

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the matter of
Full Commission Business Meeting

University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law
Classroom C
3200 Fifth Avenue
Sacramento, CA

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

9:00 A.M.

Reported by:
Michael Connolly

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Chair Angelo Ancheta

Gabino Aguirre

Vincent Barabba

Maria Blanco

Cynthia Dai

Michelle DiGuilio

Jodie Filkins-Webber

Stanley Forbes

Michelle Galambos-Malloy

Lilbert "Gil" Ontai

Jeanne Raya

Peter Yao

Staff Present

Dan Claypool, Executive Director

Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel

Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant

Representing Q2

Karin MacDonald

Jamie Clark

Tamina Alon

Kyle Kubas

I N D E X

	PAGE
1. Introduction	4
2. Public Comment	8
3. Discussion of New Web-based Interactive Tool	45
4. Commission discussion of Process for Today's Meeting and for Discussion of Maps	51
5. Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Northern California Congressional Districts)	57
Lunch Break	144
6. Public Comment	145
7. Discussion of Motions and Voting Procedures	149
8. Continuation of direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Northern California Congressional Districts)	153
9. Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Northern California State Assembly Districts)	247
10. Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Northern California State Senate Districts)	348
Public Comment	356
Adjournment	362
Certificate of Reporter	363

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

JULY 13, 2011

9:06 A.M.

CHAIR ANCHETA: Good morning. Today is Wednesday, July 13th and this is a meeting of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. My name is Angelo Ancheta and I am chairing the set of meetings this week. To my left is Commissioner Gil Ontai, who will be vice-chairing and then chairing next week's set of meetings.

Why don't we start by taking roll? So, Ms. Sargis, if you could call roll, please.

MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Aguirre?

(No response.)

MS. SARGIS: Ancheta?

CHAIR ANCHETA: Here.

MS. SARGIS: Barabba?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Here.

MS. SARGIS: Blanco?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Here.

MS. SARGIS: Dai?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Here.

MS. SARGIS: DiGuilio?

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Here.

MS. SARGIS: Filkins-Webber?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Here.

MS. SARGIS: Forbes?

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here.

2 MS. SARGIS: Galambos-Malloy?

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Here.

4 MS. SARGIS: Ontai?

5 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Here.

6 MS. SARGIS: Parvenu.

7 (No response.)

8 MS. SARGIS: Raya?

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Here.

10 MS. SARGIS: Ward?

11 (No response.)

12 MS. SARGIS: Yao?

13 COMMISSIONER YAO: Here.

14 MS. SARGIS: We have a quorum.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we do have a large number of

16 individuals who would like to provide public comment.

17 We're going to try to accommodate as best we can, as many

18 this morning as we can. We do have a slot also for this

19 afternoon. Before we sort of launch into things, let me

20 just give a preview of what we are going to be covering

21 today and over the next couple of days. As the

22 commissioners know and as I hope members of the public have

23 come to know, we are not releasing a second draft map, as

24 was earlier scheduled, this week. However, we are

25 proceeding to continue with our mapping and working with

1 our technical consultants Q2 and will provide we hope
2 sufficient public input into the process.

3 We will be later this morning providing just sort
4 of a quick primer on how to work with the new interactive
5 tool that is being provided through the Statewide Database,
6 which is the official data source for our redistricting
7 data. And it is, we hope, a useful tool, it will allow
8 individuals to actually get down to the street level in
9 terms of viewing the maps. We do hope to have a more
10 traditional format of PDF files at some point later but
11 they will not be available this morning, certainly, or this
12 afternoon. And we hope that the interactive tools along
13 with other files that can be downloaded can be used by all
14 our folks viewing on the Internet and can be useful to the
15 public in terms of public comment.

16 What we are focusing on this morning and this
17 afternoon will be directions to Q2. For those of you who
18 have been following, Q2 has been working with us on all of
19 the districts and at our last set of sessions we did
20 provide direction regarding all of the districts. They
21 will be coming back with the latest visualizations and we
22 will be directing them again today and through Friday. We
23 are still at this point not canceling the Saturday meeting.
24 I'm going to hold that in reserve. We hope to finish
25 before then but just in case we still have that day as well

1 as pretty much every other day except for next Tuesday to
2 go forward. As a general matter, again, we will be
3 covering Northern California as well as the Board of
4 Equalization, we hope, by the end of the day. We will
5 start with the Congressional Districts, work our way
6 through the State Assembly and Senate Districts, and then
7 hit the Board of Equalization later in the day. If we
8 finish earlier, we will perhaps have a little bit of a
9 preview of some of the Southern California districts and
10 look at those in the late afternoon.

11 Let me mention one more thing. Just in terms of
12 process, we have in the past been directing Q2 as much as
13 possible to focus on either a single option or perhaps no
14 more than one or two or, in some cases, three options.
15 During these sessions this week we must narrow down and
16 firm up all of those different districts. So we will take
17 options off the table this week. If it is necessary to
18 call a vote on any particular district because there is not
19 a consensus we will call a vote and I will entertain
20 motions if that happens. If we proceed on consensus that
21 will be great. But, again, if there are some differences
22 of opinion because we do have to at this point narrow it
23 down we will take motions.

24 The other thing that is a little bit different is
25 that we are now trying to formally document the decisional

1 bases for our districts. So both Q2 - and what I would ask
2 for this session and tomorrow and Friday, is for the
3 designated teams, the two-member teams who have been in
4 charge of regions, to help us along in terms of summarizing
5 the basic rationales for the districts and as a back-up if
6 one or both of those team members can sort of take notes.
7 As you know, we are compiling all of these summaries for
8 the final report. Commissioners Dai and Barabba are on top
9 of that process. So we will have sort of a double system
10 with Q2 and commissioners providing information.

11 Okay, we have a lot of speakers. I'm going to cut
12 it a bit. We will still give you some time but I'm going
13 to cut it to about a minute and a half to speak. We will
14 carry over as best we can. We had it only budgeted until
15 nine-thirty but we will carry over because there is a large
16 number. We will have another opportunity if for some
17 reason we have additional speakers lining up. But we will
18 try to get everybody in this morning. And if we are unable
19 to cover everybody we'll still have a session this
20 afternoon. So why don't we begin? We have a sign-up list
21 so I will simply call out your last name, if you weren't
22 sure where you were in the line. So, Ms. Rushing?

23 MS. RUSHING: Thank you. My name is Denise Rushing
24 and I am here as an individual and as a local elected
25 official representing the entire Lake County Board of

1 Supervisors, who unanimously voted to send me here today.

2 I'm here this morning to discuss the Sonoma-Napa-
3 Solano visualization that you discussed last week. The
4 visualization was titled 2001(sic).07.07 Congressional
5 Visualization 4 NEBAY, or Visualization 3 NEBAY. The
6 Commission gave instructions to your staff to include Santa
7 Rosa in this visualization and delete corresponding
8 population from Contra Costa County, namely Richmond and
9 Martinez. This is a great start but on behalf of the Lake
10 County Board of Supervisors I would ask that you include
11 Lake County in the district NEBAY. When I spoke to you at
12 the hearing on the 20th of May in Santa Rosa I said that
13 Lake County is one of the Wine Country Counties with Napa,
14 Sonoma and Mendocino. Your NEBAY map would orphan us and
15 separate us from all of those counties. Leaving us out of
16 NEBAY is in fact the most alarming and worst outcome of
17 this process that we could imagine.

18 We believe you could easily add us back into NEBAY
19 district by subtracting our population of 64,665 from
20 Solano County. Perhaps with this arrangement it would
21 allow you to leave Fairfield whole in the YUBA district.
22 We are a small county. If you have not been to our county,
23 and I assume you haven't, it is easy to make false
24 assumptions about us. We are very much a part of the
25 premium wine industry and in fact our county has worked

1 long and hard to realign our workforce area to be with
2 Napa. Bottom line, we should not be linked with the
3 counties in the Sacramento Valley with whom we share no
4 communities of interest. Thank you.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Forgive me if I
6 mispronounce people's names. Next is Mr. Gunier.

7 MR. GUNIER: Good morning. My name is Rick Gunier
8 and I'm here representing the grape growers of Lake County.

9 We would like you to please reconsider where Lake
10 County is aligned with. We would like to ask that you take
11 us out of the YUBA map that you have us in. We really are
12 an extension of the Napa region. Our highways start in
13 Napa, we have a region called the North Coast that is made
14 up of Napa and Lake Counties, we have very little to do in
15 selling into the YUBA region that you have us assigned to.
16 They primarily sell into the Sacramento Valley and those
17 type of locations. I appreciate your reconsidering this.
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you, sir. I'm really going
20 to mispronounce this name. Wagenknecht.

21 MR. WAGENKNECHT: Connect the wagon, Wagenknecht.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Oh, okay.

23 MR. WAGENKNECHT: I'm Brad Wagenknecht and I'm a
24 supervisor and a citizen of Napa County. And you've heard
25 from a couple of my colleagues.

1 And one of the things that we've been pushing and
2 trying to really make clear is that we would like to have a
3 district that had agriculture at its base, premium wine
4 agriculture in particular. I appreciate that you've
5 changed and added part of our little American Canyon back
6 into our district. That is wonderful, that has been good
7 for Napa and its neighbor and our little American Canyon
8 city. What I would like to ask today is that we look at
9 Lake County and try to back up what my peers from Lake
10 County have asked and have the third premium wine area in
11 our district. The 64,000 could be subtracted from Solano
12 or Contra Costa County and put in there. With this latest
13 visualization the Commission has rejected the alignment of
14 Napa with northern Sacramento Valley counties, with whom we
15 share no communities of interest. Removing the Contra
16 Costa part would also remove a part that we have very
17 little community of interest with. And so thank you.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you, sir. Odiri Napper?

19 MS. NAPPER: Good morning. My name is Odiri Napper
20 and I'm from the Greater Sacramento Urban League.

21 I'm here just to encourage you to reconsider your
22 proposed new district map due to the extreme effects that
23 it has on African-Americans in the Los Angeles area. Using
24 methods and techniques to divide cohesive communities will
25 only produce legislatures that neither represent its

1 constituents nor reflect the diversity and voice of those
2 citizens in those areas. An alternative would be linking
3 east Ventura County to the City of Santa Clarita in one
4 district while keeping the Santa Monica Mountains with a
5 West LA district, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood in another
6 district. This would be a configuration that offers a more
7 balanced population in the West LA area.

8 So, again we encourage you to just reconsider your
9 propose maps and consider the extreme effects that it has
10 on African-Americans and their representation in the Los
11 Angeles area. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: A quick question. Is that
13 for Senate, Congressional, Assembly, or what?

14 MS. NAPPER: It's for the Congressional.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Thank you.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Mr. Miller?

17 MR. MILLER: Good morning, commissioners. Thank
18 you for allowing me to speak. My name is Glenn Miller, I'm
19 the Mayor Pro-tem of the City of Indio.

20 I bring greetings from the Coachella Valley, I
21 traveled all the way down here, this is how important it is
22 to the Coachella Valley. We are very concerned that the
23 Commission now is looking at dividing up the Coachella
24 Valley into two in the Assembly District. The first map
25 that was brought towards us showed the Coachella Valley as

1 whole, as one, how it used to be 20 years ago. We've
2 waited 10 years to allow the Coachella Valley to speak as
3 one voice. All out cities that we have are intertwined. I
4 have letters here I would like to enter in the record, I
5 have one for each one, from all the affected mayors, all
6 the council members from all the area, prominent
7 businessmen and also community leaders that want the
8 Coachella Valley to stay as one, whole as one voice. It
9 was a very competitive district that you wrote up on our
10 Assembly race. You've left the Senate and Congressional
11 races pretty much in those areas where it encompasses the
12 whole Coachella Valley. But for some reason you decided on
13 the second visualization to take out parts of the Coachella
14 Valley that are intertwined with the rest of the Coachella
15 Valley.

16 There is about 400,000 people in the Coachella
17 Valley. We continue to utilize services through economic
18 development. We are no longer an agricultural town or an
19 agricultural community. We have two new college campuses
20 there that intertwine all the cities that paid into them.
21 We've got the economic partnerships that every city has
22 paid into. We have CVAG, which is the Coachella Valley
23 Association of Governments. We implore you to make sure
24 that the rest of the Coachella Valley has one voice. We've
25 waited 10 years for this. We would like to speak as one,

1 we want to hold our representatives responsible. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Ms. Swenson?

4 MS. SWENSEN: I'm Ellen Swenson. I'm also from the
5 Coachella Valley.

6 I know that you're getting conflicting public
7 testimony about what to do with our area. One option is to
8 combine Imperial County with the Coachella Valley. And I'm
9 here to say that, unfortunately, that testimony is largely
10 politically driven. And I'm handing out proof of that,
11 evidence that there are political activists in our area
12 from one party - I won't mention the party - who are trying
13 to get people to write in and for political reasons combine
14 our area with Imperial County. And also in there you will
15 see one of the activists has provided boilerplate letters
16 that you just fill your name in. And if you go back and
17 look at the testimony it's largely kind of weak, not really
18 strong COI evidence for doing this and also a lot of
19 repeated boilerplate-type letters.

20 In contrast, we who want to keep the Coachella
21 Valley tourism COI intact and within Riverside County, we
22 are coming from an economic standpoint. And to prove that
23 our site is not being political, the maps we like which are
24 from June 10th are actually balanced on political parties.
25 So we are not advocating for some maps that favor one party

1 over another, we're strictly going on our shared
2 livelihoods, our shared economy of tourism.

3 And finally, I think there is some notion that
4 eastern San Diego does not want to be districted with
5 Imperial County. But as of this morning I looked and all
6 the letters that came in, there were only eight people who
7 have written in from San Diego County rejecting Imperial,
8 rejecting the border districts that you drew. So I'm not
9 sure why you are trying to decouple East San Diego from
10 Imperial and put them with us. But my concern is that
11 there is political motivation behind it. So that's why I
12 want to bring that to your attention, respectfully. Thank
13 you so much.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Congresswoman Watson?

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: May I ask a quick
16 question of the last speaker, actually?

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Certainly.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: In your letter
19 you're basing the analysis of the suggested district on the
20 economy. One of the arguments for keeping Coachella and
21 Imperial together is really based on an agricultural
22 economy and I don't see any mention of agriculture in this
23 submission. Can you speak to that point?

24 MS. SWENSEN: Yes. I think there is a
25 misconception that the Coachella Valley has agriculture.

1 Indio, which people think of as date palms, hosts
2 international polo now all winter long. It is completely
3 different. There is a little bit of agriculture, largely
4 ornamental palm trees and things that actually, again,
5 support the resort community there in Indio. But we are
6 not agricultural, we are tourism, resorts, we have 150 golf
7 courses, we have concerts, casinos, hotels, conventions.
8 That's our economy. We are not agricultural and we really
9 don't belong. Nothing against Imperial County, but our
10 voice will be diluted with agricultural concerns and border
11 concerns if we are districted with them. Thank you.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

13 MS. WATSON: Good morning. I'm Diane Watson a
14 congresswoman retired.

15 The redistricting plans currently under
16 consideration would effectively and completely cut out long
17 time African-American strongholds of political power,
18 unfairly dividing the African-American population in the
19 33rd, the 35th and the 37th Congressional Districts. The
20 net result is only one African-American seat. We have come
21 here to be heard and we want to see that our communities,
22 seen as communities of mutual interest, are protected.
23 Don't destroy our political presentation. The formula 2, 3
24 and 4 should remain. In LA County two State Senate seats,
25 three Congressional Districts and four Assembly Districts

1 are justified by the US Census count. At least let us be
2 heard and give us consideration. The Voting Rights Act was
3 passed to protect us. I come out of retirement to say to
4 you that the four African-Americans that now represent our
5 districts would be cut by 50 percent. Thank you.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. I have Mr. Santos
7 next.

8 MR. SANTOS: Good morning, commissioners. My name
9 is Sergio U. Santos, former president of the UAW that
10 represented 5000 workers who were laid off when the plant
11 shut down.

12 I'm here today because it seems that this
13 Commission has thrown out our testimony and has gone back
14 to the first draft map. We should take the Tri-Cities
15 community of interest into consideration. Personally, I
16 have come to these meetings many times and relayed the
17 message to this Commission that the Tri-Cities and their
18 local economy needs to be represented by unified federal
19 representation tied to Hayward. The Tri-Cities and Hayward
20 have had to deal with this terrible economic condition in
21 recent years. For example, the closure of the Nummi Plant
22 in Fremont resulted in over 5000 people losing their jobs.
23 We are recovering and doing so with new operations like the
24 Tesla and Solyndra factories. But to get to that point
25 would have been impossible without unified representation

1 at federal level and all of our cities and communities
2 working together.

3 Commissioner Malloy, as a resident of Alameda
4 County I know you in particular understand how difficult it
5 has been for working families. We are hoping humbly that
6 you will give us a voice in these congressional maps.
7 Please take our testimony into consideration and either
8 revert back to one of the earlier visualizations or work
9 with the current draft to unite the Tri-Cities with
10 Hayward. At least a hundred people from our area alone
11 have contacted you to ask you to keep the Tri-Cities whole
12 and united with Hayward. There is overwhelming testimony
13 to do as much. Please take our testimony into
14 consideration. Thank you again.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, thank you. Mr. Therman?

16 MR. THERMAN: Hello, Commissioners. My name is
17 Richard Therman. I am a single parent and I'm here today
18 because it was said that it would be revisiting Northern
19 California.

20 There seems to have been a lack of testimony from
21 San Leandro, where I was born and raised, and I am here
22 today to remind you of what is important to us and take it
23 in consideration. All that we want in San Leandro is to be
24 able to stay whole as a city in our districts. We have
25 never been separated on account of our smaller population.

1 It would be horrible for us to be split. You split us in
2 both the Assembly and Congressional drafts. Rather than
3 focusing on keeping us whole, this Commission has talked
4 about where we go. What is important to San Leandro is to
5 stay whole. That, as our mayor has asked and countless
6 others in San Leandro have asked, if anything we have more
7 in common with Oakland than with Hayward or other Tri-
8 Cities. The only draft I've seen that keeps San Leandro
9 whole regards to the Congressional is the Tri-Cities
10 proposal. And I believe one of the two visualizations for
11 our second draft. Please take into consideration our
12 testimony to keep San Leandro whole. Thank you.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you, sir. Mr. Franks? And
14 folks if they are in line can come closer and maybe sit
15 behind the speaker to speed things along.

16 MR. FRANKS: Thank you for having me today. My
17 name is Anthony Franks, I'm a 23-year resident of
18 Livermore, California.

19 I had given my testimony to the Commission before
20 so that they may know what people in the area are thinking
21 and incorporate it into the line drawing process. However,
22 I came to learn that recently this Commission reverted back
23 to the first map draft that did not take my testimony into
24 consideration. This is not right. I am here today to ask
25 the Commission to either revert back to the new

1 visualization that took our testimonials into
2 consideration. I had told this Commission before that the
3 people of Pleasanton, Livermore, and the surrounding valley
4 areas do not want to be connected to the more coastal areas
5 of Alameda County; rather we would like to be in a valley
6 district. This new visualization did that. One way to
7 draw such a map for the Congressional is to connect the
8 Alameda County Valley to the Silicon Valley, which would
9 also support our local economic, research and development
10 markets for the Livermore Labs and research and development
11 projects within Pleasanton to be drawn in with a part of
12 the research and development orientated Silicon Valley. It
13 would be great for our local economy. Another way to do
14 this is to unite us with Contra Costa. What is
15 unacceptable is the draft map that this Commission has
16 reverted to. Thank you.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Ms. Ramanruthi?

18 MS. RAMANRUTHI: Good morning. Thank you. I also
19 want to thank Commissioner Forbes for really listening to
20 the citizens' input and we appreciate it and we salute you
21 for that. And I also want to thank Commissioner Malloy for
22 trying to understand to keep Fremont in Alameda and we want
23 to appeal to you the importance of keeping the Tri-City
24 areas together and with Hayward. And we were really
25 pleased with the second visualization that put Hayward,

1 Fremont and the Tri-City areas together but we were really
2 surprised to see that the Commission wanted to go back to
3 the first draft, which is really not what the citizens want
4 because we have nothing in common. We have repeatedly told
5 - this is my third personal appearance in front of the
6 Commission to plead our case for Congressional District,
7 not to put us with the Tri-Valley area that is Dublin,
8 Pleasanton and Livermore. We have nothing in common with
9 them. We are neither geographically contiguous or
10 economically the same thing. Our challenges and needs are
11 different from theirs. So I really beg you and urge you to
12 listen to the citizens' input and instruct Q2 to come up
13 with - stick with the visualization that put is with Tri-
14 Cities together and Hayward. We really appreciate it.
15 Thank you so much.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. And I can't read this
17 next name. Jara -

18 MS. DANFODIO: Good morning, commissioners. I want
19 to repeat what Shobana said and pay specific thanks to
20 Commissioners Malloy and Forbes for hearing us out. I'm
21 from Newark and I've been a resident of that city for the
22 last 15 years and I've worked and attended school there.
23 And I know the area of Fremont, Hayward and Union City very
24 well. And, like Shobana said, our interests are very
25 similar. We are not similar at all to Livermore.

