North Highlands is split.	<i>Forbes</i> – Is Sac State included? And Med Center?	<i>Forbes</i> will get info to Jaime re: Sac State and Med Center to make sure they are included and not split
ESAC	Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Vineyard. 99 corridor of Galt to Lodi is no longer included		ok
SACEG	Lodi to Galt and Elk Grove.	<i>DG</i> – At least Lodi is not where it was before. There is no way to pull Lodi back down in. <i>J</i> – Tracy and Lodi would both be split. <i>DG</i> – San Joaquin County is in 3 ADs? <i>J</i> – Yes. <i>Dai</i> – We made a trade with Vineyard before. <i>DG</i> – Yes it would have to be a three way swap. <i>Forbes</i> – Put freeway in this district. <i>Parvenu</i> – I heard African American pop saying they didn't want to be with Stockton. <i>DG</i> – But now they are with Lodi, not Stockton. <i>Dai</i> – And Galt. <i>DG</i> – If we get feedback there might be the need to adjust S boundary around Lodi. <i>Forbes</i> – Do you want them to pick up part of the agriculture land? <i>DG</i> – Yeah, instead of picking up west near 5, I'd rather have boundaries move to the East.	Put freeway in this district, move census blocks over so that freeway line is in this district. <i>DG</i> will help look at boundaries with Jaime
STKTN		<i>DG</i> - Linden, Morada are all extensions of Stockton and you are switching those for Lathrop. There are connections between Lathrop and Stockton but you might be isolating communities that are more connected. <i>Ward</i> – In that iteration you just pointed out are there city splits? <i>J</i> – No. <i>DG</i> – I would be ok with swapping out Lathrop for the other smaller communities near Stockton. By splitting east part of Stockton, you are splitting the city for all intents and purposes. <i>FW</i> – Speaker 14 from Stockton hearing had a handout. <i>Blanco</i> – I am leaning toward <i>DG</i> 's point, those smaller communities around Stockton are part of the cities. Lathrop could be with Manteca, so I am inclined to go back	Make sure Stockton airport is included. Take out Lathrop and include smaller communities around Stockton (Morada, Garden Acres) go as far east as needed to pick up pop.

		to our original idea. Morada, Waterloo, Garden Acres. I see <i>FW</i> 's point that the population exchange will have to go further. French Camp is still a part of Stockton. <i>J</i> – It would be Lathrop for Morada, Garden Acres, <i>DG</i> – Doesn't have to go as far as Linden. Go as far as you need to switch out population.	
STNSJ	Modesto is split.	<i>GM</i> – We have not been able to maintain integrity of 99 corridor which has been a principle we have been following re: our familiarity with the area. <i>DG</i> – Ceres preferring to be with Western Stanislaus county. <i>J</i> – 80k of Modesto with Merced. <i>Dai</i> – We got positive feedback about separating out Turlock. <i>J</i> – Crows Landing, Ceres, etc are together. Turlock isn't split. <i>GM</i> – I think the split makes sense. <i>Yao</i> – Stanislaus and the other district are both with 5k deviation, so 10k total. Can we pick up population anywhere around these 2 districts? It fits within our standard. I'm just noticing that the previous districts were closer.	Look at population lacking here and in neighbor district and see if it can get picked up around them both (just a note, not for 2 nd draft)
MRCED	Moved a few tracts.	<i>DG</i> – Mr. Brown has looked at this and given his blessing.	ok
FTHILL			ok
FSEC2	Area South of Sunnyside is incorporated with this district and exchange there was for Milkier and Centerville.		ok
FRSNO			ok
TLRE		<i>Forbes</i> – There is no connection with Inyo. <i>Dai</i> – 395 runs through it. <i>DG</i> – Access point is from south. <i>Dai</i> – Inyo comment was that they are both mountains and desert.	ok
KINGS			ok
BKRFD		<i>J</i> – People in Fresno said they liked it. <i>FW</i> – Ridgecrest? <i>J</i> – Up in NE corner. <i>Ward</i> – Compactness issues with this district? <i>Ancheta</i> – There is a compactness problem but if Ridgecrest gave testimony that they wanted to go with Kern and Bakersfield then that trumps. <i>FW</i> – A tremendous amount of testimony with connection of Ridgecrest to Bakersfield. <i>Raya</i> – It is a resource issues. It isn't going to win the beauty award but it makes sense from the point of view of people living there. <i>Blanco</i> – It wasn't just the city, it was the base, and that goes down and picks up military area, China Lake. This was about more than Ridgecrest, about a lot of connections to Bakersfield. <i>Ancheta</i> – Compactness question is about the top SE corner connecting to the hump. They should be connected. <i>Raya</i> – They get a lot of services from Kern county. <i>GM</i>	ok