1 I want to tell you a little story about applying
2 for a job in Livermore and I had to travel about 30 minutes
3 through hills and farm country to get to Livermore. It was
4 just a completely different setting from what I was use to.
5 And we've already heard from a representative from that
6 area who doesn't want to link up with us. And there's a
7 good reason for that. We're just very dissimilar. So I
8 would urge you to consider the visualization that
9 incorporates the Tri-Cities together, keeping them
10 together. We're more citified and they are a little bit
11 more rural. So please consider that when you're drawing up
12 the maps. Thanks.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Mr. Hutchins?

14 MR. HUTCHINS: Thank you very much. My name is
15 Henry Hutchins and I am a resident for 16 years of Fremont
16 and for Alameda County for 20 years.

17 I come to you with my concern as an African-
18 American activist about what you are doing. I'm very
19 interested in seeing that the Tri-City areas are pulled
20 together in an effective district that has served us well.
21 One of the things that is important about this area is that
22 there has been a tremendous growth in the number of
23 African-American and Hispanics in south Alameda County.
24 And this adds to a rich diversity that the area has
25 historically had. If you cut the area in half it destroys

1 a growth pattern that is effective and is doing great
2 things for our community. I think that the representation
3 - we've had a lot of firsts. For instance, in August my
4 daughter, who was an honor student at Archbishop Mitty in
5 San Jose, will be an intern in a congressional office.
6 This is a first.

7 So you've got a situation where our kids are
8 beginning to interact with the other kids of the community
9 and it becomes really important. The representation we
10 have had consistently has been powerful and strong. We
11 think that as a community this area is growing effectively
12 and if you go back to the first map you are destroying this
13 growth pattern. We ask you not to do it. We think that
14 you're doing a great job but you will do an even better job
15 if you take these interests into your consideration. Thank
16 you very much.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Mr. Aziz? And again,
18 folks, just to speed things along, if they can try to get
19 close to the mic as they are coming forward.

20 (Audience member asks the Chair to name the next
21 few speakers so they can get in line.)

22 Okay, sure. So I've got Aziz, then Murphy-Hasan,
23 Williams and then Debbs.

24 MR. AZIZ: Hello again, Commission. You know,
25 you've heard a lot from both myself and the people from my

1 area but on top of that you've heard from people all around
2 Alameda County. And we've sent the message that we want to
3 draw the lines for our own district. We want to have a say
4 in what we - you know, in our representation. And, you
5 know, the Tri-Cities proposal was the product of that. And
6 with the alarming decision of this Commission to turn to
7 the first draft we are really making two asks from you
8 guys. One, either please revisit the second visualizations
9 where you take our very - I mean, just lots and lots of
10 testimony into consideration; or you look at our proposal
11 that works directly with the first draft map. We do
12 everything in the area that this Commission tried to do,
13 like put Richmond in with Contra Costa County, keep San
14 Leandro whole, make sure the valley is separate from the
15 coastal sides of Fremont. But on top of that there is
16 still room to work. Please work with this proposal if you
17 decide not to go back to the first draft.

18 For example, to take in the Milpitas and Berryessa
19 COI you can actually take out San Ramon and Dublin from
20 what we have proposed and add that, give or take six to
21 twelve thousand people, to Milpitas and the Berryessa area
22 to give them the connection they wanted with Fremont. At
23 this point beggars can't be choosers and we're just asking
24 for our area to be together. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. And, again, Murphy-

1 Hasan, Williams, Debbs and then Murray after that.

2 MS. MURPHY-HASAN: Good morning. My name is Aliane
3 Murphy-Hasan and please bear with me but I have laryngitis.
4 I was called out last night to come to the City of
5 Sacramento to support the African-American concern and
6 called last night to come to this Commission to speak to
7 the African-American concern.

8 I am the founding member of MLK 365 here in
9 Sacramento and a member of the African-American Leader
10 Coalition, also here in Sacramento. Although I reside in
11 Sacramento, I'm a resident of California. African-
12 Americans must be heard in this process. We implore the
13 Commission to hear what we have to say and to pay close
14 attention to our concerns and the history and the regions
15 affected by the latest proposed map. We want Black
16 political representation and opportunity maintained in LA
17 and throughout the state. The way in which the Voting
18 Rights Act is being used will cause great harm to the
19 diverse communities in the LA area. Black Californians
20 work in coalition across ethnic and cultural boundaries to
21 achieve various goals. In the Inland Empire that means
22 keeping eastern Los Angeles County connected with
23 communities in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.
24 There is nothing wrong with crossing county boundaries that
25 respect the political views and the residents of Colton,

1 Rialto and San Bernardino.

2 MS. SARGIS: That's time.

3 MS. MURPHY-HASAN: I want to close with I hope that
4 you hear what we have to say today -

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

6 MS. MURPHY-HASAN: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would like to ask
8 if folks do have written comments that are not given this
9 short time constraint for the public comments that we do
10 read those in detail. So if you have something written,
11 please do leave it with our staff.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Good morning. My name
13 is Betty Williams, I'm the president of the Sacramento
14 branch of the NAACP.

15 This is my first time addressing the Commission and
16 I wish it were unnecessary. I wish this Commission had
17 avoided showing blatant disregard as of late for the
18 concerns of Black California, whether they are in
19 Sacramento or Los Angeles. When do we get to see the
20 Commission that gave us fair first draft? When do we see
21 the group of common people who are making our process
22 better for working women and men across the state? I
23 stopped in this morning to say that we need to all calm
24 ourselves and work in unity toward a product that is worthy
25 of a broad support. Please keep Sacramento linked in the

1 South Sacramento area with Elk Grove and don't forget the
2 concerns of our friends down south. Please don't
3 disenfranchise our African-American community with poor
4 reasoning and unsound cause. Thank you.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. So we've got Debbs,
6 Murray, Eisenhammer and then Stratton.

7 MR. DEBBS: Good morning to the Commission. My
8 name is Joe Debbs. I've been a voter in the state for most
9 of my life.

10 I want to refer to the July 12th article written by
11 Dan Waters implying that the Citizens Redistricting
12 Committee is collapsing and caving to the outside
13 interests. I want you to remember the first time that you
14 thought about getting on this Committee before you were
15 selected and what your motives were and your intent. Go
16 back to that first time. So I'm not trying to believe what
17 Dan Walters is writing in a newspaper about this
18 Commission. Some people want this done right, some people
19 don't care if it's done wrong, and others just want what
20 they want. I'm asking you to think about why and what you
21 really want to do. I live in Elk Grove, California,
22 connected to South Sacramento. I used to be the chair of
23 the County Planning Commission for six years, three years
24 as the chair. I've seen the demographics finally settle
25 and they are fair. To disrupt that would be a travesty.

1 You can do it now or the courts are going to do it later.
2 Hopefully, you will do what the public entrusted you to do
3 because the electives could not do it. This policy has to
4 fit the rationale and hopefully your plan is a cogent,
5 credible plan and is also accompanied by transparency.
6 Please think about what you're doing with this process.
7 Don't emulate what we used to do in the past. You're on
8 the right track of doing this thing right, do not get off
9 the side.

10 MS. SARGIS: Time.

11 MR. DEBBS: You tell me to shut up as quick as my
12 wife does.

13 (Laughter.)

14 Thank you.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Is there a question?

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yes. Sir, if you
17 don't mind, one quick question. You mention in your
18 testimony about linking South Sacramento and Elk Grove
19 areas. Would you prioritize that at the Assembly level, at
20 the Senate level, at the Congressional level? Could you
21 give us a bit more detail?

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: And please use the microphone, too.

23 MR. DEBBS: Excuse me. It's the Assembly and
24 after the Assembly I would probably suspect it's been doing
25 at the Congressional level as well. Because the voting in

1 this last election showed that the demographics is
2 beginning to settle. So please do not use the Voting
3 Rights Act against itself.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I have a question also.

5 MR. DEBBS: Yes?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: When you say South
7 Sacramento, what boundaries do you put on that?

8 MR. DEBBS: Okay, I live in Elk Grove.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

10 MR. DEBBS: And I live between Laguna and Sheldon.
11 As you know, Sheldon runs down the middle of Elk Grove.
12 And then Sacramento City kicks up. If you go down Sheldon
13 east that is still a part of the city, if you go west there
14 is a part and then there is a large contingent that is
15 right on the border of Franklin Boulevard, which runs north
16 and south. So in that area they are trying to split that
17 area off from the south area. And it took us a long time,
18 even on the local level, to get representation on the local
19 level, the city council.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And what would you consider
21 to be the northern boundary?

22 MR. DEBBS: The northern boundary would probably be
23 Mack Road, okay? Because there is a large concentration of
24 African-Americans and if they dissect that we will be done
25 for. Because it took years for that demographic to settle.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Thank you.

2 MR. DEBBS: So we want to see it stay intact.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Great, thank you. And,
4 commissioners, let's try to limit the questions as well
5 because we still have a high volume of speakers. Thank
6 you.

7 MR. MURRAY: Hi. My name is Raymone Murray. I am
8 a member of the NAACP, I'm actually the vice-president at a
9 Sacramento branch, youth chapter.

10 I have joined you this morning to share my concerns
11 about the current redistricting process and its impact on
12 the African-American community. The Citizens Redistricting
13 Commission should listen to all citizens. I'm concerned
14 that our voices will not be heard and listened to in this
15 conversation. I understand that the Commission is called
16 to create fair district lines. We ask the Commission to
17 make certain that it does not disenfranchise the African-
18 American communities while drawing those lines. Your work
19 product will impact my life significantly. Please don't
20 harm my future or disenfranchise my neighbors, loved ones
21 and friends. Thanks for listening.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. So we have Eisenhammer,
23 Stratton, Harris, Lee and then Stone.

24 MR. EISENHAMMER: Hi. My name is Eric Eisenhammer
25 and I am originally from Agoura.

1 I am here to comment on the East Ventura seat. I
2 was disturbed to see the other day that you guys were
3 considering linking us together with the south San Fernando
4 Valley and Bel Air. I believe it would make a lot more
5 sense to link us with Santa Clarita Valley, Agua Dulce on
6 up to Palmdale. My family is originally from the southern
7 San Fernando Valley. Everybody on my street moved to our
8 area to get away from that area. Our area is a lot more
9 suburban, sometimes even semirural than Bel Air and
10 southern San Fernando Valley. So I would encourage you
11 guys to not link us with them but to link us with Santa
12 Clarita Valley and on up to Agua Dulce and Palmdale.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right, thank you.

14 MR. STRATTON: Good morning. My name is Thomas
15 Stratton and I'm here representing Black Africans in State
16 Service.

17 As a California voter I thank you for your work on
18 this Commission and I'm here to ensure African-American
19 voters are treated fairly by our Citizens Redistricting
20 process. I endorse the efforts of the African-American
21 Redistricting Collaborative and NAACP and I encourage this
22 Commission to do the same. We accept your first draft and
23 unity maps. Historically, African-Americans have fought
24 not simply for political representation but the right to be
25 recognized as citizens. So it is a sense of political

1 equality that bonds us together.

2 We encourage this Commission to recall the lessons
3 of Black history while making decision that will impact the
4 future of African-Americans. We strongly encourage you to
5 maintain current levels of African-American political
6 representation throughout California. It is essential to
7 our well-being as a state that you consider how important
8 it is for you as our representatives to defend current
9 Black political representation. We are certain that
10 maintaining Black political interests in our state is good
11 for all Californians. Thank you.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. So Harris, Lee, Stone
13 and Huffman.

14 MS. HARRIS: Good morning. I'm Cindy Harris and I
15 was speaker number 20 at our Stockton meeting.

16 I'm back here to basically thank you for this new
17 map. It wasn't our first choice but we're excited that
18 this current map - and I'm talking Assembly, the current
19 Assembly map - is very good for us. It keeps us
20 diversified as a district, keeping with South Sacramento
21 and Elk Grove, we're tickled with that. We are all growing
22 communities, we're on the Highway 99 corridor, that's what
23 we wanted. In looking at the map there is not much else
24 that we would suggest. We are happy with it as it is and
25 we would like you to pack up and go home on that one. So

1 it really is. We have been on the tail end of Huber's
2 district for a long time there, too. We don't mind that
3 spot and we know how to work with it. So this would be
4 pretty much the same.

5 That's pretty much it. I mean, we're very please
6 and we hope that this map will remain. Like I said, you
7 can pack up and go home with this one. We appreciate it.
8 Thank you very much.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

10 MR. LEE: Good morning, commissioners. My name is
11 Larry Lee, I'm president and general manager of the
12 Sacramento Observer newspaper.

13 I and other Black newspaper publishers throughout
14 the state have been tracking the developments of this
15 Commission and have been frankly disappointed and concerned
16 with what we have observed: a Citizens Commission that
17 seems to not listen, a Citizens Commission that embraces
18 perspectives of many in one set of maps and then only a
19 select few in other maps, a Commission that connects South
20 Sacramento to Elk Grove, keeps Oakland whole, the Inland
21 Empire in good position and Los Angeles with a 2-3-4 plan -
22 that's two Senate, three Congressional and four Assembly
23 Districts plan. Could this be the same Commission that
24 divides Sacramento, threatens Oakland with being split
25 multiple times and uses the Voting Rights Act against

1 African-Americans in Los Angeles? Could this also be the
2 same body that separates parts of the high desert in
3 Ventura and LA Counties, which pressures populations across
4 all of South Los Angeles?

5 You each have the chance to write the next part of
6 the narrative of this Commission. We look forward to what
7 you choose to be your next headline. Thank you.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

9 MR. STONE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Aubry
10 Stone, president and CEO of the California Black Chamber
11 and for the sake of time I'll paraphrase my notes.

12 I will simply say that I represent that part of the
13 African-American community consistent with economic
14 development and private enterprise. And we at the Black
15 Chamber believe in maintaining and advancing all that
16 improves economic justice. Congresswoman Watson outlined
17 very clearly our desires and I concur completely. Southern
18 California districts are unique and complex to its
19 political culture and its historical reasoning. It was
20 designed that way for a reason, if you understand the
21 history of California and the African-American experience.
22 I would encourage the Commission to focus its direction and
23 work towards honoring Southern California's tradition by
24 maintaining the African-American political representation.
25 And note that political representation is merely an

1 extension of creating and maintaining economically
2 sustainable African-American communities. Thank you very
3 much.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. So we have Huffman,
5 Snipes, Medina and then Payton.

6 MS. HUFFMAN: Good morning. Alice Huffman, State
7 NAACP, back again.

8 Thank you for not issuing those unready maps last
9 week. It gave us great heart. And, as you can see, our
10 community has turned out to impress upon you the importance
11 of keeping our representation and our political clout that
12 we had and we have as you started this process. I did look
13 at the Southern California maps and I just want to make a
14 couple of specific comments because I will return again and
15 I don't want to keep repeating myself. But you group
16 Ventura County with West Los Angeles and that pushed the
17 Black community into each other at every level.

18 You can take care of this problem if you were to
19 vet on the Orange County border and keep Ventura County
20 connected to the high desert. You may find that Los
21 Angeles does not have to be squeezed. And this is
22 particularly the case because if you group Santa Monica
23 Mountains with West Los Angeles, Beverly Hills and West
24 Hollywood, these communities have much in common with each
25 other. And it would then open up the process to keep our

1 political clout together. Those communities are in
2 entertainment, they are an industry in and of themselves
3 and they kind of belong together. So we are suggesting
4 that you try to, as you're going through these last
5 iterations and visualization, that you try something to not
6 squeeze our communities down to two and to keep our current
7 political power as we had when we started the process, as
8 was given to us by the courts. Thank you very much. And I
9 know you do have a hard job and I do keep coming back
10 because I want to work with you every step of the way.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Great, thank you, Ms. Huffman. So
13 we have Snipes, Medina, Payton and Salaverry.

14 MR. SNIPES: Good morning, commissioners. Tim
15 Snipes from the Peoples Advocate.

16 I'm here again primarily today to say thank you. I
17 was not able to stick around on Saturday to say thank you
18 but was able to watch your deliberations. I wanted to
19 thank you for listening to the overwhelming testimony in
20 favor or linking the East Ventura Senate seat to Santa
21 Clarita. Much of that testimony was reinforced here this
22 morning. Now I would like to encourage you to please
23 follow through and ensure that Q2 draws those lines in
24 accordance with the overwhelming public testimony and your
25 own agreement on Saturday. Thank you.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

2 MS. MEDINA: I'm Vicki Medina with the Antelope
3 Valley Board of Trade.

4 I spoke to you in Lancaster about the importance of
5 creating two high desert Assembly seats, one for the
6 Antelope Valley covering Lancaster, Palmdale, Rosamond and
7 California City, and one centered in the Victor Valley
8 communities of Adelanto, Hesperia, Victorville and Apple
9 Valley. Those districts should be nested into one Senate
10 district. In your first draft maps you did just about a
11 perfect job. Senate district MISKL totally protected our
12 high desert community of interest. Please do not replace
13 it with a district not one person has asked for that was
14 visualized just last week. The recent visualization
15 combining the San Fernando Valley, Pacoima, Santa Clarita
16 and splitting the Antelope Valley and Lancaster and
17 Palmdale not only rips apart our community of interest but
18 it also ignores the public testimony from East Ventura,
19 Santa Clarita, the Antelope Valley and the Victor Valley.

20 Within MISKL you drew two great Assembly districts,
21 LAAVV covering Lancaster, Palmdale and Adelanto, and MISVK
22 covering Mono and Inyo Counties, East Kern, Apple Valley,
23 Hesperia and Victorville. Just last week when going over
24 those Assembly districts commissioners lamented that
25 Adelanto was split from the Victor Valley cities. There is

1 an easy fix for this. The mayor of Adelanto and the
2 Rosamond Municipal Advisory Council, their elected town
3 council, and East Kern have both written letters in support
4 of swapping Adelanto and East Kern between these two
5 districts. It preserves both our Antelope Valley-East Kern
6 community of interest and the Victor Valley community of
7 interest. Thank you.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. So we have Payton,
9 Salaverry, De La Libertad, Silva and Jones.

10 MR. PAYTON: Good morning. I'm Allen Payton, I'm
11 the chairman of the Contra Costa Citizens Redistricting
12 Task Force and part of the CCAG.

13 I'm here to remind the Commission of what we've
14 been working on since day one and that is to have an East
15 Bay Congressional district that is east of the Oakland and
16 East Bay Hills and that, from the fact that I live in
17 Antioch and we're talking about a Congressional district
18 that is going to make up the Tri-Valley of Livermore,
19 Pleasanton and Dublin along with the San Ramon Valley,
20 LaMorinda, Walnut Creek, Clayton, along Ygnacio Valley Road
21 and in Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Bethel
22 Island, Byron and Knightsen. And if there is going to be a
23 portion of Contra Costa in with Solano it makes sense to
24 have those sections that are connected by the Benicia
25 Bridge, which is 680, and the Carquinez Bridge, which is

1 80, and that's Concord, Pleasant Hill, Martinez and then
2 Hercules, Rodeo, Crockett over there. And we're asking
3 that it not be split up more than three.

4 We have maps that are going to be here this
5 afternoon. Our gentleman is on his way to the
6 redistricting site in Berkeley. We tried to finish it last
7 night but we couldn't before we had to be kicked out at ten
8 p.m., which was nice that we could be there that late. But
9 nevertheless, also our plan keeps the Tri-City whole in
10 Union City, Fremont and Newark. So that hopefully will
11 satisfy that issue in that area. So we will have those
12 later today when they get emailed to us and we will provide
13 them to you on mobile disk. Thank you.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

15 MR. SALAVERRY: Good morning, commissioners. Dave
16 Salaverry of the CCAG.

17 Today the Commission is scheduled to draw maps for
18 Northern California. I would like you to know that our
19 mapper, Chris Bowman, is on his way over or already at the
20 Berkeley Redistricting Center finishing up maps we will
21 submit today. The problem we had was with the Section 5
22 retrogression in Yuba.

23 But I also want to talk about partisan balance.
24 The Commission was designed and approved by voters to
25 ensure partisan balance. There are five Democrats, five

1 Republicans and four independents. And, although
2 partisanship is forbidden in your line drawing, I believe
3 there are political realities that you need to keep in
4 mind. All of you are here in part representing the
5 political parties you are members of. Had the drafters of
6 the propositions not wanted balanced districts that reflect
7 party registration they would have written a different
8 initiative. Had voters not expected balance by party they
9 would not have passed the propositions. As I'm sure the
10 Commission is aware, the chairman of the California
11 Republican Party has sent several letters to you recently.
12 These letters basically put you on notice that Republican
13 leaders believe that you are crossing lines that may lead
14 to lawsuits. Other Republican leaders have weighed in as
15 well on the fairness issue. On March 18th an important
16 Republican leader, Mr. Charles Munger, testified in front
17 of this Commission. Now, I don't know Mr. Munger well and
18 I'm not speaking for him.

19 MS. SARGIS: Time.

20 MR. SALAVERY: Okay. However, I would like to
21 remind you that he said you are the crucible, you are the
22 test and we that we expect fair maps. Thank you.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

24 MR. DE LA LIBERTAD: Good morning, commissioners.
25 My name is Armando De La Libertad and I'm the CEO of an

1 organization called the Delhi Center, which is a 41-year-
2 old nonprofit organization in Orange County that has over
3 32,000 visitors each year.

4 I provided testimony on June 18th and I want to
5 thank you for your efforts today. I first want to ask you
6 to please keep Santa Ana and Anaheim together within the
7 same Congressional district. I understand there may be
8 some discussion tomorrow about the possibility of
9 separating those two and that would be counter to the
10 public sentiment expressed by many testimonials at the June
11 18th hearing. I also want to share that I strongly oppose
12 the Senate visualization maps for Orange County because
13 they connect working class Santa Ana with the much, much
14 wealthier communities of Villa Park and the Orange Hills as
15 well as some beach cities. Instead, please consider
16 pairing the Santa Ana- Anaheim Assembly visualization
17 district with the Anaheim-Fullerton district to nest them
18 within one Senate district that encompasses the similar
19 communities of Santa Ana, Anaheim, Fullerton, Buena Park
20 and Stanton. This makes sense from an historical
21 perspective because Anaheim, Fullerton and Santa Ana have
22 similar agricultural histories, it makes sense when
23 thinking about the needs of children because Santa Ana and
24 Fullerton have the highest percentages of uninsured
25 children, and within your packets I have provided a lot of

1 facts that support these two requests. Thank you very
2 much.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

4 MR. SILVA: Good morning, commission members. My
5 name is Jesus Silva and I live and work in Fullerton,
6 that's Orange County, Southern California. I am a junior
7 high school teacher and I would consider myself to be a
8 community leader in my city and for my students.

9 This is my second time speaking in front of you. I
10 spoke before you on June 18th when you held a hearing in
11 Fullerton. At that time I was advocating to keep South
12 Fullerton, the Anaheim flatlands and Santa Ana in the same
13 Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts. Based on
14 your most recent visualization maps, I want to thank you
15 for being receptive and addressing my concerns and the
16 concerns of many of the speakers who were there at the June
17 18th hearing. However, in taking a closer look at your
18 latest maps you seem to be moving in the direction of not
19 including South Fullerton in the same districts as the
20 flatlands of Anaheim and Santa Ana. And this is why I'm
21 here today.

22 I would like to draw your attention to the academic
23 performance index scores. As you may or may not know, the
24 API scores are what the state uses to determine which
25 schools are succeeding and which schools are not

1 succeeding. If you look at the scores of the schools in
2 these three communities you will see that the vast majority
3 of these schools have scores that fall between 600 and 700.
4 One indicator of standardized test scores or API scores is
5 the socioeconomic level of the students and the families.
6 I have also heard many professors and researchers say that
7 a great indicator of standardized test scores or API scores
8 is the quality of the grass and flower beds in the front
9 yards of the homes.

10 MS. SARGIS: Time.

11 MR. SILVA: Oh my goodness. I would just like to
12 note that Santa Ana and Anaheim, the school districts have
13 been put into the program improvement districts. Thank
14 you.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right, thank you. So we have
16 two more speakers, Reverend Jones and then Mr. Harris-
17 Dawson.

18 MR. JONES: Good morning, friends. My name is
19 Robert Jones, I'm a local pastor and representing also the
20 California Association of Black Pastors.

21 And I want you to know, all of you, that we are
22 praying with you and for you. We understand what a
23 challenge it is to perform this great task that we've
24 entrusted you with. It is our hope that this Commission
25 would be led to embrace the rich historical diversity of

1 the State of California and enjoy working together with you
2 to reconcile differences in plans between the interested
3 parties. It would be of great assistance to the Commission
4 to hear the voices and the concerns of the African-American
5 community throughout the state and understand where their
6 concerns fall within their districts and their
7 configurations and what communities they identify with.

8 We believe that the Commission can achieve the
9 unity that it seeks by engaging the African-American
10 community in fruitful dialog as partners and not as
11 adversaries. It is a thought that we strongly encourage
12 you to look at those maps that fairly include the African-
13 American community in this process. We know that you seek
14 unity, you ask for it, and we've entrusted you as citizens
15 of this state that the African-Americans will have an
16 equitable representation in the unity process. So I want
17 to thank you for your time. May God bless and keep you.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

19 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: Good morning, commissioners.
20 My name is Marqueece Harris-Dawson and I'm with the
21 African-American Redistricting Collaborative.

22 We have been before you several times before and we
23 are a little bit troubled, or extremely troubled I should
24 say, about the way the process has gone. So we follow your
25 process, we've come to the hearings, we've submitted

1 testimony online, we've submitted maps, we've submitted
2 data, we've submitted very specific community of interest
3 data with regard to churches and other community
4 institutions. The first draft of your map for Los Angeles
5 County seemed fairly consistent and we continue to
6 participate with you and do a little bit of horse trading
7 around specific areas. And now we see visualizations that
8 seem to completely ignore all that work that we've done
9 with you over time throughout the state.

10 And so we agree with the other speakers that have
11 spoken today from NAACP and other organizations that the 4-
12 3-2 formula ought to be realized. And we have tried to
13 supply you with the necessary data and information to do
14 that. And it seems as if that's been set aside as of this
15 last weekend. We have no idea why, we are very puzzled,
16 and so we're going to continue to ask you why and we're
17 going to do that in a loud and in a public way.

18 And, again, we want to continue to work with you
19 but we need to see a signal from you all that that work has
20 in fact been heard and been worthwhile. And if there is a
21 disagreement with us or with what we're putting forward
22 then we would like to be able to have a discussion about
23 that and not find out because we see a visualization on the
24 internet that completely obliterates everything that we've
25 been providing testimony about for the past four or five

1 months. Thanks.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. One question.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Good morning.

4 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: Good morning.

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So obviously all of us have
6 been thinking about this a lot. And when you say 4-3-2,
7 can you say what you mean by - three what?

8 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: So -

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I mean, you say Congressional
10 district but three Congressional districts what?

11 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: We mean three effective
12 districts where African-Americans can compete for
13 representation. And so there are specific ratios that we
14 have provided you all that allow that to occur. And there
15 is a long history of that occurring over time. And so,
16 again, there are specific percentages where we have
17 submitted more than one iteration of maps that achieve
18 that.

19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, I understand that. So
20 what is effective in your calculus?

21 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: In our calculus we have
22 submitted districts that have balanced demographics where
23 the African-American population is somewhere between 30 and
24 45 percent and other groups would have similar ratios in
25 those districts.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Would the other groups all be
2 under that African-American population in those maps?

3 MR. HARRIS-DAWSON: No, no, no, they wouldn't
4 necessarily be under.

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Great. Thank you. I believe that
7 covers everyone for this morning. We will have a short
8 comment period at the end of the day as well.

9 Okay, Q2, are you hooked up at this point?

10 MS. MACDONALD: I think we are hooked up, yes.
11 Just one second.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so what I want to do before
13 we sort of get into the process is if you are able to sort
14 of give a demonstration of how to access the new
15 interactive tool.

16 MS. MACDONALD: What we are looking at is the
17 swdb.berkeley.edu, it's the site for the Statewide Database
18 where we have a web interface. And we basically modified
19 that web interface to be able to show the visualizations
20 that the Redistricting Commission approves.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. And if you start at the CRC
22 website there will be a link to this particular page.

23 MS. MACDONALD: Yes, I believe there is a link from
24 the CRC webpage to this particular page. And Jamie is
25 going to walk you through how to use this.

1 MS. CLARK: Good morning. So here district type,
2 select district, there is a drop-down list. We can select
3 Senate and note that here is the date that it was posted.
4 So this is also in reference to what visualizations are
5 being shown. As you can see, the Senate district lines for
6 July 11th are currently up. Here "locate an address within
7 a district", you can add any location. And here we are at
8 McGeorge School of Law. If we zoom out a little bit then
9 we can see the district lines. And if you click inside any
10 of the district boundaries then this box will appear that
11 has the district name, the deviation, the percent
12 deviation, Latino VAP, Latino CVAP, Black CVAP and Asian
13 CVAP by percent. You can do this for any plan set. It can
14 also be shown in satellite or hybrid. Here in the bottom
15 left-hand corner you can access the GIS archive and here on
16 the right-hand corner it will take you to the Statewide
17 Database website.

18 MS. MACDONALD: So what this also allows you to do
19 is you can basically zoom into the district if you want to
20 see where the district line actually falls. So Google
21 allow you to zoom into a really close-up view and you can
22 actually see the street boundaries. So, for example, using
23 this boundary where the hand is right now you can basically
24 see that it runs up Fulton Boulevard, for example, and then
25 it crosses the El Dorado Freeway, which is the 50. This is

1 probably not the best area because it's not an urban area.
2 So let's find something -

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Ms. MacDonald?

4 MS. MACDONALD: Yes?

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I had a question.

6 One limitation in this regard is that we can't see the
7 boundaries for cities or counties, or is there some way of
8 doing that?

9 MS. MACDONALD: You know, I have to explore that.
10 I don't know at this point whether Google lets us do that.
11 As you know, we only had a day to put this together. So I
12 think at least you can see the street boundaries. Let me
13 investigate that. I'll send a message up to the Statewide
14 Database and see if Google actually has city boundaries in
15 there. I don't believe they do but we will investigate it.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Other questions from the
17 commissioners? Commissioner Barabba?

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I don't have a question, I
19 just have a compliment. I think this is going to be
20 really, really helpful and I really appreciate all the work
21 that you've all put in.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, Ms. MacDonald, we also have
23 some additional files that are loaded on the CRC website, a
24 new file which is called, I guess, a .kmz file, which could
25 be used with Google Earth if folks want to use that program

1 as well.

2 MS. MACDONALD: So I'm not the expert on Google
3 Earth, I have to say. But essentially what we've made
4 available on the CRC website is equivalency files and also
5 a .kmz file so that when people have Google Earth on their
6 own computer they can download this and then they can
7 basically look at it on their own home computer, they don't
8 have to go over the web.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, I believe, having used it
10 yesterday that if you use Google Earth there is a border
11 layer which allows you to look at city and county borders.

12 MS. CLARK: Yes.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio then
14 Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes, and again I think this
16 may be a comment or two. One is just for the public's
17 knowledge. Right now what's up is just Northern
18 California. And I believe Southern California will be
19 coming in the next day.

20 And the second comment is I think this just goes to
21 show that this is - similar to Commissioner Barabba - this
22 is a really great way for the public and media and anyone
23 else who is concerned that they won't get to see an actual
24 physical second draft map to say these are the
25 visualizations we're working on. And I think it's very

1 easy to interact with and it's really an opportunity. I
2 think, despite us being painted as going dark or what not,
3 I think this is an example. But this continues our
4 excellent efforts at transparency and openness and it's
5 incumbent upon the public and the media to follow along
6 with this. Because it's very easy to use and there is no
7 excuses for accusations otherwise.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I am technically
10 challenged sometimes and I just want to make sure that I
11 have it straight as to what each of these programs are
12 showing us. So the Statewide Database that you had up
13 earlier - and I was actually looking at - that you
14 demonstrated. Now, is this our draft map, the first draft
15 map?

16 MS. CLARK: So these are the current visualizations
17 that we're working with. And here in this description it
18 shows the date that they were created.

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Well, that's where
20 I'm getting a little confused. Then there's the difference
21 between the Google Earth, which is identified as the CRC
22 visualizations, which is different than what we have on the
23 Statewide Database. We have various visualizations.

24 MS. MACDONALD: Correct. I think we could, if you
25 wanted to, we could load in the first draft maps if you

1 wanted to. We have not loaded them in. What we did is we
2 loaded up the files that we're going to be discussing
3 today.

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: That's it.

5 MS. MACDONALD: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay.

7 MS. MACDONALD: That's the only thing that's in
8 there right now. And because this is a new search engine,
9 basically we're posting everything with a date and time
10 stamp so that people know that this is basically the date
11 when they were created so that there is no confusion about,
12 you know, files that were previously posted. And the CRC
13 has the same files posted. The only difference with the
14 Statewide Database is that we have this web interface where
15 people can actually look at it without having to download
16 something to their own computers.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, terrific. The
18 other question that I have is for when we get to Southern
19 California tomorrow and the visualizations that we spoke
20 about and the potential options for, for instance, Los
21 Angeles tomorrow, will the Statewide Database have each of
22 these options available in the district type bar that you
23 have at the top as we discuss options and move around?

24 MS. MACDONALD: This is a very timely question, as
25 I just got a file with three options from Ms. Boyle. And I

1 actually just conferred with Chair Ancheta about how this
2 should be posted. And they will be posted as Option 1, 2
3 and 3, again with the time and date stamp.

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: At the district type
5 at the top of this -

6 MS. MACDONALD: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: -- page we're looking
8 at. I'm just walking the public through it as well so I
9 can follow along and the members of the public when we
10 start seeing different options will see it up in that box.
11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes. And thank you. It's very
13 helpful and honestly it's new for us and it's new for the
14 public. So we want to make sure there aren't any glitches.
15 And for Q2. And no doubt there will be a glitch along the
16 way but I think this is a very helpful tool, particularly
17 in its ability to kind of get down to the street level,
18 which has been a problem with previous maps and
19 visualizations.

20 Okay, just as a reminder, what we are doing in a
21 few minutes will be going through the visualizations and we
22 will start with the Congressional maps. I did want to
23 remind folks that we are trying to keep track of why we're
24 doing things. So that's actually going to be more formal
25 this time in terms of each district. We will spend a

1 little more time doing that, again, for our report. Just
2 as a reminder, I will just run through the list if you
3 don't remember where you were situated. So Region 1 we
4 have Commissioners Ontai and Commissioner Raya; Region 2,
5 Commissioners Filkins-Webber and Dai; Region 3,
6 Commissioners Ward and Forbes; Region 4, which is Southern
7 California, we've got San Fernando, Santa Clarita, Antelope
8 Valley, Commissioners Barabba and Parvenu; West Side, South
9 Bay-Long Beach, Commissioners Parvenu and Yao; San Gabriel
10 Valley, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena, Commissioners Raya and
11 Galambos-Malloy; Downtown, Central, East LA, Commissioners
12 Blanco and Filkins-Webber; Region 5, Commissioner Aguirre
13 and Commissioner Ward; Region 6, Commissioner DiGuilio and
14 Commissioner Aguirre; Region 7, myself and Commissioner
15 Barabba; Region 8, Commissioner Dai and Commissioner
16 Galambos-Malloy; and then Region 9, Commissioner Forbes and
17 Commissioner Ontai. So as we get through these - obviously
18 these aren't all Northern California but just as a
19 reminder, when we get to Southern California as well we
20 will be looking to you to help us get these descriptions
21 down. Okay?

22 Also I did send around via email just some
23 suggested language you might want to use. Again, this is
24 only if we have a problem and there isn't consensus
25 regarding moving something forward. If we do have a lack

1 of consensus we will have to take a vote on moving
2 something forward. So you might check your email regarding
3 proposed language. I'm suggesting language of something
4 along the lines that the Commission would direct Q2 to
5 advance for ongoing consideration, say, the Senate
6 visualization entitled - the name - presented on - the date
7 - and containing, you know, X, Y districts, so name the
8 district as well. So the main thing is indicating what
9 type of map is this, when was it presented and what are the
10 districts within it. And, again, for those times when we
11 do have options we will probably refer to them as option
12 one or option two or something like that. So just for
13 recording. Now, again, the default is if we are on
14 consensus we will simply just move forward. And if we need
15 to have sort of a summary motion at the end we will just
16 sort of do that at the end before we move on to the next
17 set of maps.

18 Does that sound okay in terms of just how we're
19 proceeding?

20 (Affirmative responses from Commissioners.)

21 Okay. And Jamie left the room.

22 MS. MACDONALD: Yes, could we just have two
23 minutes?

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, maybe we can take a five
25 minute break then.

1 (Five minute recess at 10:22 a.m.)

2 Okay, we are back.

3 During the break it was suggested that for today we
4 deal with the larger details of the districts and reserve
5 for next week really minor changes, you know, get down to
6 the street level or may involve dealing with deviations and
7 trying to get those numbers down as needed, but not really
8 to do any major changes with the districts. Now, again,
9 there is a little bit of padding that we built in at the
10 end because the - as we've been calling it - sort of drop-
11 dead date is the end of July. But we put the 28th as the
12 target date.

13 So, for example, if we have to go into overtime
14 this week - let's say, for example, we have to go into
15 Saturday - it is possible to push everything back a day. I
16 think that's one possibility. Again, not ideal but we can
17 do that. But I think the general process is to really nail
18 things down this week and not go into next week with any
19 either options or major changes occurring. And,
20 Commissioner DiGuilio, you can add in as well.

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think you did a very good
22 job. I think just to add to it briefly would just simply
23 be that, again, the exchange for not having a second draft
24 map was to give us the time this week to work out these
25 details and then allow the mappers to go back and implement

1 our directions. So whatever time it takes to really focus
2 down and give specific directions so that Q2 has their
3 walking papers and will be able to use the time in the next
4 few days to do the mapping once we're done with line
5 directions.

6 Again, we're assuming that once those
7 visualizations - the newest ones come up next week - they
8 will be, again, able to be uploaded to the site and we can
9 work with those as we move into the live line drawing
10 sessions. But in essence what they come up with next week
11 before live line drawing sessions will be kind of the
12 replacement of the second draft map. That will be kind of
13 the higher level details that have been implemented based
14 on our directions. And after that point it will just be
15 the smaller block level and line adjustments that will be
16 taking place next week.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Raya?

18 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I just want to be sure that we
19 feel we can go into that extra time if we have to. You
20 know, sometimes I feel there is kind of this emphasis on
21 here's our deadline, here's our deadline for Friday. And I
22 want to feel that there's enough time if we have some
23 significant differences of opinion that we're going to
24 explore those.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think there will be time.
2 I think that's what Commissioner Ancheta had mentioned,
3 there will be a chance to have some discussion. And also,
4 if we need to, we may have to vote. Because there is no
5 more opportunities to come back with another option or two.
6 What we walk away with after these next few days into
7 Saturday - if we need to - will be clear directions. But
8 after that point, whatever we do in these next few days,
9 Saturday - and I don't even know if there is a Sunday, I
10 hope not. I mean, I'm not sure if it had been agendized.
11 But there is this balance between what has to happen after
12 we walk away, there has to be enough time for Q2 to
13 implement that and then also allow us to, you know, kind of
14 - it's a block, whenever you push one day it pushes each
15 block out a day or two. So I do think Commissioner Ancheta
16 has that in his radar to do that.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes. And we will not leave until
18 we are done this week. And, again, we don't want to have
19 to go into the weekend, certainly we would like to get it
20 wrapped up by Friday. But those meetings are still on the
21 calendar and if we have to continue, we will continue.
22 And, again, we do have a couple of days of padding if we
23 push - and, again, it's to push back next week as well so
24 that Q2 does have adequate time to implement what we give
25 them this week. But the general sequence is basically set.