		<p>– It appears that there is a highway that connects those communities. If we don't include Weldon, Onyx etc. communities along the transportation link. <i>FW</i> – Do you see an option to join those? <i>J</i> – To balance the district we would have to move some population and I don't know the most responsible place. Crossing line between Kern and SLO? Or removing Tehachapi area? We also heard testimony that the current transit corridors were very used. <i>Forbes</i> – Be sure that <i>GM</i> – Adjust the boundary so to add unincorporated areas west of California city along the 14. <i>DG</i> – You'd be splitting California City but nominally. <i>Barabba</i> – The roads are not restricted to one district.</p>	
EVENT	Oxnard, Camarillo, West Lake Village, etc.		ok
SBWVE	Ventura intact, Ojai and Oak View, Lompoc is whole and with Mission Hills and Air Force Base in other district. Santa Ynez	<p><i>GM</i> – Good job! <i>FW</i> – For shape, should we include the forest? <i>DG</i> – Part of those mountains are with Ventura. Can we put them all with this district? <i>Raya</i> – Where is the line? <i>DG</i> – Connect top of hump where Lompoc is to straight Ventura border. <i>Aguirre</i> – Take it from 4 corners area and go W and slightly S. <i>DG</i> – Look at topography.</p>	Bring SB part of Los Padres National Forest in. Look at topography.
SLOB			ok
ESF	Tried to bring Visitation Valley in but I would have to cut into LGBT community	<p><i>GM</i> – There is an argument to me made that the LGBT community is spread throughout the city. I know that we have gotten specific testimony, but in such an expensive city as SF, I don't like splitting 2 of the more modest communities. <i>DG</i> – How did you fill this out as far as which COIs were kept together and which were not? <i>Ancheta</i> – <i>GM</i> does raise the issue of low/low to moderate income areas like Bayview, Excelsior. It is two separate communities. There is a lot of stuff between Chinatown and Visitation Valley. You still have to divide the cities in half. You could rotate the population. <i>Parvenu</i> – If you move Presidio and Marina into West SF, wouldn't that make that area more affluent? <i>GM</i> – Type of issues in Westside and North side are different than Eastside. There is more of a connection of Bayview to Visitation Valley to Excelsior. <i>T</i> – We started with CAPAFR line in the beginning, I looked at a lot of submissions and many maps had our West line. This is a CCAG line. <i>Ancheta</i> – Excelsior and Vis. Valley are denser than Marina and Presidio I think. <i>GM</i> – The Unity maps include Presidio and Marina on Westside, less of a straight line and include Mission on Westside. <i>Dai</i> – I think the middle line is good, you are really shifting at bottom and the top. <i>Barabba</i> – We are breaking up what looks like a seashore. <i>GM</i> – Well it's all coastline. <i>Barabba</i> – But would that be considered within the Bay? (Presidio and Marina)? <i>Dai</i> – Presidio is the crossing over. <i>Dai</i> – Vis. Valley for Presidio and</p>	Like new iteration where ESF includes Visitation Valley and Excelsior, and WSF has Presidio, Marina, Presidio Heights and part of Western Addition

		<p>Marina? <i>Parvenu</i> – Is that something we can do quickly to see the projections of the table? <i>T</i> – Yes. <i>FW</i> – After lunch. <i>Ancheta</i> – There are connections between Excelsior and Visitation Valley, and there has been testimony. Maybe we could take Excelsior and Vis. Valley and go up to Pac Heights for the exchange. <i>Blanco</i> – Isn't the Excelsior tied to the Outer Mission? <i>Ancheta</i> – Yes, and ethnically they are very similar. <i>Blanco</i> – I just think Excelsior has some characteristics of Bernal Heights and shares a lot in common with Outer Mission. <i>GM</i> - I think Excelsior can go either way. I think Vis Valley should be with Bayview. <i>Blanco</i> – I have always thought Excelsior as connected to Outer Mission. <i>J</i> – Because Excelsior and Vis Valley are so heavily populated, where do you next after Presidio, Marina, and Pacific Heights? <i>Dai</i> – Presidio Heights and Inner Richmond?</p> <p>Looking at NEW ITERATION</p>	
WCC	No change		ok
PTANT	No change		ok
OKLND	San Leandro is whole and picks up more of EQCA's area in district North.		ok
EALAM	No change	<p><i>Ward</i> – Can we walk through it to discuss compactness? <i>DG</i> – The big portion goes to the county line and is the foothills, windmills, unpopulated. <i>Blanco</i> – It is really populated in it concentration. <i>DG</i> – Moraga to Pleasanton heavily populated. <i>T</i> – COI testimony to keep Dublin, Pleasanton together. <i>DG</i> – This is kept with county. <i>Yao</i> – The point where the 4 districts come together.</p>	ok
HYWARD	A few blocks moved along Fremont lines to accommodate making San Leandro whole.		ok
MLPTS			ok
	NOR CAL SDs	<i>1ST VISUALIZATION</i>	
NORCO	No Petaluma.	<p><i>J</i>- Rohnert Park could go east instead of Petaluma. <i>DG</i> – Before Petaluma was suggested to go with Marin, but if it goes better with Napa...<i>Dai</i> – Is there another logical city that we could exchange for Petaluma? <i>Blanco</i> – We could carry Santa Rosa split from AD over to SD. <i>DG</i> – Continue with AD split? <i>Blanco</i> – Yes. <i>DG</i> – You could have same split for both districts or you could try to rectify that problem this time around. <i>GM</i> – I would like to see what it</p>	ok