1 Commissioner Yao?

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: So, again, stating what I think
3 I heard in my way, when we leave a particular region on a
4 particular district map we're not going to investigate any
5 other alternatives. In other words, no more options. And
6 we have to basically take time out to make sure that we can
7 all live with the version that we have discussed and make
8 decisions on. Because I think having to continuously
9 investigate options is problematic in terms of adhering to
10 our schedule. And, again, I hate to let the schedule drive
11 everything but I think we are at a point where we simply
12 have to do that. And with or without all the information
13 we need, we need to basically move forward, to go with a
14 single configuration once we leave a particular region
15 under discussion in the next few days.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah, draw whatever sports analogy
17 you want, it's the fourth quarter or it's whatever period
18 you want to be in, we're there. Commissioner Aguirre?

19 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. And just adding to
20 that, as a Commission, of course, we all realize that we
21 can't please everybody and the center of the universe
22 concept is something that everybody holds dear to their
23 heart. But ultimately working within the established
24 criteria there are going to be some folks that are not
25 going to be happy with the maps and they will continue to

1 come to us and say that but ultimately I think if we apply
2 the criteria as we see it then I think it's going to be a
3 great improvement on what there was before. All right,
4 thank you.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we are ready to plunge in,
6 then. Do you want to start at the top?

7 MS. MACDONALD: Okay, that's what we will do. And
8 we're starting with Congressional.

9 MS. CLARK: So here is the North Coast District,
10 Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino - if we zoom in
11 here - sort of western Sonoma County and Marin County is
12 whole. Per CRC direction, the City of Santa Rosa and
13 Rohnert Park are in a Congressional district moving east
14 with Napa.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so on the coastal district,
16 again, as a short narrative, why does this district exist
17 as it does? So our two team members, would you care to
18 just - or maybe it just sort of states the obvious but why
19 is this district configured as it is?

20 (No response.)

21 So Commissioner Forbes?

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Oh, you're asking me. I
23 thought you were asking them. Sorry. It's a coastal
24 district, it shares a common economy. And all the COI
25 testimony we had was to create that district. We didn't go

1 all the way down into Marin because we thought that it
2 would basically be too long.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: We did actually go
4 down to Marin in a previous iteration and we were told loud
5 and clear that that was too far south and that the
6 interests of the far north end of the coastal district and
7 the southern end in that previous iteration - which was
8 really highly urbanized parts of Marin County - that we
9 needed to reconfigure that significantly.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct me if I'm wrong, but
11 the current version does go down to Marin.

12 MS. CLARK: Yes, it does.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right, it goes down to Marin
14 but not to the Golden Gate. We also did make Siskiyou
15 County whole in this one.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Which is in the adjacent district.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right, it's in the adjacent
18 district, not in this district. But I just want to point
19 out that it is now whole, that was a change.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner Galambos-
21 Malloy then Commissioner DiGuilio.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And to confirm, in
23 this visualization we have Santa Rosa whole?

24 MS. CLARK: Yes.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: In the adjacent district.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: In the adjacent
2 district, which we were not able to do to create a coastal
3 district that included the full population of Santa Rosa.
4 And so we chose to prioritize keeping Santa Rosa whole.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio?

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think, to go back, as
7 I understand it this district does go all the way down to
8 the Golden Gate Bridge, is that correct, Ms. Clark?

9 MS. CLARK: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And the reason was
11 originally we tried not to have a population base that was
12 centered in Marin and that was where one of our earlier
13 visualizations crossed over into Siskiyou and we kind of
14 did the horseshoe, for lack of a better word, to try and
15 pick up the population in the north. And we heard very
16 loud and clear that that was not something that was
17 acceptable, even though it was keeping communities that
18 were - counties that were smaller population, the
19 differences versus inland was significant. And then we
20 heard from the coastal, from Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino
21 and down that they felt that the community of interest link
22 all the way down to Marin, even though that was a
23 population base, was more aligned with them.

24 So, again, we had some different iterations around
25 the Santa Rosa area once we made that decision to go down

1 to Marin but we chose to keep Santa Rosa whole and put them
2 in with Napa along the lines of the Wine Country and to
3 also try and keep the integrity of the 101 corridor, which
4 before had been cut up a number of times, I believe. We
5 tried to keep it whole. So, as I recall, that's kind of
6 some of the testimony for where we had been.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. So Commissioner Dai and then
8 Commissioner Filkins-Webber. And, Commissioner Dai, could
9 you also comment on what level of detail you think is most
10 effective for tracking purposes and for the report?

11 Because we can get pretty detailed and we can spend a lot
12 of time on each district, but I want to make sure we get
13 through them.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: If you guys hopefully have all
15 looked at the draft narrative examples you'll note that
16 unless there is a Section 2 or Section 5 county in your
17 district that the narratives are relatively succinct. So
18 the idea is to kind of summarize major communities of
19 interest that, you know, we attempted to keep whole or
20 mostly whole. Because there are many smaller communities
21 of interest that were respected but, you know, we don't
22 need to go into all of those details. I think capturing
23 the highlights in terms of what the shared interests are of
24 everyone in the district is really what we're trying to go
25 for there, we're not trying to make this a serious tome

1 here, so about a paragraph for each district.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: So anyway I had a comment and I
4 just wanted Ms. Clark to comment on, I believe we had given
5 some direction on trying to keep Lake in with Napa. And we
6 got obviously some suggestion this morning from public
7 testimony of swapping that population out with either
8 northern Contra Costa or Solano. And I just wanted you to
9 comment on what the issues were there.

10 MS. CLARK: To swap out Lake for this area of
11 Contra Costa County, there would still be a portion of
12 Contra Costa County in this visualization. For Solano
13 County, if we moved this line west then I believe that
14 Fairfield could possibly still be split. But if there was
15 CRC direction to explore that -

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think the exchange was
17 with Lake and with the City of Fairfield. So right now - I
18 know we had a discussion about trying to minimize the
19 Fairfield split. But 64,000 in Lake, what would happen
20 with the Solano-Fairfield line then and how does
21 Commissioner Forbes think about this?

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, I think that's
23 possible, I think it's something worth looking at.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I mean, Fairfield is
25 already split and we would be able to keep Lake whole and

1 at least with Napa. Because we were not able to, you know,
2 put Mendocino, Lake, Napa and Sonoma together in a single
3 district but at least we could have, you know, two counties
4 in each district.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You know, I also notice that
6 we have some deviation to work with in this one.

7 MS. CLARK: This is Congressional.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'm sorry.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: That was my point
11 based on the comments this morning, whether when we are
12 looking at the narratives and we're having these
13 discussions whether we should consider the potential
14 ramifications of the requests made by the public. So,
15 again, hearing the testimony this morning regarding Lake, I
16 was wondering where was the consequence. And it sounds
17 like it's with Fairfield. And whether based on the totality
18 of the community of interest testimony we've received
19 whether that might be a consideration for the Commission
20 before it adopts anything final.

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again, I think this is
22 something we should at least try. It might solve two
23 problems.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so we need to have some
25 agreement on whether this is something we try or we go for

1 it. You have to either go for it or you don't go for it.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think we should go for it.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I think we should go
4 for it.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Go for it.

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: So the direction
7 would be to remove Lake from YUBA and put it with NEBAY.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Correct.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And then to switch out
11 Fairfield with Lake.

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, and make up the
13 population in southwest Solano County.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Check with Ms. Clark and
15 see if that will work.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Q2, do you have some
17 comments on this?

18 MS. CLARK: If somebody has the city splits report
19 for Congressional handy - I emailed that out to the
20 commissioners last night - that can say what the exact
21 split is in Fairfield and then we can have more insight
22 into that.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Can anyone pull those up?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I don't know that
25 everyone received it. I didn't receive it.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, I didn't get that,
2 actually.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Was that sent to CRC Staff for
4 posting?

5 MS. CLARK: Yes.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: So is it on the website somewhere?

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, it's on the web, okay.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Look under meeting handouts on our
9 website.

10 MS. CLARK: That's where it is.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It's called reports.

13 MS. CLARK: Right, I found it. So the split in
14 Fairfield right now, the portion of Fairfield that is in
15 the district with Napa and Santa Rosa is 27,000.

16 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Oh.

17 MS. CLARK: Lake is 64,000.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: We can't get enough
19 population.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So what would you have to
21 do? How far down would you have to go, approximately? If
22 you could give us an idea.

23 MS. CLARK: So all -

24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So, in other words, we
25 would be making Fairfield whole.

1 MS. CLARK: All of Fairfield would be whole, Green
2 Valley, this entire section would be in the YUBA district.
3 Either the entirety of Benicia could be in it or Benicia
4 would be split or Vallejo would be split.

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I think Benicia could
6 be in Solano given the entry, you know, sort of into the
7 delta. And this is the 80 corridor. I'm trying - the
8 reason I'm hesitating is I can't remember the testimony on
9 Benicia in particular. I know from knowing the area that
10 that would not be inconsistent with, you know, the
11 transportation and the area. I don't know if you can keep
12 it whole or not.

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Would it, Commissioner
14 Blanco, in terms of Benicia being linked with Sutter and
15 Yuba?

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, I don't think that would
17 make sense.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't think you're going to
19 get the population unless you split Vallejo.

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I think you could pick up
21 if you needed to pick up - it won't give you enough - but,
22 you know, Benicia, Port Costa, you know, those are all
23 those cities that sort of go up 80 past the Carquinez.

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: But I think we're still going
25 to be 14 or 15 thousand people short of matching Lake if

1 you put Fairfield and Green Valley and Benicia, all that
2 area, I don't think you - unless you split Vallejo.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Mm-hmm.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Unless you split Vallejo.

5 And so I think the choice is splitting Vallejo or keeping
6 Lake where it is.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I believe Lake is with
8 Napa in the Senate and Assembly.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It is with Napa.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I mean, I think this is a
11 good exercise.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Mm-hmm.

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think we really do try to
14 take these things into consideration. It's just that
15 sometimes our role is to balance the impacts in other
16 locations as well, too, and to try to do the least amount
17 of harm, recognizing that Lake and Napa would like to be
18 together, Congressional. But the impacts in other
19 communities may be too great for that to happen.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And they are together in the
21 Assembly District.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco then
23 Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think for the narrative we
25 should talk about the length of the district from Del Norte

1 to Marin and what led to that district, in particular - and
2 I don't remember this, so I'll be the first to say that -
3 whether it had anything to do with not crossing over the
4 bridge. You know, whether a lot of these configurations
5 that we're dealing with here, including the length of this
6 coastal district, were related to our decision to have a
7 hard stop at the bridge. Because I think that would - you
8 know, we did get comments about the length of this
9 district. And, you know, it is a long district. So I
10 think we need to explain what were the - as Commissioner
11 Filkins-Webber has said, what are the things we were trying
12 to accommodate that led us to having a district of that
13 size?

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Filkins-Webber
15 and then Commissioner DiGuilio.

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: In that regard we
17 also had received a public comment this morning about the
18 south Contra Costa, which I think includes the other towns
19 of Martinez and Hercules. Jamie, can you advise the
20 Commission, or refresh our recollection, and the members of
21 the public as to what potential consequences? So if we
22 were trying to put Lake back into the NEBAY, the Napa
23 district there, to include Lake - and, again, based on this
24 morning's comment - if we were to consider taking out the
25 lower portion there of the Contra Costa, what the potential

1 ripple effects could be and where we hit a hard line that
2 makes it difficult for us to adjust any further districts
3 in Contra Costa or Alameda for that matter.

4 MS. CLARK: Because there is a hard line at the
5 Golden Gate Bridge, if we were to include Lake with this
6 NEBAY district then the population here, the line between
7 NEBAY and COCO, would move north. There is this hard line
8 at the Golden Gate Bridge and also none of the east to west
9 bridges are crossed. And so basically the population moves
10 in a U, which would mean that this line here at the Golden
11 Gate Bridge would move south and we would need to pick up
12 population from - ultimately, we would need to pick up
13 population in northern San Francisco just to balance the
14 rest of these districts here in the Bay Area.

15 Another option would be if Lake moved into NEBAY
16 and then again this line between NEBAY and COCO moved
17 north, then we could pick up population here for Solano
18 here and then replace that somewhere in San Joaquin, maybe
19 from Tracy or Manteca. And then this Stanislaus-based
20 district would have to pick up population from somewhere in
21 the foothills.

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: So essentially, in
23 summary, you're either going to consider disrupting the
24 community of interest testimony not to cross the Golden
25 Gate Bridge; alternatively, if you have to go to the east

1 then you're disrupting the Congressional district of
2 keeping San Joaquin Valley whole, then the consequence
3 could potentially be splitting Tracy and then going even
4 further to the east and splitting Foothill districts into
5 San Joaquin or Stanislaus or the district - I can't see the
6 next name - below.

7 MS. CLARK: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: So the potential
9 ramifications of meeting or trying to accommodate community
10 of interest testimony that we received this morning in
11 particular, just to highlight it as an example, could have
12 those ramifications to potentially disrupt and split
13 additional cities and to split community of interest
14 testimony that we received that actually spans from the
15 Golden Gate Bridge all the way to the Foothill district?

16 MS. CLARK: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Thank you.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio and then
19 Commissioner Dai.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm just going back to
21 Commissioner Blanco's question about the length of the long
22 districts. And I think we will see this in a number of
23 districts, the coastal, the MTCAP and the Foothills.
24 They're large, they're long. But I think that's a very
25 good point to go back, that we had tried to maintain some

1 of the geographic integrity of the coastal range. And as a
2 result of just many of these counties up here that are very
3 low populated. And in order for us to reach the number one
4 criteria, which is equal population, they have
5 traditionally been very large size, sometimes very long, or
6 just very big in general because of trying to reach the
7 population. So it's funny, I think Commissioner Blanco
8 brought up something that we've been operating on from the
9 very, very beginning. But it's good for us to reflect on
10 it, to meet the population requirements these smaller
11 populated areas and the geographic boundaries along it as
12 well, too.

13 And I think we do need to make one last point, is
14 that I don't think in this situation the Golden Gate Bridge
15 determined the length of it. In fact, we saw a lot of
16 different iterations. We broke the Golden Gate Bridge in
17 some of our visualizations and we saw the repercussions of
18 that along the whole East Bay Area and we chose not to do
19 that. But in this particular case it wasn't that the
20 Golden Gate Bridge dictated it, it was really trying to
21 keep the integrity of the northern coastal down and the
22 inland parts, Siskiyou, Modoc, separate from each other.
23 And then just for population we went down the coast.
24 That's the reason for the length.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And let me note. I'm

1 letting the discussion go a little bit longer simply
2 because I'm thinking that the fundamental interests that
3 we're talking about will be replicated in the other
4 districts. I'm going to be much tighter in terms of time
5 as we move forward. But it's good to flesh these out now.
6 Commissioner Dai and then Barabba.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. We did and I think we
8 were successful at making two North Coast districts for the
9 Assembly. And we are working with, you know, different
10 units. But, Ms. Clark, could you just remind the
11 Commission why with the Congressional we weren't able to
12 kind of do a clockwise rotation of the population between
13 the North Coast District, the Yuba District and the
14 Northeast Bay District? Because we had talked about
15 separating out kind of urban Marin and making it go east-
16 west instead.

17 MS. CLARK: If we were to take out Marin to try and
18 create two North Coast districts for Congressional, then
19 basically Del Norte to Modoc to Sierra or even Nevada
20 Counties to Mendocino would be one entire Congressional
21 district. We heard a lot of COI testimony that advocated
22 for north to south districts in this region. And also the
23 Yuba Section 5 district, just in attempting such
24 visualizations it was very difficult to have those
25 benchmark VAPs be met.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Barabba?

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes. The other in the
3 overall report framework that Commissioner Dai and I are
4 working on, one of the things we have to remember is those
5 19 counties make up about a third of the land mass of our
6 state. And I forget what the number was, but it was around
7 four percent of the total population. The likelihood of
8 that not having large districts is remote at best. And I
9 think we should kind of put that forward because one of the
10 reasons people move up there is because they like the
11 extent to which they are not populated heavily but the
12 price they pay is they have big districts.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. And I believe for drafting
14 purposes you are starting with sort of regions up front and
15 then going into specific districts.

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: So the general regions are sort of
18 mischaracterized by those set of attributes. So
19 Commissioner Blanco?

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry, could
21 Commissioner Barabba repeat again for me just very quickly
22 the land to population ratio he said? Was it 19 counties
23 you said?

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Above Sacramento there are
25 roughly 19 counties and the - I'll send you the report that

1 I put together for Commissioner Dai. But I think it was
2 like 19, almost a third of the - 29 percent or 30 percent
3 of the state's land mass and only about four percent of the
4 population.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, and thank you for
8 letting this go on longer because I think we are sort of
9 getting ourselves ready for how we're going to talk about
10 this. But along the lines of an overview for all of this,
11 I think it's also important to address because there is a
12 lot of concern that districts have changed a lot from last
13 time and even from the 1990. And I wanted to point out two
14 things. In 1990 when the maps were drawn, you know, the
15 special master maps, there were seven new Congressional
16 districts that decade in California. So that's the
17 parameters people were working with, they had seven new
18 Congressional districts to work with. In 2000 they had one
19 additional Congressional district was added as a result of
20 the census. This time we have no new Congressional
21 districts.

22 So I think in terms of the narrative it's important
23 to point out that we are for the first time ever in a
24 status quo situation. Even though different portions of
25 the state did grow, we did not have enough to add any more

1 Congressional districts, as opposed to one last time and
2 seven the time before that.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And I think there is a factor
4 that follows up on that and that is relative to the rest of
5 the state the Northern California area has shrunk. And
6 given the fact that the districts are larger - 930,000
7 people, for example, for a Senate seat and 703,000 for a
8 Congressional seat - you're going to take up even more area
9 in the north state to get to that population number. Like,
10 for example, I added up the counties north of Sacramento.
11 If you don't count the coast the entire population north of
12 Sacramento is about 760,000 people. There just aren't very
13 many people up there relatively speaking.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: And I think they like it that way.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And that's why they are
16 there. That's why our Senate seat, you know, drives into
17 Sacramento because we can't get to 930,000 any other way.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, are there any additional
19 comments?

20 (No response.)

21 We're not doing much at this point. So we have a
22 general discussion of NOCST and we've talked a little bit
23 about some of the adjacent ones. Let's just summarize
24 again, let's move forward. So MTCAP. And Commissioner
25 Forbes can discuss -

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, well MTCAP is a similar
2 discussion as the previous one. It's big, it does have
3 community of interest in that it's mountainous and timber,
4 it also has the I-5 corridor, it keeps Siskiyou together
5 again. We also did not put Shasta with the coast, that had
6 been one variation that had not been well received. And,
7 again, when we were in Redding we heard that the people who
8 lived there did not want to be dominated by the urban areas
9 of Sacramento and so we have kept this to be a loosely
10 populated area. So it is not dominated by any urban area.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio?

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think it might just
13 be worth noting that we did hear from Redding and Shasta to
14 some degree that - and there is an argument they are a
15 valley-based community. But, again, this is balancing the
16 COI of those further down in the valley as well, too, in
17 Yuba, Sutter, Glenn, Colusa and some of the population and
18 geographic locations of Shasta and Redding in that northern
19 MTCAP district.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional comments?

21 (No response.)

22 If everybody is okay, that's good. How about YUBA?

23 COMMISSIONER YAO: Chair Ancheta?

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes?

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: I guess we made a decision on

1 not moving the Lake County into the district, is that
2 correct.

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Right, we should clarify
4 that.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Correct, yes.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay. I just wanted to make
7 sure. I know the argument was against making changes but I
8 just want to precisely state the fact that we are not
9 making any changes

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right, it's on the record.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: So, Commissioner Forbes, do you
13 want to describe YUBA?

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay, this district is
15 largely a rural district with Glenn, Colusa, Yolo, Solano
16 and Sutter. We've kept Yolo whole, with the exception of
17 West Sacramento. And again, it's the I-5 corridor. But
18 we've created primarily an agricultural district along the
19 I-5 corridor. I assume that the Section 5 numbers have
20 been met.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: We will confirm that in the report.
22 But, again, for VRA-related districts we will have more
23 data, particularly for Section 5 districts we will have
24 benchmark and district data that looks at the various -

25 MS. CLARK: That's included in the packet of

1 reports that I sent you last night.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right, okay. And, again, I think
3 on this district we are fine in terms of meeting voting age
4 population benchmarks.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I will ask the question I
6 want to put in here. Glenn County is split, is that not
7 correct?