		would look like together (Santa Rosa whole). <i>Blanco</i> – When we don’t nest, what is it that we are doing? We have used a variety of terms but we need to articulate why we haven’t nest in certain situations. <i>J</i> – Monterey SD boundary is different so we can’t nest. Looking at the SDs as their own set will make for better SDs. <i>DG</i> – Nesting being our lowest criteria, if nesting isn’t possible you go back to the others. I think this meets those criteria. <i>DG</i> – One issue is Petaluma. Do we want it with Marin? If so we have to swap out Rohnert Park.	
WINE	Lake, Yolo (but no Sac), all of Napa, all of Solano, moves into Benicia and Martinez.	<i>Forbes</i> – Good things: delta all in one piece. Blue ridge mountains together. Lake and Napa together. Yolo whole. I think this is a good option. Hardest part is the bridge jump. <i>Dai</i> – Takes Crockett and Port Costa. <i>Blanco</i> – It is the mouth of the delta in some ways. I am more concerned about it going all the way down to Pleasant Hill. <i>Dai</i> – But we had testimony of that as a commuter corridor. <i>GM</i> – It looks like we have split commuter corridor. <i>Dai</i> – All the testimony I saw was Benicia, Martinez, Pleasant Hills, not the smaller communities. <i>GM</i> - If we have the COI that supports this then I am comfortable with it. <i>Blanco</i> – Lake to Pleasant Hill? Pleasant Hill has become fairly urban with the mall and near Concord. Vine Hill, Pacheco, Mountain View, would be keeping 680 together. <i>GM</i> – Are there smaller cities we could add instead of splitting anyone? <i>T</i> – IF you take those three into WINE and you get to over - 1% in the RAMON district? You can add two but not all three. <i>DG, Dai</i> – Ok then add two.	Add Mountain View and Vine Hill
YUBA	Northern Sacramento communities; Citrus Heights. Rancho Cordova is split to keep API whole.	<i>J</i> – Direction is: Remove Rancho Cordova and pick up pop in Northern Sac, maybe Sac city. <i>J</i> - Adding some of North Highlands and ideally keeping North Highlands whole and somewhere in the Northern part of city of Sac, to balance out the district, add as much of Rancho Cordova as possible. Yes I would still have to split part of Rancho Cordova. <i>Forbes</i> – We are getting the API community combined? Is that the benefit? I’m not sure it’s worth it. <i>Dai</i> – Currently the Rancho Cordova split is along 50? <i>Forbes</i> – Yes. <i>Dai</i> – Unless there is a better split that might be a decent split along the highway	YUBA with Rancho Cordova split, Sac API community intact.
MTCAP	West Placer is split. Folsom and Fair Oaks included, maintains integrity of Folsom Dam area.		
SAC	No splits. Elk Grove included		