8 MS. CLARK: That's correct. Glenn County -

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And that's for population?

10 MS. CLARK: - is split for population. Solano
11 County is also split for population. Fairfield is the only
12 city split.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And remind me, the split in
15 Glenn, this is the one where we split Glenn as opposed to
16 the 99 corridor, is that right? No.

17 MS. CLARK: I believe that is in the Senate plan
18 set-

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

20 MS. CLARK: - where it was either to split Sutter
21 or Colusa.

22 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, that's right.

23 MS. CLARK: This split in Glenn is just purely for
24 population, the plus or minus one person population
25 constraint for Congressional districts.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me ask a question. You
2 know, this is somewhat rhetorical. Is there any way of
3 keeping Glenn whole and slicing Fairfield somewhat more?
4 The advantage of getting all of Glenn?

5 MS. CLARK: In exchange for - okay, we would either
6 have to then split Butte County or Nevada County or Placer
7 County again.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You could not pick it up out
9 of Fairfield and do something at that end of the district?

10 MS. CLARK: If we were going to pick it up from
11 Fairfield then we would have to split Napa County.

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay. I just wanted to ask
13 the question so we knew the answer. Thank you.

14 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: And there is no proposal to change
16 that?

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. That's fine.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I just wanted to respond to
20 the question from Glenn, How can you split us?

21 MS. CLARK: Yes.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure. Okay, any additional
23 comments on this district?

24 (No response.)

25 Your pleasure, Commissioner Forbes.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Why don't we just go
2 Sacramento?

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

4 MS. CLARK: Since last time you have seen a
5 visualization for this district Elk Grove has been removed
6 from this area of West Sacramento and the City of
7 Sacramento. To make up population here we have moved up the
8 80 corridor to include all of Antelope and all of North
9 Highlands and the census place Arden-Arcade is split for
10 population.

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here again we made an effort
12 to keep the API community in the southern part of the
13 county together. The main part of Sacramento is in fact
14 kept together. And Sac State and UC Davis Med Center are
15 in the central area. We received a letter from the city
16 manager in our first iteration that they were outside of
17 the core area of Sacramento. And so you basically have a
18 city/county split here with the county areas to the east.
19 Citrus Heights is kept whole in this iteration.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: In the adjacent district, okay.

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, in the adjacent, right.
22 I'm sorry. I'm reviewing these two together as sort of one
23 unit.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right. Commissioner DiGuilio,
25 Commissioner Yao, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy and then

1 Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: The one thing I'm having a
3 difficult time with - and it's actually, I bring it up now
4 only because it's related to these two districts - is the
5 one just north where we have Roseville and Rocklin and all
6 of that, in the Foothill District. I know we talked about
7 this briefly. And I just would like to take a minute to
8 see if there are any other options that we have. Because
9 that just seems like it's very problematic to me. So I
10 don't know, Ms. Clark, if there is anything that can be
11 done to switch out population, maybe with - I'm not sure
12 what the rotation would be, what our options would be in
13 terms of trying to get the Roseville-Rocklin into a
14 Sacramento-based or something in the valley versus
15 something in the foothills. Maybe if you could just give a
16 brief option and then that might make the decision easier.
17 But it's just the one area that I'm troubled by.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: As am I.

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm wondering if there is
20 an exchange that could happen with the Placer, Nevada in a
21 rotation of that. I'm not sure, I'd like to see if I can -
22 I know we're really hemmed in in the south and you need
23 population for that Foothill District. So I'm just curious
24 as to what our options are.

25 MS. CLARK: Sure. And that's correct, this area is

1 included in the Foothill District for population. And this
2 area in the valley, because of the Section 5 districts, has
3 hard lines that cannot be crossed. I think that if there
4 was to be a population rotation then it would be from the
5 north, just to not move around those Section 5 districts.

6 Options could include - and it would be, again, to
7 make up population in this Foothill District if we were to
8 remove the West Placer County area, would be to instead of
9 this area in West Placer County, to move population from
10 Sacramento County into the Foothills District. That would
11 be Elk Grove, Florin, Vineyard, Rancho Murieta, possibly
12 all of Rancho Cordova or it would potentially need to be
13 split.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't think you'd gain
15 anything.

16 MS. CLARK: I think that that's -

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It's just another urban area
18 or suburban area moved into the trade.

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Is there anything in the
21 Placer, Nevada, I'm thinking in the western parts of those?

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You need 200,000 people.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: That's why - I agree with
24 Commissioner Forbes that the urban part of Sacramento would
25 not be a trade-off but I'm wondering if there is anything.

1 Currently some of those - I don't know if Grass Valley and
2 some of those up there, the population base. But they are
3 currently in the MTCAP District and I'm wondering if there
4 is not a huge trade-off to go to a Foothill District versus
5 a MTCAP. These are not ideal.

6 MS. CLARK: I think that if this was going to be
7 moved into the MTCAP District then we would need all of
8 Nevada County, all of Sierra County and then just keep on
9 moving north to make up for the population. Unless we
10 split Yuba County or split Nevada County then this West
11 Placer population would be isolated from the rest of the
12 district. So we would have to split these counties
13 basically right down the middle just to make the MTCAP
14 District contiguous.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess I'm not so much
16 concerned about - I don't necessarily think putting
17 Roseville in a MTCAP District is good, either. I'm just
18 wondering if you can do a switch between MTCAP - again,
19 this is just too much, 200,000 people with the population
20 to go up and around.

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, you could do
22 something like Butte to the Yuba District and Yolo to the
23 Sacramento District and Sacramento to El Dorado. But I
24 don't think you'd gain anything by doing that.

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

1 MS. CLARK: And another option could be this
2 Roseville area into the Yuba District and then Glenn, Lake,
3 Colusa and part of Yolo into the MTCAP District and then
4 moving this Foothills line north into MTCAP.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So you would essentially
6 break up the ag district that you have created.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Mm-hmm.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I'm seeing a lot of heads
9 shaking on all that.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I appreciate you talking
11 through those options. Because this is a difficult one for
12 me but I think, again, the balancing of the trade-offs, it
13 will just have to be one that we can put down on the record
14 that we've tried other options.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And I think in reference to
16 the Foothills District we have kept Lake Tahoe whole in the
17 Congressional area and we have kept the population so that
18 the Foothill District still has the predominant population.
19 So it will retain its character.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so just to get back. So we
21 were on SAC and then as part of your discussion you were
22 talking about - is it SACCO?

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes. Sacramento County.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: The adjacent one. Do you want to
25 add anything else to that one?

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: I'm sorry. We'll go back to the
3 queue. I just wanted to confirm that. It was Yao,
4 Galambos-Malloy then Filkins-Webber.

5 COMMISSIONER YAO: The speaker this morning talked
6 about Elk Grove and South Sacramento. Commissioner Forbes,
7 you seemed to understand that.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, that was in the Assembly
9 District. And, in fact, I looked at the Assembly map and
10 our proposed Assembly map meets their objectives.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: The Assembly meets it but this
12 Congressional, we definitely have split that historical
13 African-American community. Or are they together except
14 they are just not with Sacramento?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think they are together but
16 just not with Sacramento.

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think this was to do the
18 API community. I think what we balanced was in the
19 Assembly and Senate we kept Elk Grove with South Sacramento
20 for the African-American community and then Congress -
21 remember, there was the Elk Grove/Vineyard API community?

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, it was also South
23 Sacramento.

24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: South Sacramento.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, I mean he talked about

1 Mack Road. Well, this district cuts on Florin Road, which
2 is significantly north of Mack Road. So the Elk
3 Grove/Florin area, the area he talked about, is largely
4 incorporated in the Sacramento County District.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, actually -

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, so you feel that this is
7 probably the best combination -

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: - we can accommodate at this
10 point in time?

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Mm-hmm.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, thank you.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai, you can interject
14 just on this particular point.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify
16 that the API community included South Sacramento as well.
17 So this does split the API community but it does keep
18 several key areas together, Florin, Vineyard and Elk Grove.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Actually, Florin Road is the
20 northern area of what is considered South Sacramento.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So the API community actually
23 is pretty much together.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's mostly together but there
25 is some part.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy
2 and then Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Commissioner Yao
4 asked my exact question. I'm just trying to figure out if
5 we had managed to preserve both the API and African-
6 American communities in this visualization.

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Now, if the Commission would
8 be agreeable to this - and I have not done this yet - I
9 could look - if you look at this map it says Florin, Florin
10 Road? It could be that, you know, we may want to move that
11 up a little bit and see if we can pick up the Oak Park
12 neighborhood, which is closer to 50, and trade it off into
13 Rancho Cordova, I'd have no idea, the Arden-Arcade area
14 there. That's possible and that would pick up more of the
15 African-American community.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would be very
17 supportive of that.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can you say that again,
19 please?

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay, if you look at the map.
21 If we move the lines - see where it says Florin Road and
22 you come up the 99 to roughly Highway 50, you see there is
23 a little square there. That would be formed by the 99 on
24 the west and the 50 on the north. And then trade that out
25 for moving further into the Arden-Arcade, which is just a

1 neighborhood, it's not a city. That would put more of the
2 African-American community in the SACCO district.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And that's an exchange.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That would be an exchange.
5 And I would ask our line drawer what she thinks of that.

6 MS. CLARK: Yeah, I think that that is definitely
7 possible. I also just want to bring to the Commission's
8 attention that there is COI testimony advocating for this
9 neighborhood to be with the City of Sacramento.

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right. And, again, that's
11 the question. I mean, this neighborhood is an integral
12 part of the City of Sacramento. It happens to be an
13 African-American neighborhood. And so we have the trade-
14 off of do you want to keep more of the African-American
15 community together or more keep the city whole? I think
16 overall it's better to keep the city whole but I wanted to
17 offer that as an option for the Commission to consider.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Can you give us a
19 better sense of how much population you're talking when you
20 talk about moving that boundary north and including more of
21 the African-American population with Elk Grove and other
22 communities? I mean, are we talking about -

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I would have to ask Jamie.
24 It's probably, oh, I would think at least 40,000. It's
25 significant.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

2 MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And that's
4 essentially for the Oak Park portion?

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's exactly right. And
6 you're going to pick up, you know, this population that is
7 not necessarily African-American as well. You will pick up
8 a little more of the Asian population, too.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let's go to Commissioner Filkins-
10 Webber and then Commissioner DiGuilio.

11 MS. CLARK: That population that's highlighted is
12 56,000.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So it's a big move. I mean,
14 I would be disinclined to do it but I just wanted to put
15 the options out there.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner Filkins-
17 Webber.

18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: This has been a
19 little bit of my concern as well and I think we need to
20 talk about it. I'm looking at the Statewide Database,
21 because it's a lovely tool, to actually look at these
22 streets and it's very helpful here. I don't know where -
23 the line that comes down on the 99 - and that's where I
24 have a little bit of concern - this looks like there may be
25 a balance here again between communities of interest with

1 Florin, Vineyard and Elk Grove and the API interest versus
2 the testimony we heard this morning that South Sacramento
3 wanted to be with Elk Grove. So knowing that balance, is
4 there more work here that could be done but yet still
5 preserving the community of interest testimony that Ms.
6 Clark just pointed out as to that eastern area of
7 Sacramento?

8 And then I had one other question as to how some of
9 these - this little area at the top of SAC, that little
10 hook on the blue part? How did those get created and - I
11 know we might be at too much of a micro level here.

12 MS. CLARK: That's the city boundary of the City of
13 Sacramento.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay. So we would
15 probably be looking at just highlighting it or cleaning it
16 up or would it be still considered a city split? It just
17 looks like a neighborhood when you're looking. If you
18 split it and you made it all part of SAC, well then it
19 would be a split, is what I'm saying.

20 MS. CLARK: Yes, if you split - is the question to
21 incorporate this area?

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I'm just asking how
23 it gets created. But it sounds like it's the city
24 boundary.

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, thank you. So
3 I guess the question just goes back to, are we respecting
4 the testimony we received this morning if there is some
5 inability to do that due to a balancing of communities of
6 interest or is there some way of looking at keeping the
7 South Sacramento area whole? Are we doing that in this
8 district?

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, if I'm
10 understanding Commissioner Forbes right, I mean, we're
11 looking at which part of Sacramento to include. It's not
12 going to foster a split, it's do we keep more of the
13 southside in or do we keep more of the Arden-Arcade area
14 in, is that correct?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's correct. But, again,
16 if you consider what Sacramento would consider the core of
17 Sacramento, the part I discussed moving would be considered
18 the core of Sacramento. The core of Sacramento, I think,
19 would be the numbered streets and the lettered streets
20 which go from, you know, A to Broadway and then the avenues
21 which go out to like 47th Avenue to the south. And the
22 numbered streets go out to like 55th Street out to the
23 east. That's sort of the core of Sacramento. And so this
24 would be cutting out a section of what would be considered
25 the core of Sacramento in order to have a greater

1 concentration of the Asian population and the African-
2 American population.

3 As I said, I think it would be better to keep the
4 core of Sacramento as a unit. We got that letter from the
5 city manager when we talked about moving the med center,
6 which is on, I think, 50th Street or 55th Street, and Sac
7 State, which is also about 55th Street. When we had that
8 outside the core they didn't like that. And so I would be
9 inclined to keep the core part of the city together. But I
10 just wanted to have a discussion about what we heard today,
11 what could be done, to address that.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio then
13 Commissioner Dai.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think I'm inclined on a
15 couple of levels to keep the core together. And it
16 addresses both what we heard this morning - the Elk Grove
17 has not split in any district, it remains whole. Its
18 connection to South Sacramento is split only halfway in the
19 Congressional, up to Florin on the southeast side is still
20 there. And, again, I think we've done a pretty good
21 balancing act of trying to maintain the earlier COI we've
22 heard with the central part of Sacramento and still
23 maintaining Elk Grove as a whole, Vineyard as a whole, and
24 linking that where we can to South Sacramento. But I think
25 overall we have been able to respect the COI testimony we

1 heard this morning.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: And I would agree. I think
3 we're basically balancing both the API and African-American
4 communities' testimony about South Sacramento against the
5 City of Sacramento. And I think it's a reasonable balance.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, is there any proposal for
7 modification, then, at this point?

8 (No response.)

9 Okay, we're keeping it as is. Commissioner Forbes,
10 are you pretty satisfied with your general description?

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes, it's very much an urban area
13 and surrounding communities. Do we want to go to the
14 Foothills?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I suppose we brought
16 the Foothills in the context of Roseville. I think the
17 Foothills District is a satisfactory district and I think,
18 you know, they maintain - again, it's their community of
19 interest that we heard both in Auburn and I think it was in
20 Merced, they talked about that they have a different
21 interest from the flatlands. The fact that we kept Lake
22 Tahoe together is a real plus and Truckee as well, which is
23 also a plus. We heard that they wanted that to be made
24 whole. And the way the population is distributed the
25 Foothills District interests will be the predominant

1 interest in that district. And I think that's what we were
2 trying to achieve.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Given the volume of
5 testimony that we receive, I think it was from Tuolumne
6 County, if Ms. Clark could address what the potential
7 ramifications were if we were to consider putting a
8 portion. Because what we see here is we did respond to
9 community of interest testimony that was concerned
10 regarding the length of this district. And what we have
11 done is shortened it but the potential ramifications of
12 considering testimony from Tuolumne, you see that it would
13 split that district up and we would have considerable
14 difficulty in trying to put the northern part of the
15 Foothills District with any other area as well as the
16 southern portion. So, Ms. Clark, if you could maybe expand
17 on that a little bit as to that community of interest
18 testimony that we received and what the potential
19 ramifications could be throughout the central region there
20 of California.

21 MS. CLARK: Sure. So moving Tuolumne and/or
22 Calaveras County into Stanislaus or into the same
23 Congressional district as Stanislaus County, which we did
24 hear COI testimony about, would obviously break up this
25 Foothills District. We would have to replace that

1 population potentially by adding Mono and Inyo Counties and
2 part of Tulare County. So, in fact, that would lengthen
3 the Foothill District.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And, again, this is shorter
5 than it was and it does have the same as the north part of
6 the state in the sense that you don't have a lot of people.
7 So it's going to be a large district.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio?

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, and this is an area
10 that I think Commissioner Aguirre and I, being in that
11 region, have looked at closely. And Tuolumne and Calaveras
12 being linked with Stanislaus County, there are a number of
13 linkages. But I think there are a couple of issues that we
14 were trying to balance, whereas if you just took those
15 counties and linked it with Stanislaus you isolated the
16 southern part and those ripple effects just for population,
17 again, those southern part of the Foothills would have to
18 be linked over into - well, well past, actually, Mono, Inyo
19 and probably into San Bernardino. Of if you put the
20 appendage in with the Foothills - I say appendage, if you
21 had a whole Foothills and then it just reached down into
22 one valley community, Stanislaus, I think that would be
23 problematic in terms of a lot of what we're trying to
24 balance.

25 It's just, again, you can see the linkage and we

1 really did try and go through those options but the
2 consequences in terms of the rest of the Foothills, it kind
3 of just shattered everything else, particularly since,
4 again, a reminder that the southern part of the San Joaquin
5 Valley is so set with the Section 5 districts down there,
6 there is just really little to no maneuverability.

7 MS. CLARK: Right. And that's to say that there is
8 no option to create a couple of foothill/valley districts
9 because of the Section 5 districts of Merced and Kings
10 Counties. So basically there can't be a couple of east to
11 west districts right here, there's just the one north to
12 south.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, any additional comments?

14 (No response.)

15 Okay, we're going ahead with that one. Maybe we
16 can swing back to NEBAY, I guess. Is that still yours,
17 Commissioner Forbes? Or are we in a new region?

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's North Bay, isn't it?
19 That's not a Bay Area? Cynthia?

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Are we now in the Bay Area region?

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: I guess so.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let me make sure. Do you have any
23 others, Commissioner Forbes?

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't think so.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so we are moving to the next

1 region.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Should we go to the Bay
3 Area or, Jamie, do you want to finish with the Central
4 Valley?

5 MS. CLARK: I think that we should finish with the
6 valley and then we can move onto the Bay Area.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

8 MS. CLARK: So this visualization, SNJOA, includes
9 the City of Stockton, Lathrop, Lodi to Galt in the 99
10 corridor and then some of this eastern Contra Costa County.
11 And this community.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Whose got this one?

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, that's Commissioner
14 Aguirre and myself. I think this one is almost a result as
15 much as anything else of moving up from the valley from the
16 bottom, the constraints on both sides with the Section 5's
17 that are in the south part of the San Joaquin Valley and
18 the integrities we just mentioned with the Foothills
19 District. The population comes up with all of Stanislaus
20 County and part of San Joaquin County. So this is, again,
21 the integrity, you have Galt and Lodi that were able to be
22 taken into the San Joaquin County District, which was very
23 favorable. I think the only aspect is the Contra Costa
24 part of this district. But, as we've seen and we will
25 probably go into in order to get that incorporated, there

1 is a big shift that has to take place all the way around
2 and you have some barriers that have to be broken in order
3 for that to take place.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: And even though it's probably
6 not Contra Costa's favorite incarnation at least Antioch,
7 Brentwood, Oakley, Discovery Bay and Bethel Island are
8 together.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional comments?

10 (No response.)

11 Okay, I think we're good on that district. Do we
12 want to go south?

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: This district was, again,
14 really a result of the district below it being the Merced
15 Section 5 that was set. So then you had the remainder of
16 Stanislaus County - excuse me, you had Stanislaus County
17 and the remainder of San Joaquin County. And the linkage
18 here was trying to keep the south cities in San Joaquin
19 County, Tracy, Lathrop, Manteca, linked with Stanislaus,
20 both along the 5 and the 99 corridors and still being
21 traditionally agriculture and to some degree commuters into
22 the Bay Area.

23 As I mentioned before, we did look at linking
24 Stanislaus County into the Foothills but the ripple effects
25 of that were not desirable. And I should just also note

1 that in the Senate and the Assembly Merced is linked with
2 Stanislaus County and splits Modesto in both of those in
3 order to meet its benchmarks. So this is the one
4 opportunity for Modesto and Stanislaus to be whole, where
5 before they were kind of at the mercy of Merced.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any comments?

7 (No response.)

8 Okay, we're good. Merced?

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And maybe if Ms. Clark
10 wants to talk about this, but this is the Section 5 that I
11 believe we have looked at quite a lot and settled on early
12 on.

13 MS. CLARK: Right. So this visualization is the
14 entire County of Merced and then west Madera County, the
15 flatlands of Madera County along the 99 corridor. There
16 was a lot of COI testimony advocating for this split. And
17 for population and to meet the benchmarks then this south
18 Fresno COI and the City of Fresno.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And this has been pretty
20 stable for the last couple of iterations.

21 MS. CLARK: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think the one thing
23 again to note that Ms. Clark mentioned is in the County of
24 Madera we have heard testimony of the differences between
25 the valley and the foothills and also keeping them

1 together. So we've heard conflicting COI. So in this
2 visualization they are separated, I believe in a later one
3 they are together.

4 MS. CLARK: Yes, in the Assembly they are together.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, next.

7 MS. CLARK: Next can we please look at the Kings
8 Congressional District? This visualization hasn't changed
9 since last time you've seen it. It's west Fresno County,
10 the entirety of Kings County, northwest Kern County,
11 including these farming communities in Bakersfield and
12 outside of Bakersfield, south Tulare County and then also
13 the City of Dinuba.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, I thought we had given
15 direction - and I don't think it was directly to you, but I
16 think it was at the last or one of the later meetings when
17 - because Mr. Brown had indicated to us that the Section 2
18 basis was not as strong because of inconclusive racially
19 polarized voting. Maybe that wasn't conveyed to you but we
20 had - guess not, okay. So what was the - given the
21 previous iteration, which had it, I think, at around 49
22 percent, the Latino CVAP -

23 MS. CLARK: The previous iteration had 49.72
24 percent Latino CVAP.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, was that an easy exchange with

1 the adjacent district?

2 MS. CLARK: Yes. The exchange is for this Kings
3 County District picked up the City of Dinuba in exchange
4 for some communities here in southwest Tulare County along
5 the 99 corridor and also for Kingsburg, which is the city
6 here along the 99 corridor, it's in Fresno County.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, I believe the consensus last
8 time was to revert that iteration and that's basically the
9 switch you just described, which is the Fresno District was
10 not changed much either from the - this is a fairly simple
11 -

12 MS. CLARK: The exchanges between -

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: - exchange.

14 MS. CLARK: - this FRSNO District and the Kings
15 District.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah, okay. Commissioner Barabba?

17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If I heard you correctly, we
18 are no longer required to be above 50 percent CVAP, is that
19 correct?

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. I think Mr. Brown stated
21 that the statistical evidence was not basically firm enough
22 to say that it had to be a Section 2.

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If that's the case then it
24 looks like we might be able to clear up that little Dinuba
25 area there and trade it off in other areas.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes. And I think we basically
2 concluded - I guess the communication wasn't there but I
3 think the direction would be to do that and basically just
4 limit it to that exchange that you just described.

5 MS. CLARK: Sure.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: That shouldn't cause any problems
7 with the other adjacent districts?

8 MS. CLARK: No the rest of the boundaries will stay
9 the same.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: You are cleaning up
12 the Kings District at the Dinuba?

13 MS. CLARK: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, I just want to
15 make sure I had that clear. Thank you.

16 MS. CLARK: Can I repeat the direction back?

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

18 MS. CLARK: That is to return Dinuba to the FRSNO
19 District and to pick up the population from Kingsburg and
20 also communities in southwest Tulare County along the 99
21 corridor.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: That's correct. And, again, to the
23 extent that reflected the previous iteration that should be
24 just fine.

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. We're okay on that.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I had just one
3 question. If anybody has the reference on - I was looking
4 on the website for that first iteration. Is it on the
5 website? The one that you are asking Q2 to go back to.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Would that have been the first
7 draft map?

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Was it the first
9 draft map?

10 MS. CLARK: I have that but I will have to - it's
11 not loaded into this plan. If I open a new plan I can -

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: No, I'm not asking
13 that we waste your time. I just wanted some direction if
14 it was in the first draft or if it was a visualization post
15 the first draft maps, that I could look at it real quick.

16 MS. CLARK: It is the first draft.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Thank you.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, Commissioner Filkins-Webber,
19 if you want to take a look at it we can come back to it.
20 It's not a complicated exchange at this point. So let's
21 just go ahead then. Where are we now?

22 MS. CLARK: If we move on to FRSNO, that's the
23 district that this Dinuba-Kingsburg exchange was just
24 discussed.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: So, Commissioner DiGuilio, anything

1 to add, or Aguirre?

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think basically this was
3 a result of the kind of geographic boundaries that we had
4 in conjunction with the two Section 5 districts. So what
5 we did was try to keep the integrity of those valley-based
6 metropolitan areas together and that's what drew this
7 district right here, FRSNO.

8 MS. CLARK: In previous iterations for
9 Congressional districts, Fresno had been split into five
10 different Congressional districts and so there also was an
11 exchange for this community, Squaw Valley, which previously
12 had been in the Tulare District, for population. And then
13 there was an exchange there.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And you recall from the
15 public testimony they just asked to be down from five
16 Congressional to four. I think those from the county
17 recognize what was happening. And I think we were able to
18 accommodate the reduction from five Congressional districts
19 down to four.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, anything else.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Sorry.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Go ahead.

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I don't want there to
24 be minutia but if we put Dinuba back into Fresno and we are
25 cleaning this up - because I'm looking back at the draft

1 map and I'm a little concerned whether - there wouldn't be
2 any impact on splitting Fresno again, would there?

3 MS. CLARK: No.

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, thank you.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I would just point out when
7 you look at the - because, you know, we were only able to
8 reduce it from five to four splits. But when you look at
9 Fresno County as a county - I don't know if you can do the
10 outlines here - it's a very, very big county that goes from
11 really the tip of Mono all the way over to Monterey. So
12 it's a huge county that goes all the way from the foothills
13 across the valley. So, given the fact that it's that size
14 and that we've got the Section 5 districts I think people
15 have to realize that that county is a difficult county to
16 try and reduce the splits in.

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: There are actually two
18 Section 5 counties in Fresno. So it is difficult.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: And that will certainly be
20 reflected in the report. Next.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question: How many times is the
22 City of Fresno split in the Congressional district?

23 MS. CLARK: It is in two Congressional districts.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, thank you.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Next district, Ms. Clark.

1 MS. CLARK: The next district is this KR district.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, and I think at this
3 point it was again, once we had done the metropolitan area
4 of Fresno, Visalia, Tulare, and dealing with the Kings curl
5 this was kind of the area that was left in the Central
6 Valley not crossing over into LA County or San Luis Obispo,
7 San
8 Bernardino, this is the metropolitan area of Bakersfield
9 and then a little bit the southern portion of the foothills
10 with Tulare.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: And also we did have to go into
13 Lancaster?

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry, yes, we did.
15 And we did try and pull the line up as much as possible.
16 But, again, with Congressional and deviation being so low
17 we were forced to go into the high desert there. You are
18 correct. And that was something Ms. Clark had worked very
19 hard to try and adjust, even with Mono and Inyo as
20 possibilities. But there was just too large of a
21 population to maneuver that through.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional comments on this
23 district? Commissioner Blanco?

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, just to point out that
25 Ridgecrest is here.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But not just Ridgecrest but
3 that whole area below it to the China Base. So it was kept
4 all together. I don't know that we really considered it,
5 but I know that that was - like I say, it wasn't just a
6 city but there is a whole region there with military
7 national security interests that we've tried to keep in
8 that district.

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And did you mention Edwards
10 Air Force Base, too, with that, I believe?

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, next.

13 MS. CLARK: Can we move on to SLOSB, please?

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

15 MS. CLARK: There is a hard line here between
16 Monterey and San Luis Obispo County as Monterey is a
17 Section 5 county. There is also a hard line between San
18 Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura and Ventura County and
19 Kern County. There was a lot of COI testimony also about
20 the existing districts and not wanting to move east from
21 these more coastal counties. This visualization shows San
22 Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties whole. The only
23 city split is in Ventura and that was per CRC direction.
24 The split just moves along the coast in the City of
25 Ventura. And then the shape here in northern Ventura is

1 sort of based on the Ojai Unified School District line.
2 There had been COI testimony that the upper Ojai Valley
3 belonged with Ojai and the rest of the Ojai Valley.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Aguirre, this is your
5 area?

6 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. Essentially, as has
7 just been pointed, we started out from the north with the
8 county line and we just tried to capture rolling down the
9 coast with the ocean on the left side and the Coastal Range
10 on the right-hand side. Most of the population, of course,
11 is along 101. The rest of it on the east side is generally
12 unpopulated. Going on into Santa Barbara there was concern
13 about the area of Ojai. And in order to capture that we
14 decided to go along the coast into the City of Ventura
15 capturing kind of like the tourist beach area of the City
16 of Ventura, going down toward - I think we stopped on, was
17 it the Santa Clara river or Spinnaker Drive? Somewhere
18 along there.

19 MS. CLARK: I just moved down into Ventura and then
20 just for population reasons stayed out here.

21 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. So, of course, it
22 recognizes the tourist connection between the five cities
23 area in northern San Luis Obispo then down into Santa
24 Barbara, which is heavily tourist, and then down into the
25 tourist area around the City of Ventura. And it also

1 recognizes that there is significant agriculture in the
2 Santa Barbara area and into the Santa Maria area, with some
3 viticulture up into the area of San Luis Obispo.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio?

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think this is a very good
6 district as well. And I think the one thing I would be
7 curious to get feedback on in terms of from the City of
8 Ventura is, I think we have done a very good job of keeping
9 Ojai and the upper Ojai Valley with the City of Ventura but
10 the trade-off was to go along the coast. And the reasoning
11 for that was that this is a Congressional district and the
12 majority of the rest of the district is a coastal one and
13 the idea was to go into the City of Ventura along the
14 coast. I think there is some play in there whether how far
15 in the city wants it to go in terms of - I think it goes up
16 to Main Street.

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: But this is just an area
19 where it gives the city an opportunity to comment on this,
20 where they believe that line should to. There is a
21 population that needs to be picked up and this was the call
22 that we made. And if there is something that they would
23 like to change with that, that's where we would hear from
24 them.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, any additional comments?

1 Commissioner Blanco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We should probably include in
3 the narrative the East Ventura decisions we made in this
4 district.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: So, Commissioner Aguirre, anything
6 else?

7 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: All right, moving on into
8 the EVENT Congressional District, essentially, you know,
9 after working on the SLOSB District we moved into the area
10 and we thought it was captured very well by the fact that
11 there are ten cities in this area. They can't all be on
12 the team, so to speak. So there is one area that needs to
13 be out and that happens to be based on COI testimony, not
14 only from Simi Valley but from Santa Clarita and also from
15 the Thousand Oaks area that it seemed like Santa Clarita
16 and Simi Valley had more of a COI between the two. So
17 previously the area was in other iterations significantly
18 different, where Thousand Oaks was split as well as Oxnard.
19 So in trying to work on those, trying to keep the
20 agricultural COI of the Santa Clara Valley and the Oxnard
21 area and all of the area around Camarillo, in fact, then
22 this is the iteration that seemed to make the most sense.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, other comments on this
24 district?

25 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: One additional comment

1 related to the east county is that we heard significant
2 testimony about keeping the east county together, that
3 being the Casa Conejo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Simi Valley
4 and Camarillo area together, which we've managed to do
5 except for the area of Simi Valley.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai, did you have a
7 comment?

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Just to say that we were also
9 able to keep the Santa Paula and Fillmore-Piru area
10 together. It's highly agricultural.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Blanco?

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, the alternatives
13 proposed to us by some of the residents of east Ventura
14 County that would have kept all those cities - Simi,
15 Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Casa Conejo - together all split,
16 put big portions of Ventura with Santa Barbara and had more
17 city splits. So I think we've minimized the splits of the
18 county and the cities and the communities of interest
19 together here as much as possible.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yes, and I think one of the
22 other proposals we saw - forgive me for not remembering -
23 the other option is if you include Simi Valley with the
24 rest of their east Ventura County partners is to go up the
25 coast and split Oxnard and Port Hueneme and bring that down

1 into the LA area. And, again, this is just the balancing
2 act of, you know, what's going to work best for not just
3 one city or one county but the region as it ripples out.
4 So this was, I think, that which did the least harm. Simi
5 Valley is a great tenth player but it's a tenth player in
6 this particular baseball team out of nine.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: And just for members of the public,
8 we are only covering Northern California, though obviously
9 we are in Southern California right now. But, given the
10 division of labor among our mappers, this is sort of the
11 southernmost area we are going to cover today and then we
12 will start taking the adjacent districts in later sessions.

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I would venture to
14 guess that Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo don't
15 consider themselves Southern California, they consider
16 themselves south-central coast. That's a big distinction.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah, and we supplied a north and
18 south, and obviously there is a -

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Southern Central Coast.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Everything north of LA.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Not to insult anyone, of course.
22 But we just made a very crude division of the state between
23 north and south. So Monterey? Ms. Clark, are you done
24 with your districts at this point?

25 MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let me do a time check. We
2 are at ten to twelve.

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: May I raise one more question
4 associated with that?

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: The southern edge of the Ventura
7 County where it dips into Los Angeles County, that's
8 because of the Thousand Oaks - that little -

9 MS. CLARK: This is Westlake Village.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Westlake Village, yes.

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And that city straddles
12 both counties.

13 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah, an unusual configuration, a
15 straddler. Okay, let me do a time check because we are at
16 ten to twelve. We will have to swap out the mappers to go
17 to the Bay Area districts. Did you want to add something,
18 Jamie?

19 MS. CLARK: Yes, Tamina and I can switch but we can
20 both use - we don't need to switch machines.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. We can keep going. Also we
22 are going to take a lunch break. We could take an early
23 lunch break and just sort of reconvene at a quarter to one.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Can we finish
25 Congressional?

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: We can keep going. I just wanted
2 to get a sense. Okay, why don't we just keep going then.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would like to keep
4 moving.

5 MS. ALON: Okay, here we are in the Bay Area. And
6 let me just repeat to you the instruction that I got last
7 time I was here. I was directed to revert back to the
8 first draft map, keep the Golden Gate Bridge as a hard line
9 and then incorporate the newer Monterey visualization which
10 meets the benchmark. And then work on some street level
11 details in Richmond and in San Jose.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, is the NEBAY yours as well?

13 MS. ALON: NEBAY is up here. This is kind of half
14 mine and half Jamie's. But you already talked about it.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes, I don't want to orphan it in
16 terms of discussion. Maybe we can just start there.

17 MS. ALON: Sure. We did keep Napa County whole,
18 including American Canyon, in this visualization. We also
19 put the urban area of Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park, matched
20 it with the urban area in Napa as well. And then went
21 south for population, Benicia-Martinez corridor there with
22 the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. And then similarly across the
23 Carquinez Bridge. And just a reminder per our previous
24 discussion, we erred on the side of keeping Lake County
25 whole but that required that to be put in the Yolo District

1 and the trade-off if we were to have taken Lake into Napa
2 would have required a split either of Vallejo or Benicia,
3 as I recall. So we erred on the side of trying to keep the
4 cities whole and the county whole.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So because we had this
7 discussion this morning and we saw that we could to some
8 degree keep Fairfield into Solana and there would an
9 integrity there and we might be able to go down a little
10 ways in trying to incorporate Lake, but that would have to
11 become a decision from Lake in terms of having itself
12 split. So that would be something for them to make that
13 decision and that's something that might be able to be
14 accommodated in the last live line drawing because it would
15 be a pretty equal population shift if that's what they
16 wanted. But that would have to be a decision. Again, I
17 know there were individuals this morning that wanted to
18 keep it whole with Napa but that's not possible. So the
19 next best option would be -

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Split with Napa.

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: - split with Napa. And
22 they can make the call for us.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy
24 and then Commissioner Barabba.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: In looking at the

1 101 corridor, this is a significant improvement. I think
2 last time we looked at options we were considering one that
3 effectively broke the 101 corridor into three separate
4 segments. And so what we've done in this visualization is
5 there is a split but it's fairly balanced in terms of
6 population on either side of the 101 split, if you look
7 just at these southernmost counties, and keeps Santa Rosa
8 and Rohnert Park together, which are two very close-knit
9 communities.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba is
11 passing. Any other comments?

12 (No response.)

13 Okay, no proposals at this point. So let's move
14 south then. So is it Commissioner Dai and Commissioner
15 Galambos-Malloy then?

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: You want to go, Connie?

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Sure, I can walk us
18 through. As everyone knows, we have very strong COI
19 testimony from the communities essentially east of the
20 hills. So when you look at the 680 corridor on the north-
21 south axis all of these communities from essentially San
22 Ramon going north have a very strong community of interest
23 there. This district does an excellent job of preserving
24 those communities. When we look at some of the areas where
25 this district had to make some trade-offs, one of them that

1 I note particularly is having to split off Pittsburg and
2 Antioch, which are significant-sized cities. Of course,
3 any other changes we think about in this area could impact
4 the way that is split.

5 But my understanding is that they are both whole in
6 this configuration?

7 MS. ALON: No.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: No? Can you clarify
9 which city is split and by how much?

10 MS. ALON: Pittsburg is whole and Antioch is split
11 by 30,000 people.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay, so Antioch is
13 split and then if we go up into the northwest corner my
14 understanding as well is that Richmond is split.

15 MS. ALON: Yes, that's right.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So I actually have
17 some significant feedback as we get farther south into
18 Alameda County, which could impact how we're thinking about
19 this district. But I think the ongoing concerns that we've
20 had are around some of the splits, particularly with
21 Antioch and Richmond being similar in size and being
22 smaller cities and we are looking at splitting both of
23 them. I think we have even as of this morning some COI
24 testimony regarding where we have chosen to split Richmond
25 and there may need to be some - if we do move forward with

1 considering a Richmond split we may need to adjust exactly
2 where that split is occurring.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco?

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, I am still having
5 problems with this whole area. We've got those cities
6 which are sort of the - I don't know what you would call
7 them, you know, all that Benicia, outer delta area that
8 we've got them in so many different - we've got Hercules
9 and Martinez in one and then Bay Point-Pittsburg in another
10 and half of Antioch and Richmond split. I think maybe
11 because, you know, I'm originally from this area, I think
12 so much of that corridor that goes along the 4 and picks up
13 all those towns is so connected. You know, Martinez, Bay
14 Point, Pittsburg, Antioch. And here we've got them
15 completely split up in so many different districts. And
16 then on top of that Richmond split. I don't know, I am
17 really not sure what's driving it but it feels - and it's
18 unfortunate because we don't really have a lot of testimony
19 talking about this as a region. But when you know this
20 area that corridor on the 4 that goes along the water or
21 whatever, where the BART runs, you know that's the BART
22 line, just I'm troubled by this splitting up of this entire
23 area.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy then
25 maybe Q2 can elaborate a bit more.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would have to
2 agree with Commissioner Blanco's feedback. I have really
3 spent a lot of time reviewing what we've proposed for this
4 area. And as I look at, you know, my areas of concern for
5 the region it is really focused on the East Bay. I think
6 what we've done well is that we've kept that 680 corridor
7 together and I think there has been a number of other
8 things that we could do a lot better on. And I think that,
9 you know, the decision to revert back to our first draft
10 maps has a number of consequences. So, you know, I would
11 like to as we start moving - I don't know, at this point I
12 don't actually think it's super useful to give a lot of
13 direction on this district without having taken a look at
14 the district south so that we can think of them in a
15 regional context. But if other commissioners do have
16 feedback just for this one district we could entertain
17 that.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio and then,
19 again, I will go to Q2.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I would like to see.
21 Because I think there's things happening in the southern
22 part around this district and the northern and I do see
23 that it would be nice to reunite those communities along
24 the 4. But I see part of the issue is in order to do that
25 you will have to take from the Napa to start off with.

1 MS. ALON: Right.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILLIO: And then that's going to
3 push population up through Solano, Sacramento. I mean,
4 that push is going to have to go one way and then to fix
5 the problems in the south with population. I mean, this is
6 - it starts there and I see you could fix some problems but
7 then the repercussions up into Napa, I'm assuming, are
8 going to have to go east. Because we can't really go west
9 because then you have to jump over the bridge, right? So
10 your push is going to have to be Napa, Solano, San Joaquin
11 and then, because of Section 5 - yeah, I would just like to
12 hear what our mappers have to say about some of this as we
13 move forward.