FTHLL	Includes Mono and Inyo. Galt to Lodi corridor. NE San Joaquin county and Eastern Stanislaus, NE Tulare.		
		2 nd VISUALIZATION	
SAC		<i>Forbes</i> – I know we had testimony about Citrus Heights and Rancho Cordova but there is only one bridge that crosses the American river there. <i>Dai</i> – I don't remember what the reason for Rancho Cordova/Citrus Heights together. <i>DG</i> – I want to look at Stanislaus split. <i>J</i> – Rancho Cordova is not included here. <i>DG</i> – If you take Rancho Cordova out you can keep integrity of API community. <i>Dai</i> – Putting Galt and Lodi with San Joaquin and putting Turlock in the Foothills. <i>DG</i> – I think this is the one chance for Lodi to be with its home county.	Sac API community intact.
MTCAP	Folsom dam intact.		
FTHLL	Mather and Vineyard included. Eastern Stanislaus. Same area of Tulare.		
SNJOA	Galt through Lodi, city of Modesto.	<i>Forbes</i> – I think the first one is better. I think the finger that wraps into Sacramento is not what the Valley people would prefer. <i>DG</i> – I think there are benefits and problems to both. We have to decide what does least harm. In 2 nd Rancho Cordova was not split. I think that in regards to San Joaquin county it is good. Stanislaus county is split three ways currently. Look at the areas that are having biggest impact in both maps. I think Sacramento impact with Citrus heights is something to look at. <i>Forbes</i> – With this plan you have added 200k to a rural district. <i>Blanco</i> – I share that concern. That is a lot of what we heard about SD and CDs that combine rural and urban areas. What happens to representation when you have a concentration in one part of the district? <i>DG</i> – Rancho Cordova is split from its COI. This keeps API community intact. <i>Dai</i> – Which we had split in AD. <i>Blanco</i> –Is this an approximation of nesting? <i>J</i> – I'll add the layer again. <i>FW</i> – I think <i>DG</i> 's point is good. We've heard a lot about San Joaquin and if we have the opportunity to have Lodi, Galt, Stockton, Tracy whole, we aren't doing that in CD and AD. <i>J</i> – I followed the direction to the best of my ability about moving no more than 200k out of Sacramento for pop. <i>Forbes</i> – I agree with <i>FW</i> . <i>J</i> – It doesn't have to be that shape but I had it go to	Split in Rancho Cordova and pick up Vineyard?

		Rancho Cordova because Citrus Heights said they wanted to be with Rancho Cordova. <i>J</i> – Another option could be to add Vineyard and move into Arden/Rosemont area for FTHIL pop. Vineyard and Rosemont? <i>DG</i> – Is API community in a specific spot in Vineyard. <i>Blanco</i> – The focus should be keeping these small communities together in these large configurations. It’s not that they are going to have a large impact. <i>Blanco</i> – Currently we are splitting Vineyard from Florin and Elk Grove (COI). <i>Raya</i> – Is that community together for CD? <i>J</i> – I believe so. <i>Ancheta</i> – If you are trying to pull Vineyard in based on these figures you have to split. <i>Forbes</i> – Galt and Lodi with Stockton should take priority over keeping API community. <i>J</i> – Split in Rancho Cordova and pick up Vineyard?	
MRCED	West Modesto is included with West Stanislaus county.	<i>FW</i> – Mr. Brown said this was ok and did not retrogress, same with Yuba districts.	ok
KINGS		<i>Ancheta</i> – Is this above 50 percent Latino CVAP? <i>J</i> – Yes. <i>FW</i> – Brown had some questions about Fresno portion. <i>J</i> – I think he might be referring to CDs. <i>FW</i> – We’ll check. <i>Dai</i> – We cleaned up the scoop but split Tulare now. <i>Ancheta</i> – As long as it is compact for Gingles purposes then we can move to our further criteria. <i>Blanco</i> – Does it keep CVAP the same to put the city back together? <i>J</i> – LCVAP is .4 percent higher if Tulare isn’t split but if Tulare is included or not the LCVAP is over 50 percent for both. <i>DG</i> – The issues we are dealing with are city split and Gingles compactness. <i>Blanco</i> – In the valley, this is a recurring theme for us, that small towns that border 99 tend to be closely related and the way that area is built up. The split is predetermined for us.	Work with this version.
TULKE			ok
SBWVE	No change.		ok
WMONT	Goes down to SLO and north to all of Santa Cruz, Gilroy, Morgan Hill, San Martin.		ok
SJOSE		<i>Ward</i> – What COI are we respecting here? <i>T</i> – The E part is uninhabited, big space only has 400 people. Lines in thinner part of district in the center are to keep Berryessa COI together and Little Saigon and Evergreen together.	ok
SNMAT			ok