14 MS. ALON: So this district, as you can see, is
15 interesting because it's the intersection of one, two,
16 three, four, five, six districts which the Commission has
17 given direction about. And so as the direction has evolved
18 over time this district ends up being the one that gets
19 changed whenever something from the north ripples down or
20 something from the east ripples over. And so this is
21 really just a product. What this district started out as
22 was really not crossing this area, keeping this part intact
23 and coming over here. But then as all of the decisions
24 were made for north of this area, north of this region,
25 this is what eventually ended up happening. So, I guess,

1 depending on what your decisions would be up north, that
2 would change this.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Galambos-
4 Malloy?

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, I recognize
6 that I have always been in the minority on this issue. But
7 this concept of crossing or not crossing the bridge, I
8 suggest that we may revisit that as a result of looking at
9 the East Bay. Because I think the consequences of what
10 we're seeing in the
11 East Bay are really drastic. So I am still open. I know
12 we have a lot of strong COI testimony not to cross the
13 bridge, a much smaller amount of COI testimony that says we
14 might be able to cross the bridge. We have managed not to
15 cross the bridge in our other districts and I think this is
16 one of the areas we may need to consider some sort of
17 compromise if that's one of the options that helps us
18 address some of the East Bay issues.

19 MS. ALON: Last week I presented a visualization
20 which did cross the bridge. Did you want to see that one
21 again?

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: If you have it
23 handy, yes.

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: If you have it handy,
25 just to remind us. Or we can look it up on the web, I was

1 about ready to do that.

2 MS. MACDONALD: We will switch plans really
3 quickly.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I'm wondering, I
5 mean, would it be helpful to go through the other two
6 adjacent districts and acknowledge the issues that we're
7 seeing? There may be the possibility that that
8 visualization addresses all those issues or it may be some
9 other hybrid.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can I ask a question of our
11 mappers? Was this also impacted? Did we end up with this
12 fragmentation also because of the American Canyon or is
13 that unrelated?

14 MS. CLARK: I believe that that was unrelated.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.

16 (Pause as mappers change views on screen.)

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Do you want to do a quick break,
18 Ms. MacDonald?

19 MS. MACDONALD: We're just looking for the file, so
20 just a second.

21 (Further pause.)

22 Perhaps a five minute break.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, why don't we just do a five
24 minute break.

25 MS. MACDONALD: As soon as you call the break we

1 will find it.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we will take a short break.

3 We will still be breaking for lunch probably in about a

4 half an hour or so.

5 (Five minute break at 12:05 p.m.)

6 Okay, we are back from break. So, Ms. Alon, if you

7 want to continue.

8 MS. ALON: Sure. So this is a visualization which

9 was introduced last week. And this has a slightly

10 different configuration for the COCO District in which we

11 have this area not being split into three but into two.

12 And so I was asked to revert back to this one just to take

13 a look at it for notes and see if it solves any problems

14 further down in the Alameda area.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any commentary regarding - you

16 know, we did see this last week and the general instruction

17 was not to go with this. But, again, there are some fixes

18 on a couple of areas but there are also changes in others.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And, Ms. Alon, if

20 you could remind us on the first draft map, how the first

21 draft map differs from what we're seeing right now?

22 MS. ALON: Sure. In this area that we're

23 discussing the first draft map has Richmond split and

24 coming down into this so-named Richmond District and then

25 the other half of Richmond going east into the COCO

1 District and then this Martinez-Crockett-Hercules area
2 going north into Solano.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So even though we
4 provided direction to Q2, the visualizations that we are
5 looking at today, the most recent version, I feel very
6 uncomfortable with for a number of reasons in the East Bay.
7 And as we get farther south into the districts I think the
8 repercussions as we look further south at the Tri-City area
9 is significant. I think there are different options on how
10 we could release some of the population pressure. We have
11 all referred to the idea of crossing the bridge. That's
12 one possibility. I think another possibility might be
13 looking at the LaMOrinda area.

14 We have had significant testimony not to cross the
15 hills. We've also had some more modest testimony that
16 there is a connection between those hill communities and
17 the western part of the bay. And I think we have - you
18 know, we're recognizing trade-offs in different places and
19 if we have kept them all together in other maps we may need
20 to look at breaking that. You know, if you get to the root
21 of what some of my issues are here in the East Bay, I think
22 when you look at this area, kind of Richmond north, when
23 you're looking at Vallejo, Benicia, Pittsburg, you're
24 looking at an area that's, you know, socioeconomically very
25 modest, many of those cities. And because of where they

1 are located some of the visualizations we've been looking
2 at split them as many as five different ways, which makes
3 it very challenging for effective political representation,
4 especially when you're talking at the Congressional level.

5 Then as you go farther south in the East Bay the
6 way I think we have acknowledged as a Commission that we
7 were not able to keep the Tri-Cities whole was to say,
8 Well, we were able to do it at the senatorial level. But I
9 think it's been very clear from the part of the Tri-City
10 area that not all representation is created equally. And
11 when you're looking at the unique economic interests of
12 this part of the Bay Area and the manufacturing base and
13 what it will take to retool the economy in that part of the
14 area, those are Congressional issues. And so to say, Well,
15 we kept you together at the senatorial level, I just don't
16 think that cuts it. When you combine that with the fact
17 that it is one of the most densely populated and diverse
18 Asian areas in the Bay Area and in the state, now we've
19 heard about the Latino and African-American populations
20 when you combine the Tri-Cities with Hayward, I think that
21 the visualization we started with today is very problematic
22 for a number of reasons.

23 So, you know, clearly this is close to home, it's
24 not home, but it's close to home. So I would be interested
25 to hear what other commissioners have to say. But I would

1 definitely not feel comfortable with where the
2 visualization that we started this conversation with.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco, did you want
4 to chime in here?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I mean, I share a lot of the
6 same concerns. I mean, you talk about the cities of
7 Richmond, Hercules, Pinole, Martinez, Bay Point, Pittsburg
8 - first of all, this is one of heart of the mortgage
9 crisis. I mean, these are not - they used to be middle-low
10 income. Now many of them have really become extremely low
11 income. It's an area with a lot of issues. And not only
12 are they now separated into five Congressional districts
13 but they are in districts that may not understand some of
14 their issues. So I feel like this area is getting the
15 brunt, as somebody said, of being sort of the convergence
16 where everybody else is - we're doing great things for
17 everybody all around and then in here it gets completely -
18 it's like leftover thinking about the importance of this
19 community's need for representation.

20 So I feel the say way about the Tri-City issue,
21 that we've made a lot of - we are accommodating a lot of
22 people and then basically the East Bay, the working class
23 poor neighborhoods of the East Bay basically have not
24 received a lot of attention in terms of what would
25 districts look like that should represent their needs. So

1 I'm very concerned about this. As it is now I could not
2 give this map a thumbs up.

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: This one that you're
4 looking at now?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, the previous one. This
6 one, you know, has that issue of the Bay Bridge. When you
7 look - which I'm not saying that's a minimal or I don't
8 want to minimize the concern. But when you look at all the
9 other things that flow from that where you have the Tri-
10 Cities kept together, LaMOrinda kept together, you have
11 Richmond whole, you have Oakland - is Oakland split in this
12 one?

13 MS. ALON: Oakland is whole.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oakland is whole. And then
15 you have the corridor, San Pablo, Richmond, Hercules,
16 Crockett, Benicia, cities that have a lot of similarities.
17 And you do still continue to have Antioch and Oakley, but
18 they are with Brentwood and Bethel and Discovery Bay. If
19 you were looking at the - if your center of the universe
20 was not the Golden Gate Bridge and that divide, if the
21 center of your universe was that you were an East Bay
22 person this would be a perfect map.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Except I would point out that
24 the Eden area was split, so it wouldn't be perfect. But is
25 might be fixable.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio?

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I just have some concerns.
3 I would like to explore this more. Because there is a lot
4 of - I see that there are benefits in the East Bay but to
5 me it still raises some issues that we had a long
6 discussion about last week, which was the whole Richmond-
7 San Pablo area going with Solano. I'm not wedded to the
8 Bay Bridge - I mean, crossing the Golden Gate. If that
9 solves something I have no problem crossing it. I just
10 feel like at this point I thought we had gone through the
11 exercise -

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, the concern was Yuba and
13 Napa for Richmond, not Solano.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think what we have to
15 look at is, we've made some decisions about these other
16 districts and the Marin being tied to Sonoma and, you know,
17 we've made a lot of decisions already in this Solano, Napa,
18 Marin, Sonoma. And if we change what's happening down here
19 - not to say that we can't because I don't want that to be
20 the driver, but there are other implications in the
21 northern part of the state that we have to look at, it's
22 not just trying to fix the Bay Area east or west, it's the
23 repercussions up the coast as well.

24 And I also want to get someone's opinion on what
25 happens in the south, too, in San Jose and northern - I

1 think northern Santa Cruz is taken care of. But so I'm
2 just kind of curious about exploring it. We're looking at
3 things in isolation. But, as I recall, we did look at the
4 bigger picture last week.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Forbes?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think part of the problem I
7 have with dealing with this going north is that there are
8 so few options going north, there just aren't the people to
9 move around. And so to try and correct this to the north,
10 just really, I think, disrupts a whole bunch of districts;
11 I mean, five or six districts that really don't have any
12 choices in how they are set up.

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Actually, can we back up so
14 we can see what it does to the north?

15 MS. ALON: This northern area is not - don't look
16 at the districts for this northern area because you have
17 given new direction since then for these.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If we went to a more
19 southerly part of it, it would cause us to go back up and
20 look at something like this, is that correct?

21 MS. ALON: I'm sorry? Oh, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And if we go up into Marin,
23 you know, that swings everything around across the north
24 part of the state. I just don't think you can do that.

25 MS. ALON: One thing I would point out, there was

1 discussion last time about switching San Ramon and these
2 areas over here for San Leandro in order to keep Eden
3 together and to keep this corridor together. If you do
4 that, that's about an 85,000 person population shift. And
5 so you could come back and take in some of Richmond over
6 here. Now, it would split it and it wouldn't solve the
7 whole problem but it might be a starting point.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Additional comments? Commissioner
9 Dai?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, just to recap some of the
11 discussion and the reason why we ended up going back to the
12 first draft. So in addition to the Golden Gate split,
13 which was not so much about the bridge as trying to
14 separate urban San Francisco from a more suburban and rural
15 area in Marin, moving south I think that the concern -
16 let's see, there was - the first draft was the only
17 incarnation that kept both the west valley cities together
18 as well as the Eden area. And perhaps Commissioners
19 Ancheta and Barabba can comment further on the implications
20 in San Jose, but it does split the Milberry (ph) COI as
21 well. And I may have had some additional impacts on some
22 of the other smaller communities of interest within San
23 Jose. Ms. Alon might be able to -

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Can you confirm that in terms of
25 the southern ripple, or the southern differences?

1 MS. ALON: Well, in this map we actually do have -
2 so the Fremont-Milberry COI is not together but we have
3 significant areas of Milpitas and Berryessa together and
4 areas which wish to be with them. And then the Alum Rock
5 area with the downtown. And then Evergreen and Little
6 Saigon are in this district together. This map also
7 preserves the Golden Triangle, which is kind of this area
8 over here, which is a high tech area COI.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And to loop back to
10 San Leandro, my perspective on San Leandro is that the top
11 priority should be keeping San Leandro whole if we can do
12 that. I think there would be flexibility as to whether San
13 Leandro at the Congressional level is paired with Oakland
14 or whether it's paired with the Eden area, I think it's
15 important in one of our districts at least to include the
16 Eden area whole. I don't think there is as compelling a
17 case as to why that needs to happen at the Congressional
18 level as opposed to another level of districts versus when
19 we look at an area like the Tri-City area where we have a
20 really clear and compelling reason as to why Congressional
21 representation makes sense for that area.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any commissioners want to speak in
23 favor of one versus the other? I'm not sure there is a
24 third option here that might be explored.

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can I still see - I mean, I

1 know Ms. Alon said don't look at the north. But we have to
2 look at the north. So I want to see what happens. Yeah,
3 what does this version do to the north?

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: My question is
5 whether this version actually works out the entire north
6 such that the northern areas we're looking at combine
7 appropriately with this version? Because oftentimes we
8 will look at a visualization that is one option but the
9 rest of the map doesn't flow correctly as far as population
10 numbers, et cetera. So, Ms. Alon or Ms. Clark, if that's
11 been worked out in this visualization that would be helpful
12 to address Commissioner DiGuilio's question and mine.

13 MS. CLARK: Okay, so these visualizations for
14 Northern California are pretty similar to the
15 visualizations that we just went over today to some extent.
16 Again, the difference here is that the City of Santa Rosa
17 is included with the North Coast District and that's a
18 result of this population in south Marin being included
19 with San Francisco. So we lost population here for the
20 North Coast District in southern Marin County and therefore
21 could include a majority of the City of Santa Rosa.

22 This Richmond area is included with Napa County as
23 is Rohnert Park, which is in Sonoma County. The split here
24 along Fairfield is similar population-wise. Solano County
25 is split as is Sacramento County, this delta area of

1 Sacramento County is included; West Sacramento is split
2 from Yolo County; Yuba, Sutter, Colusa and Lake are whole;
3 Glenn is split at a very similar split to the previous
4 visualization; and this MTCAP District, Siskiyou is whole;
5 and Lake Tahoe is also whole, it is included in the MTCAP
6 District, as opposed to the Foothills District.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So in the other one Lake
8 Tahoe went with the Foothills District with its home
9 counties?

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Exactly.

11 MS. CLARK: Yes, but that could be altered for this
12 if we picked up - if the split here in Placer County was
13 similar to the previous visualization then I believe that
14 the Lake Tahoe basin, including Truckee, which is
15 approximately 60,000 people, could go with the Foothills
16 District and the exchange would be that Placer County would
17 be split along the 80, north Auburn would be in MTCAP
18 District, the City of Auburn would be in the Foothills
19 District and then somewhere along here there would also be
20 a split. However, I don't know for sure that there would
21 be a city split created by that move.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: So the objection to this
24 visualization a few days ago was that Richmond was going
25 with Napa.

1 MS. CLARK: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: So maybe people have changed
3 their minds.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Now I would like to see who
5 else is in there with Richmond. I continue to be concerned
6 about two such diverse communities being put together where
7 you have everything we've heard from Napa from day one is,
8 Our focus is on agriculture and on our wine industry. And
9 then you have, you know, Pinole, Hercules, Rodeo and
10 Richmond very poor urban areas, struggling to even just get
11 jobs and foreclosures. And I don't know who is going to
12 pay attention to them politically in Napa at a
13 Congressional level, it does concern me.

14 I mean, you know, I was talking offline right now
15 with Commissioner Galambos-Malloy and we were saying, Well,
16 maybe if there is a large group of them, you know, in Napa
17 and not just Richmond but other cities maybe that helps.
18 And, you know, so I'm trying to see who is in there that
19 could -

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Vallejo is in at about
21 116,000. You know, but part of this goes to, again, your
22 point, Commissioner Blanco, that even if there is a
23 significant group with Richmond what does the significant
24 group of Richmond have in common with the significant group
25 of Napa? I mean, those are two very different - even if

1 it's kind of evenly split, so to speak. Not that that
2 doesn't happen in other areas. So I'm just pointing that
3 out, that this would be a situation where you'd have very
4 different communities being linked together regardless of
5 one dominating or them equally being split.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So crossing the bridge
7 doesn't resolve the issue for Richmond then, really.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It solves a lot of the other
9 issues, it keeps them whole and keeps them with other - it
10 keeps them with some other very similar cities, Vallejo,
11 Martinez, Hercules. Where is San Pablo in there?

12 MS. CLARK: San Pablo is with Richmond.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, so those are all -

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And El Cerrito. Is El
15 Cerrito in that cluster moving north?

16 MS. CLARK: El Cerrito is with Richmond.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, so that really is, that
18 southern area there is one very similar community.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: We did get
20 significant testimony about keeping Richmond, San Pablo and
21 El Cerrito together.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I'm sorry, Chair.

25 Our reporter might be having a problem seeing who is

1 speaking so maybe if you can queue up the speakers to help
2 the reporter.

3 THE REPORTER: Yes, thank you. It is hard to see
4 who is speaking at times, microphones are in front of
5 mouths from my view and hands are also in front of mouths.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so go ahead. Commissioner
7 DiGuilio is speaking right now.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So I think it kind of goes
9 back to, we started the discussion with the other
10 visualization, the original one. There was a problem with
11 the 4 corridor going between districts. And you still have
12 that issue here. I think there are some things we need to
13 - in order to move this process forward I think we need to
14 kind of have a starting point. Because we are kind of all
15 over the map about, Well, it would be nice to have this and
16 it would be nice to have that. But, you know, this is the
17 time to make some decisions. So in this case you still
18 have a number of districts for Contra Costa and we have to
19 kind of decide what's the least harm for that area and the
20 other areas.

21 So I just don't see how we're going to get out of
22 having some problems with the 4 corridor, if I'm not
23 mistaken. In either visualization it's going to be a
24 problem, is that correct?

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So if we look at that as
2 one of those things that we just are not going to be able
3 to correct then let's look at moving onto the next issue.
4 And what I still have some issues with is Richmond being
5 linked with Napa and I still think that the - again, not
6 that crossing the Golden Gate isn't a problem but we've
7 heard significant testimony from Marin and Sonoma not to
8 cross the Golden Gate because of COI as well as we've heard
9 a lot of significant testimony from the Tri-Cities to keep
10 themselves together.

11 So, again, this is not that one has more and one
12 has less, it's definitely not about how many people have
13 said what, believe me. We've read them all and it's not
14 about who has more, it's about what works best for the area
15 as a whole. So I would kind of like to get into that
16 discussion.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Yao then
18 Commissioner Barabba then Commissioner Galambos-Malloy.

19 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, I think this
20 discussion is taking the form of trying to keep Contra
21 Costa County whole. And basically if you take a look at
22 the geography of Contra Costa or where people live you have
23 a pocket of communities that include Pittsburg, Antioch,
24 Bay Point, that are toward the northeast. And then you
25 have the central part, which is the Martinez, Lafayette,

1 Walnut Creek and so on, going along the highway. And then
2 you have a separate pocket of people that would include
3 Richmond and so on. So by making the objective of trying
4 to keep these three communities together and trying to make
5 that a high priority, basically it would just totally
6 destroy or overwhelm all the other priorities within the
7 whole Bay Area going up and down, including the Bay Bridge.

8 So maybe the question I want to pose to the
9 Commission is: How important is this priority in the
10 overall scope of what we are attempting to do? Certainly
11 it is a clear objective, we try to keep the county together
12 as much as possible. But I think the expense of impacting
13 five or six different districts the way we have constructed
14 these is probably almost next to impossible at this stage
15 of the game.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioners Barabba,
17 Galambos-Malloy and then Blanco and then Dai.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I can appreciate the concern
19 over different income levels but to address that issue
20 we're going to take two relatively rural counties, Napa and
21 Marin, and tie them into very densely populated counties.
22 And how representation is going to be handled there, I
23 think, is really problematical.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I definitely hear

1 the concerns that are coming. I think the reality is the
2 visualization we started this conversation with does not
3 result in effective representation at the Congressional
4 level for the East Bay. And the idea that because we have
5 certain things locked in on the north side and therefore
6 we're just going to kind of work with the leftovers in the
7 central area, I think, is challenging. I think we've dealt
8 with some of these same tensions in Los Angeles, where we
9 had started at the coast and then we got to the center of
10 LA and realized we were hemmed in and it wasn't working.
11 And then we reversed course and kind of did the opposite.
12 And I think the answer really lies somewhere in between.

13 My perspective on, again, what we could shift in
14 this is that priority-wise - I know we're not going to keep
15 the 4 corridor all together. In fact, we have had COI
16 testimony talking about Solano County and Napa County as
17 really being, you know, fairly diverse counties that have
18 different sub-regions within them. I'm okay with that.
19 I'm not okay with Richmond being split, split within itself
20 and being split with its neighbor cities, all of which are
21 fairly small and which we should be able to keep together.
22 I likewise have concerns that we are not keeping the Tri-
23 City area together and I think that there are ways to do
24 that. And if it means that we have to look at east county
25 and we have to look at the bridge I think, again, these are

1 parts of the region that have been preserved in other
2 layers of the maps.