SF	Small split in South SF.	<i>Ancheta</i> – How much of South SF is split? <i>T</i> – 12k. <i>Ancheta</i> – Which parts of the city, is this an API COI? <i>Dai</i> – Yes previously I asked you the best place to split South SF and you said you used lines based on the API COI. <i>T</i> – Yes. <i>Ancheta</i> – Leave it.	ok
FREOAK		<i>GM</i> – We did have to split San Leandro slightly in this, correct? <i>T</i> – Yes, it is two census tracts, 7554 ppl, I minimize it to the extent that I could. <i>GM</i> – This is a challenging area. San Leandro is whole in AD and CD. Here in the SD it seems like a double whammy, because they are split and not with Eden area. It is not ideal, but we looked at the streets and worked together to have the best split. Eden COI: San Leandro, Ashland, San Lorenzo, and Fairview, Castro Valley and sometimes Hayward and Cherry land. There are parts of San Jose proper? <i>T</i> – Only a little. <i>GM</i> – If we shave off that part of San Jose can we get San Leandro? <i>T</i> – I can only get about 6-7k out of that San Jose part. <i>DG</i> – If you break off San Jose you are pushing too much into Monterey. <i>GM</i> – What would we have to take out to put San Leandro in? <i>T</i> – Split San Jose neighborhoods, split Sunnyvale, and keep moving pop up and go over the bridge. <i>GM</i> – We have a COI that we are not respecting in any district. <i>Dai</i> – SJOSE is under populated. <i>FW</i> – Also recognizing that we are conserving many COIs here: Dublin, Livermore COI, Berryessa COI, etc. <i>Ward</i> – On most Northern boundary what is that? <i>T</i> – County line.	ok
RAMON			ok
RCHMD	Richmond is whole, San Leandro is only split.	<i>GM</i> - It looks like maybe you can swap Rodeo for San Leandro? <i>T</i> – Good thinking but it doesn't work with the FREOAK.	
	<i>NORCAL CDs</i>		
RCMD		<i>DG</i> – This is an opportunity to keep San Leandro whole and with Eden. You can put San Leandro in... <i>T</i> – The Fremont Coalition line is here and I did not split Richmond because I received direction not to.	
YOSON		<i>Blanco</i> – Richmond is in Contra Costa county, and in this CD they are with a rural district. We have gotten a lot of testimony in Richmond, some of the testimony was about not getting split but some was about being in Alameda or Contra Costa. <i>GM</i> – Richmond has not been split in any districts. <i>DG</i> – Richmond would prefer to be with CC or Ala but not Yolo. San Leandro whole with Eden, San Ramon back with its COI. Put northern part of Contra Costa with Yolo and split Richmond and put half with Oakland and half with Contra Costa. <i>Forbes</i> – I agree that putting this in Yolo county is a stretch. <i>FW</i> – Can	Revert to 1st draft maps, use new Monterey which will affect San Jose COIs which we will try to keep COIs together that want to be together (like Evergreen, Golden Triangle, LGBT etc.) but not all of them in the same

	<p>you give us some consequences for <i>DG</i>'s plan? <i>T</i> – This exchange between San Leandro and San Ramon and Dublin can happen. As far as to how to put population back I would have to talk to Jaime. <i>GM</i> – I support <i>DG</i>'s assessment, how big would the Richmond split be? <i>Blanco</i> – I still think that is problematic. <i>DG</i> – Pinole would be dividing line? <i>Blanco</i> – Rodeo, Hercules could go over up North but Pinole down is urban Bay Area. <i>DG</i>- That is all significant population. <i>T</i> – You could split Oakland down the middle and split Fremont and split San Jose communities in half. Those San Jose communities are all tightly packed in. <i>DG</i> – If you have to split it away from urban core, what is the next best choice to put Richmond with? <i>Blanco</i> – Contra Costa. <i>DG</i> – If the ripple effects of Pinole down need to move down. <i>J</i> – That would move Pleasant Hill etc east and split Stockton, eventually cross the Ggate bridge by 200k people. <i>Dai</i> – This is being driven by Monterey district and not splitting Richmond. <i>J</i> – It will take all of Marin county, part of Sonoma. <i>GM</i> – I am most concerned about YOSON district. <i>Blanco</i> – Me too. <i>DG</i> – We can split Richmond but then we have to find a good home for it.</p> <p>DRAFT ONE MAP:</p> <p><i>GM</i> – There are two COIs intact, Eden and Tri-Cities in Alameda and 580 corridor district. <i>T</i>- Part of Fremont is split. <i>Blanco</i> – In so many ways this map keeps so many more COIs together. <i>GM</i> – The alternative view we had causes the small cities to bear the brunt. <i>Dai</i> – We also kept West Valley cities together here, right? <i>T</i> – Yes. <i>Dai</i>- That would be the only version that keeps those cities together. <i>GM</i> – I feel like in this visualization we are able to give more communities some of what they want. Hayward is connected with Tri-Cities, that isn't an exact pairing but we have Eden and Tri-Cities together. But connection to Yolo for Richmond doesn't make sense. We have gotten COI testimony that links flatlands of Oakland with Emeryville and Berkeley and that corridor is not one we have had together in other pairings. <i>Forbes</i> – Richmond into COCO, COCO moves pop into San Joaquin. Oakley and part of Antioch into Solano district and Pittsburgh in SNJOA. <i>GM</i> – I don't think that larger grouping is set. I agree with <i>Blanco</i>'s comments but we could move Richmond around and keep them whole but we might have to split them at least once. <i>Forbes</i> – I am reluctant to keep Fremont whole right now. <i>DG</i> – In this, Richmond is linked with Napa, whether they are linked with Napa or Yolo it is still a problem. Overall, it does a lot more good for keeping San Jose COIs together.</p>	<p>district. Preserve small groups of COIs. Look at Richmond offline on street level for split. Don't cross GGate bridge.</p>
--	---	---

Barabba –But a consequence of this is going over the bridge and creating an SF/Marin district. First draft map is not acceptable because it doesn't adjust to Monterey's changed. So it is not useable. *Dai* – Do you have an alternative that uses the new Monterey district? *T* – If you want to keep Richmond whole you have to cross the GGate bridge. *FW* – Is it possible, if you don't cross the GGate bridge and split Richmond, where would Richmond go? *T* – Some of it would go to Oakland district and the other part would go north. *Blanco* – You could take Richmond west of 80 and you won't have to put El Cerrito and El Sobrante with district below, that doesn't have to be part of the cluster. If you have to split Richmond, split it at 80. *DG* – I would like to see or hear if we keep Monterey as we have to have it and not go over the GGate what the districts will look like. *Blanco* – We got a lot of testimony about keeping Gilroy etc together, but outside of that, they are in CDs that make sense for them. By putting them together we are distorting representation for other Bay Area people. What it has created for Richmond and the cities around it is a problem. If I had a choice between keeping all those communities together and keeping Richmond with ECC or Berkeley/Oakland, I would choose Richmond, even if Richmond was split. Part of Richmond with ECC and part with Oakland district. *Barabba* – Solid line at GGate bridge and keep Monterey lines and see what else they can do. They have heard all the comments that are relative to Richmond and we can split it. *Blanco* – Let's look at street line in Richmond. *GM* – I think the split could reflect the testimony about Richmond being in ECC and Alameda district. *Forbes* – But if you take 200k out of Yolo, what is that going to look like? *FW* – I feel that the way that you preserved San Jose interests and the other COIs, that the new version is better than the draft map.

J – Let's talk about some possibilities. If we want to move Richmond east into COCO, then Antioch would be whole. Concord would be split. Pittsburgh and Bay Point would move out to SNJOA. The 200k people in SNJOA, Stockton, Lodi, and Galt could be moved into YUBA, or Brentwood, Bethel Island, Byron, etc, would be moved into YUBA. Fairfield and Vacaville would move in with Napa. *Blanco* – As it is, Contra Costa is split in 4. *Dai* – What if we looked at first draft map and fixed edges of the districts. San Jose Evergreen area, Berryessa area, the testimony was not to have them all together in same district but just not to split them up. *T* – I might split LGBT COI. *Dai* – We

		<p>don't have to go with other version of the map because the COIs don't want to be split but they don't all have to be together. If we can fix the COI splits, which are more minor. <i>GM</i> – We'd still want to keep Little Saigon with Evergreen and downtown, etc. <i>DG</i> – We don't have much ability to fix Hayward in the congressional. <i>Yao</i> – Public comment about Richmond? <i>DG</i> – Could American Canyon be fixed? <i>Forbes</i> – The biggest one for me would be Santa Rosa. <i>GM</i> – At one point we considered more of an E/W split looking at Richmond. <i>T</i> – The two sides don't have even pop. <i>GM</i> – Same problem as Hayward.</p> <p><i>GM</i> – I just want to say that I think by keeping the Ggbridge as a barrier we are preserving higher income communities at the expense of other communities and that makes me uncomfortable, there was testimony saying that crossing the bridge is ok. <i>DG</i> – I don't have a problem crossing it if it doesn't make more problems but it seems that it does. <i>Dai</i> – I think we have entertained that but it creates problems. <i>FW</i> – I agree. <i>Barabba</i> – I am opposed to crossing the bridge and I am not sure that decision is based on wanting to satisfy needs of the wealthy. <i>Blanco</i> - I am intrigued by <i>GM</i>'s comment but like <i>DG</i> I do not know if crossing the bridge will solve these problems (West Contra Costa with Richmond and San Pablo, or Richmond into Oakland) <i>DG</i> – It seems to me that there is more consensus for this idea but not complete. <i>Forbes</i> – Crossing the GGate bridge for me is unacceptable. I think you gain nothing by crossing the bridge. <i>GM</i> – I don't disagree with <i>Forbes</i>' statement but this configuration is not ideal for everyone.</p>	
		<p><i>J</i> – Population shift will largely be dealt with for North Coast and Yuba, so my current visualizations</p>	
<p>NOCST / NEBAY</p>		<p><i>DG</i> – Take that part of Siskiyou out. <i>FW</i> – A lot of testimony about Del Norte and Marin. <i>DG</i> – Can you go from Santa Rosa and do Napa, So. Solano, Yolo as an E/W district. Keep integrity of Coastal district and take out Siskiyou to allow from Yuba, Sutter, Colusa Lake, So. Yolo... <i>J</i> – Just thinking about the numbers, Yolo would be split, which it is not in the visualizations I prepared for today. <i>Dai</i> – Suggestion from testimony we got from the League of Conservation Voters also had one for the CD. <i>J</i> – I think the image on here is 200k off. They want to go over the bridge. <i>Dai</i> – I think those are choices. Going into the delta makes more sense. <i>J</i> – If you went E then 200k of SE Sonoma plus Napa plus Solano is approx 700k. <i>DG</i> – One thing it to not leave Delta areas down, you would have to bring the line south, taking off part of</p>	<p>South Marin can be included instead of Santa Rosa for NOCST</p>

		<p>Napa and Solano. <i>Forbes</i> – You’ve also left 150k in Yolo county with nowhere to go. <i>J</i> – Yolo can remain whole and go with Yuba.</p> <p><i>J</i> – It would be a whole circle; you would move Santa Rosa over then keep rotating so Richmond is back with RCMD.</p> <p><i>J</i> – South Marin can be included instead of Santa Rosa. I will look into it but I think no Lake. <i>Blanco</i> - We received a lot of comment about this was posted to not put Trinity with the coast. <i>DG</i> – Oh I thought that was Shasta and talking about the others.</p>	
MTCAP	Nevada county is whole except for Truckee. Auburn and North Auburn split from each other but each are whole cities.	<i>DG</i> – Roughly the same, maybe just some pop exchanges with Butte and Glenn. I know that it was our intention to keep Truckee with Lake Tahoe but I think there is a little issue with splitting Truckee from Nevada.	Small note for future: we might have to reunite Truckee with Nevada if we get testimony.
YUBA			
FTHL	Includes Lake Tahoe.	<i>DG</i> – Roseville going all the way to Tulare. <i>Dai</i> – Mono is with this district.	
SACCO			
SAC	City of Sacramento with small split, west Sac and Elk Grove.	<i>Forbes</i> – I would split off Elk Grove and have it join SACCO and I would pick up pop by moving up the 80. <i>DG</i> – Elk Grove up to Folsom? <i>Forbes</i> – Yes, or up to American River. To combine API. I think Sac looks more to the NE than the S. <i>DG</i> – Elk Grove is with Sacramento in AD and SD? <i>J</i> – Yes. <i>FW</i> – I am concerned about what population splits will occur. <i>Forbes</i> – Antelope, Foothill Farms, and Citrus Heights, keeping 80 corridor together makes sense. <i>Raya</i> – It looks like you would split Citrus Heights.	Take out Elk Grove and move it to SACCO. Take NE cities of Antelope, Foothill Farms, Citrus Heights, keeping 80 corridor together and add to SAC
SNJOA		<i>DG</i> – Link Galt back into SACCO if Elk Grove is there. Galt’s schools are with Lodi but its fire and other things are with Elk Grove. <i>Forbes</i> – If you put Galt into SACCO, what will you take out? <i>J</i> – If Galt goes back into SACCO then line near Citrus Heights and Rio Linda moves west and Fairfield split in YUBA moves west then Martinez split move South and Antioch split move East.	
STANI		<i>DG</i> – This is a good, give Lathrop a chance to be with Stockton.	ok
MRCED	Tract below Sunnyside can’t fit for LVAP numbers.	<i>FW</i> – Mr. Brown said this is non-retrogressive.	ok
FRSNO	Now has Squaw Valley.		ok

	Reduces number of splits in Fresno county to 4.		
KINGS	Added Dinuba.	<i>FW</i> – Brown said this could be section 2. We’ll check in with him. J – I have also sent him a visualization of this. I think this might have been the mix up of SD vs. CD re: compactness. <i>Ancheta</i> – I want Mr. Brown’s comments on this area.	ok
KR	Eastern Tulare and remainder of Kern. Moves into Antelope Valley.		ok
SLOB			
EVENT	Includes upper Ojai Valley (based on Unified School District) and changed boundary in Ventura. Ventura Ave is intact and split is drawn along the coast as per direction. (worked with <i>Aguirre</i>) Simi Valley is split by 8k ppl.	<i>DG</i> – We also had an issue with Malibu going North as opposed to going South. Simi Valley has been out of its county for all three districts.	Simi Valley has been out of county for all 3 districts.
	BOE	<i>T</i> – West and East met benchmarks, which is what is driving everything	
WEST	Put Ventura with Coast and not with LA		
EAST			
LA	OC is whole except Lancaster	<i>Parvenu</i> – Ventura county is most appropriately aligned with East and agricultural zone. And I understood them to not want to deviate from that. <i>DG</i> – It looks like the Bakersfield office is out of Kern. <i>Yao</i> – I don’t think we should take these into consideration because they are not stipulated by Prop 11. <i>Raya</i> – I think it is akin to COI testimony. <i>Parvenu</i> – Letters we have from Bill Leonard: there should be exchange, with Ventura going into East. Other comments; Ventura should be with east b/c shared watershed and shared industries and lifestyles. Swapping Ventura with San Fernando. <i>Aguirre</i> – I like this configuration because the COIs really rest with coastal area, agriculture area, urban, etc. <i>Dai</i> – I was going to say that we heard a lot of difference about agriculture along the coast vs. inland, as Tamina pointed out we are in danger of not meeting benchmark. <i>DG</i> – We got permission to break	

		counties. I think that if East and West have to make benchmark then this is how they will do it. <i>FW</i> – I think there might be other options. This is the only option when you’re not splitting counties. <i>K</i> – How would you define this particular COI? How would you want to distribute that? Geo-code them and put an equal number in each district? <i>FW</i> – It looks like 5 offices in each district. <i>K</i> – Those offices are mostly in the districts that have to meet benchmark. <i>Aguirre</i> - They said they might have to move offices around after this. <i>FW</i> – Also they didn’t seem to acknowledge our benchmark. <i>DG</i> – The impact is on staff when they are doing the audits, not on the public who can go to any office. <i>K</i> – They just don’t have a lot of offices in one particular area and I don’t think we can fix that. <i>Parvenu</i> – I just wanted to be clear that I stated their COI testimony for the record so they know that we have acknowledged it. This looks clean and compact to me. <i>Dai</i> – Similar to Mr. Neff’s submitted map. <i>Barabba</i> – If they were able to improve benchmark rates by splitting a county they should. <i>T</i> – We did.	
	<i>SO CAL ADS</i>		
POMVL		<i>FW</i> – Need Brown’s confirmation of both these possible Section 2 districts. Ward – Why did we go into Fontana? <i>FW</i> - Section 2. It is an unincorporated part. <i>Blanco</i> – I don’t remember why this part of Fontana. <i>Dai</i> – This is unincorporated. <i>Blanco</i> - So we didn’t have to break into city proper.	
RLTFO	Grand Terrace is taken out for population.	<i>Dai</i> – We did have testimony about keeping Gran Terrace with Colton.	
SBCUC		<i>Dai</i> – Loma Linda is with Redlands which is what they asked for. <i>Yao</i> – It’s too bad we isolated Rancho Cucamonga. <i>Dai</i> – Yes but there isn’t much to do.	
MISBK	Big Bear area is together.	<i>FW</i> – It is geographically necessary to move to Apple Valley and Hesperia because Big Bear is a big mountain. <i>Dai</i> – This is consistent with COI about high desert area.	
BBCOH		<i>Dai</i> – We were concerned about split in San Jacinto with Hemet. How much in Hemet are we splitting off? <i>J</i> – About 20k in BBCOH. <i>Yao</i> – I think it would be hard to link Palm Springs to 29 Palms. <i>FW</i> – Well that is how you get to 29 Palms. <i>K</i> – I was mapping that area yesterday and they looked at it today too, unless you want a really long skinny district. <i>FW</i> – You have all those little cities in Coachella Valley. <i>Dai</i> – It sounds like you’ve tried. <i>DG</i> –They gave due diligence.	
COACH	All of Imperial, east Riverside. Desert Hot	<i>GM</i> – Why is Cathedral City where we put it? <i>FW</i> – There was one person who commented. Let’s pick up this discussion tomorrow.	

	Springs is split.		
--	-------------------	--	--