3 And so I am willing to look at trade-offs and, you
4 know, renegotiate portions of the northern state if we need
5 to. And, you know, I regret that we had to start at the
6 north and I sense frustration on the part of my fellow
7 commissioners of saying, We need to make decision, we need
8 to move on, we have already locked in the northern state.
9 But I don't think that our goal was to do that at the
10 expense of the Bay Area.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so it's Blanco, Dai then
12 DiGuilio.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, I just want to correct -
14 there seems to be a misunderstanding that this is about
15 trying to keep Contra Costa County together. For me that's
16 not the issue at all. I mean, Contra Costa is a huge
17 county, it has a lot of variety. I mean, you know,
18 Richmond is in Contra Costa. And then you have, you know,
19 stuff all the way to the east. That was not at all my
20 point.

21 I was referring to a collection of cities in an
22 area that is actually in Contra Costa that have a need for
23 similar representation and that's what we split into five
24 Congressional districts, that area up at the top that sort
25 of rings northern Contra Costa and goes west to Richmond.

1 Those are very similar cities and they are in five
2 different Congressional districts in what we were looking
3 at for today. Like Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, I think
4 there are differences along the 4, I don't think we have to
5 keep them all together and I think, you know, we've had
6 testimony to that effect. People get that, that you can't
7 keep them all together. So I want to clarify, this is not
8 about Contra Costa all together.

9 And I just would concur with much of what
10 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy said, that this is - I know
11 this is frustrating but this part of the state needs as
12 much thought given to it of trying to keep communities of
13 interest together as we've given, you know, places
14 throughout the rest of the state, where we've spent hours
15 discussing, you know, Simi and Moorpark and Santa Clarita
16 and, you know, Calabasas and Agoura. And this is an area
17 that's complex and we need to not just say, Well,
18 everything else is set so we can't think about this.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I'm going to let Ms. Clark
20 speak and then we will have Commissioner Dai, Commissioner
21 DiGuilio and Commissioner Ontai.

22 MS. CLARK: I can speak to sort of what would
23 happen in Northern California if we went with this
24 visualization and moved Richmond and Hercules, this area,
25 in with the district that Pittsburg is currently in. Would

1 you like to hear?

2 (Affirmative response from Commission.)

3 Okay. Last time when we went over this - just
4 referencing the notes - this area is approximately 200,000
5 people. So what would happen if we moved 200,000 people
6 into the COCO District is that - assuming that because the
7 Commission likes the way that the rest of the Bay Area
8 looks with this visualization, if we weren't going to touch
9 the districts south of that - so if 200,000 people moved
10 into COCO then this line between the San Joaquin-based
11 district and COCO would be that Antioch would become whole,
12 Pittsburg and Bay Point would also move, right? So the
13 line would move west this way. And Concord would be split,
14 I believe Concord would be split. It could potentially
15 remain whole.

16 Then this district, SNJOA, would be overpopulated
17 by 200,000 people. So that population could either be
18 removed by moving south here and splitting the City of
19 Stockton or by having that population picked up from the
20 Solano-Yolo District. So 200,000 more people into this
21 district. And then if we were sort of moving in a circle
22 then Lake, the remainder of Glenn, Colusa County and either
23 part of Yolo or perhaps the City of Fairfield and Vacaville
24 would move in with this Napa District. That's if we also
25 were not to split Napa County, which I believe would be

1 unnecessary.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I'm not going to respond to
4 that right away. I was going to suggest something less
5 drastic, which was potentially looking at the LaMorinda
6 area and trying to make the changes, you know, basically
7 within the East Bay here to reduce the ripple effects out.
8 Yeah, so my question is: If we reverted back to the
9 previous draft, the first draft maps, and looked at moving
10 Orinda, maybe all of LaMorinda into the, well, what's
11 called the RCMT District, which I think doesn't have
12 Richmond in it anymore, into the Berkeley-Oakland District,
13 does that help us in terms of opening up - it would
14 actually pull down the population from the north, correct?

15 (No response.)

16 Ms. Alon, could you give us a sense? If we did a
17 counter-clockwise rotation in the population there does
18 that resolve some of our issues or not?

19 MS. ALON: I don't believe it's enough population
20 to make the exchange. This is only, so 24 plus 18 plus 16.
21 So I don't know if it would be enough to take the run into
22 Richmond. You may be able to separate it from the rest of
23 its corridor.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner DiGuilio,
25 Ontai, then Blanco.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess I'm just a little -
2 I'm trying to find ways to move this process forward, too.
3 I mean, there are some real difficult choices to be had
4 here. And if there was a really easy answer I think we
5 would have found it or it would have been suggested to us.
6 So I think we just have to kind of take a look at some
7 point at what the trade-offs are in the different areas and
8 see what we feel comfortable with. Because each one has
9 pluses and each one has minuses. And I think we have to
10 look at that in their totality.

11 And I know there are different issues with
12 Congressional versus the state districts but I think, you
13 know, having fair representation versus, like, absolutely
14 having no representation at all, I think there are some
15 drastic differences between those kind of statements. And
16 I think even in a situation like with Richmond - and I know
17 it's different in Congressional versus state - but they are
18 whole in the Assembly and Senate and I think we have been
19 trying throughout the whole state trying to balance areas
20 and do a lot of compromises. And there is going to have to
21 be a compromise somewhere. And I just would like to see if
22 maybe we can maybe work towards that a little bit more with
23 all of this and try to find the thing that does the least
24 amount of harm.

25 What I would kind of like to suggest is maybe

1 starting with the visualization that we had, the original
2 one we had today, and see if we can correct some of those
3 and what it would take to do some switches out in that
4 regard. Because we do have to give some type of direction.
5 And last I would just say that I don't mind revisiting the
6 north, either. I think the reason why the north may be
7 more set is simply because there is lack of population. So
8 the shifts that have to occur in the north are so drastic
9 to make some changes that - we can obviously go back and
10 revisit them, it's not a set piece - but it's moving very
11 large geographic areas in order to accommodate things that
12 happen on a smaller scale in an urban area.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we are going to do
14 Commissioner Ontai and then Commissioner Blanco. Then I'm
15 going to cut discussion for right now, have a process
16 point, and then we will do a lunch break. But we may have
17 to go on motion after lunch. Let's just go to the last
18 comments. Commissioner Ontai?

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Ms. Clark answered my
20 question.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: So Commissioner Blanco?

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So this is - I just want to
23 clarify again. My point wasn't about keeping Contra Costa
24 whole. This is not just a discussion about Richmond whole.
25 It's about this entire community that I described earlier

1 being split off into a lot of different districts where
2 they won't have anybody who really looks at this as a
3 whole. So it's not about the city of Richmond. You know,
4 if that were the issue and half of Richmond were in Contra
5 Costa and half in Alameda, we've had - the residents are
6 split about that anyway. So I wouldn't necessarily - you
7 know, like I said last time, there the issue for me was
8 where do you make the split to make it in a responsible
9 way. So this is not about keeping Richmond whole, it's
10 about the larger configuration of the East Bay in our
11 current iteration.

12 One thing that, you know, if we needed to shift to
13 at least bring some resolution we could also look at not
14 just Orinda but we could take El Cerrito out and Orinda out
15 and then do a swap to put, you know, those in the district
16 to the west. And put the other one - you know, move the
17 line for Richmond and perhaps Pinole. You know, I don't
18 know the numbers. But that would be another way, is to
19 move all of Richmond and Orinda out.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I'm going to give
21 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy 30 seconds and then I will cut
22 it there.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: This transitions to
24 the process point of, I think there's a couple of ways you
25 could approach it. I personally would not feel comfortable

1 with us using the first draft as our starting point to
2 adjust from. I think that first draft is farther away from
3 where we need to be and so it might be a shorter road to
4 travel if we look at the second drafts or the alternative
5 that we've been presented by Ms. Alon. Or another idea
6 might be to agree on some building blocks for what we would
7 want to see happen in the East Bay.

8 For example, can we agree that at the Congressional
9 level that maintaining the Tri-City area as whole and
10 preferably with Hayward is something that we would like to
11 work with. And then we are able to get from Q2 what are
12 the decisions you need to make as you move outward from
13 there.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. So on process we will take a
15 lunch break. We will resume at 1:40.

16 Reminder, Bagley-Keene: Don't talk to each other,
17 except you can talk one on one. But don't do serial, don't
18 confer on this. This is obviously something you might want
19 to talk about over lunch, don't do it.

20 What I will do is entertain either a motion or a
21 point for discussion after the lunch break. And, again,
22 you can certainly suggest a starting point and revisions
23 and we have to go to vote, we will go to vote. But I do
24 want to move this along. Okay, so break.

25 (Lunch break at 12:54 p.m., to resume at 1:40 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

1:52 P.M.

CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I think we have quorum. We are resuming from our lunch recess. Actually, it might be a good time to take a few minutes of public comment since we've had some interesting discussions. So maybe just a few minutes, if we have any speakers who want to perhaps comment on some of the morning session. Okay, so we'll take again just sort of two minutes each.

MR. PAYTON: Thank you. I'm Allen Payton again with the CCAG. We have some maps that we've done specifically on the Congressional districts in Northern California. The final ones up around Yuba are getting fixed up right now because of trying to address, we had a one percent regression - is that how you say it, regression?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Retrogression.

MR. PAYTON: Retrogression, that's right. I knew there was another syllable or two in there. But if you look into the Bay Area specifically, if we can kind of get in closer there, if we could go down to Fremont. Obviously, right there you see that San Francisco, that district does not cross the Golden Gate Bridge so you keep San Francisco and Marin separate. And you come down onto the CD-13 and I believe that's 15 that keeps - one of those

1 two, I believe, keeps Fremont, Newark - well, I apologize.
2 There is something different between what we were told and
3 what is appearing on the maps. CD-13 is the Hayward
4 District, correct? Yeah, Hayward, Union City - nope, sorry
5 that doesn't do what we thought we were going to do in
6 keeping Hayward, Fremont and Newark together - excuse me,
7 Union City, Fremont and Newark together. It definitely
8 doesn't do that. Well, I retract that comment.

9 Let's look at C-10 because I know about CD-10, that
10 is the Contra Costa and Tri-Valley, that's the Dublin-
11 Pleasanton-Livermore district, that's how that's treated.
12 But the bottom line is if we go back and look at the one
13 that you were looking at earlier and bring San Ramon back
14 into that district and Dublin or the portions of Dublin it
15 basically moves San Leandro into that Fremont district. I
16 know that's not what we're looking at here. But that was
17 one of the things we wanted to look at from earlier, moving
18 San Ramon and part of Dublin back in. Because otherwise
19 you're just cutting out two portions, right, of the 680
20 corridor?

21 And you can move the Richmond district farther into
22 Contra Costa, all the way over to Pittsburg and Bay Point.
23 And it is pretty much an even swap between Pittsburg-Bay
24 Point, it was about 80,000, and the Dublin-San Ramon, which
25 is about 80, 82, 83. Nevertheless, that was kind of the

1 original district for the East Bay Congressional district
2 we created. And it is similar to the State Senate
3 District, except for the fact that it was obviously 200,000
4 people less.

5 Over into the San Joaquin district, it does take
6 the eastern portion of Contra Costa out of there and it
7 does allow for going up into Elk Grove. Unfortunately, it
8 crosses the Sacramento line but it does pick up that water
9 area of the Sacramento County, and Isleton and all, along
10 routes 160 and 12. Am I over two minutes? I believe I am.
11 So -

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Probably. And if you have a
13 written-

14 MR. PAYTON: - if you want me to be quiet I will
15 be quiet now.

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I have a question.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure, go ahead.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Did you do anything in the
19 Monterey District?

20 MR. PAYTON: Yes, Monterey is great, actually, from
21 the standpoint of meeting the VRA requirements by, I
22 believe, two percentage points. And then 54.03 percent
23 Hispanic is how the Monterey District, CD-17, comes out.
24 And then the Merced District, CD-19, comes out at 57,
25 almost 58 percent Hispanic. And then finally you have

1 Kings County, which ends up at 71, almost 72 percent
2 Hispanic. How Chris did that I have no idea, but he did.

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But you split Monterey Bay
4 in half?

5 MR. PAYTON: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay, thank you.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

8 MR. PAYTON: Thank you.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Anyone else for public comment?

10 MR. AZIZ: Hello again, commissioners. So, you
11 know, I've been listening to this conversation and I hear
12 the problem being that you have two different versions, you
13 have a Northern California that you want locked down and a
14 Bay Area that you want to move around. Well, because the
15 Bay Area was locked down to the first draft maps, the five
16 counties which our proposal, the Tri-Cities proposal, works
17 with are Contra Costa, Oakland, San Jose, Fremont-Newark-
18 Union City, and South Santa Clara, were the only districts
19 we affected in our map and those are the only districts
20 that you had set back to the first draft. By kind of
21 looking at the Tri-City proposal and taking into
22 consideration that COI you have the possibility of, you
23 know, reconfiguring the East Bay in a way that is more
24 likable for Alameda County and the surrounding residents
25 while keeping Northern California and the surrounding areas

1 together in the same exact way that this Commission has set
2 out because basically the first draft border is what - you
3 know, is there for Contra Costa and all the way down into
4 south Santa Clara.

5 So I really urge you to look at the Tri-City
6 proposal because you can basically on top of basically
7 where Northern California is and, you know, the parts under
8 the East Bay which you've already taken into consideration,
9 you can basically copy and paste our proposal right into
10 that area. And I'm sure if there weren't too many changes
11 to the area because of the direction that would be
12 possible. And you could confirm that with your Q2 staff.
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you. Any other members of
15 the public?

16 (No response.)

17 Okay, very good. Can we get on screen the original
18 posted Congressional visualizations?

19 MS. MACDONALD: We're working on it.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

21 MS. MACDONALD: Just one second.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: As a reminder, commissioners, I've
23 been consulting the past resolutions regarding how we look
24 at potential problems on voting for maps. And our
25 procedures focus specifically when we're voting on a

1 statewide map and create procedures when we can't achieve a
2 special majority. It sort of looks at a five member
3 grouping that might want to discuss a particular district
4 and then we can move forward from that. So it doesn't
5 really cover what we're doing today in terms of
6 visualizations. So I think to revert to our normal
7 procedure we can go to motion. Again, presuming there is a
8 remaining dispute on any particular set of districts. I
9 think functionally it's basically the same because it
10 ultimately comes down to a vote.

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct me if I'm wrong,
12 didn't we have something in place that allowed us to vote
13 on districts by districts in the visualizations? I thought
14 we did.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, it goes to the maps, the
16 final maps.

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: No, I know, of course,
18 that's there. Maybe I will just look at my records.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: So what is on the table officially
20 right now is the posted visualization. So I will entertain
21 any, you know, motions or - well, motions that might want
22 to either vote to move forward with this particular
23 visualization or engage in some amendment. Now, we don't
24 have - our procedure that we had adopted for problems in
25 the statewide maps with voting focus on a single district.

1 Obviously, as we know, you cannot simply vote on a single
2 district typically because there are impacts in several
3 districts at the same time. But if we want to sort of
4 start with COCO as our problem point we can move around
5 that. But there seems to be, again - there's clearly at
6 this current visualization there is an alternative
7 visualization that was presented a few days ago.

8 At least one commissioner suggested starting from
9 something different. So I will entertain motions. I think
10 I have Dai, Barabba, Yao and Galambos-Malloy.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I would like to propose
12 that we start with this and consider moving the LaMorinda
13 area, El Cerrito and, I believe, Kensington is in there as
14 well, into the Oakland District, which would hopefully
15 allow us to keep that corridor with Richmond and San Pablo
16 moving north together.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, is that in the form of a
18 motion or simply a suggestion at this point?

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm happy to move that if there
20 is not consensus on it and we need to have a vote.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, I was about to say the
23 same thing, is that we should stick with this visualization
24 and then try to fix this rather than reverting back to the
25 other one.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: I would like to hear from those
3 who would move - who would vote against this particular -
4 that would vote against the motion, to offer up what they
5 would consider as a viable either an approach or a viable
6 district so that we have something to select from. Because
7 if I am simply voting for or against a particular district
8 I'm kind of looking at only half the data. This is
9 obviously a new process for us.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: And I want to see if you would
12 want to consider, as rough as it is, those that would not
13 support this map, what would be their approach? Either
14 offer up a process or an alternate configuration.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: And that's as an alternative to
16 this particular one?

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I would like to support
20 Commissioner Dai's idea. But what I would like to see if
21 she would accept is just the thought of just using this as
22 a basis and then following that we could have a discussion
23 of how to move it around. But maybe to start it with just
24 simply a motion that we will start with this as a
25 visualization and we can work on the details from there.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional comments on that?

2 (No response.)

3 I mean, we don't have to go to motion if there is
4 consensus to start with that. If there is some
5 disagreement we can go to motion.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I agree with that.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Is there an agreement to
8 see if we can fix this first?

9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Can I ask that we
13 zoom out just a little bit so we can see the south
14 boundary? And, Commissioner Dai, could I ask you to
15 explain again in a little more detail? You were suggesting
16 that we move LaMorinda into Oakland and then push Richmond,
17 El Cerrito, San Pablo northward, is that what I heard?

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, it would actually - by
19 moving the population in there it would result in a
20 counter-clockwise rotation of the population. And I was
21 also suggesting, because Ms. Alon said that was not enough
22 population, that El Cerrito and Kensington could also go
23 into a district with Oakland and Berkeley and that would
24 hopefully either reduce or eliminate the Richmond split and
25 put them with Hercules and Pinole and, I think, San Pablo

1 as well.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Comments from Q2? Or any
3 clarification regarding that potential change?

4 MS. CLARK: So the switch would be just between
5 these two districts, is that correct? Or does Richmond go-

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Three.

7 MS. CLARK: Richmond goes in with Sonoma?

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai, could you
9 clarify, please.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Tell us what would happen if
11 you did the switch just between the two districts. Yeah,
12 actually if you do that then it will push the north part to
13 encompass the 4, right? If we pushed in from Orinda,
14 Lafayette and Moraga we will have to balloon out in the
15 north, correct?

16 MS. CLARK: In this district, OKLND, approximately
17 71,000 people from Richmond are in this district. So if
18 the switch would be to move LaMorinda and then El Cerrito
19 and perhaps San Pablo and the rest of Richmond into the
20 Oakland District?

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

22 MS. CLARK: And then move what out of this
23 district?

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Split it.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I just wanted to

1 clarify to make sure I'm tracking what issue this is
2 designed to address.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai, do you have -

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: So if we were to add the rest of
5 Richmond into Contra Costa we would have to take something
6 out currently.

7 MS. CLARK: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think it's a question of -
9 you can do it that way, putting Richmond in and taking
10 things out and putting them with Oakland.

11 MS. CLARK: So the switch is between COCO and
12 OKLND?

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct.

15 MS. CLARK: And the idea is to put LaMorinda and
16 perhaps El Cerrito, or just approximately 71,000 from COCO
17 into OKLND and then to move the rest of Richmond into COCO?

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuillio?

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: If it's 71,000 we have to
21 do I'm just looking - and my eyes are great back here - but
22 the LaMorinda area and El Cerrito is not close to that, is
23 that correct?

24 MS. CLARK: El Cerrito and LaMorinda is just, I
25 think, a few thousand people over 71,000.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So you would have to have a
2 little split somewhere?

3 MS. CLARK: Yes.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Again going back to
6 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy's question, is the purpose for
7 this suggestion to make Richmond whole or trying to keep it
8 in Contra Costa? And then the question is the balance
9 between any community of interest testimony that we had
10 that would put Oakland with LaMorinda. I'm just trying to
11 understand this discussion, other than to try and keep
12 Richmond whole.

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yeah, I think the
14 challenge I'm facing with Richmond - I mean, it's clear to
15 me it's a small city and based on some of the COI why we
16 would need to keep it whole - the piece around keeping it
17 with Contra Costa County, I can identify with that in terms
18 of fair representation be connected with the rest of your
19 county. I think the reality is that a lot of the COI
20 testimony we've gotten about Richmond and its connection to
21 Contra Costa County has actually been tied to a specific
22 Congressional representative, which, you know, constrains
23 our ability to weigh that testimony as heavily as we might
24 be able to other pieces of COI testimony from other parts
25 of the region.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: To me, I don't know, the
3 purpose of trying to do this rotation or whatever we call
4 it that we're trying to do here, isn't around Richmond
5 whole, okay, or putting it in Contra Costa. I mean,
6 obviously I would like to have it whole but it's not
7 necessarily about putting it in Contra Costa. My major
8 concern in this area - and I don't know if there is
9 anything to do inside this population that we have in the
10 existing map in Contra Costa - is more than just Richmond.
11 It's the fact that those cities like Richmond and San Pablo
12 are in one place and then you have Pinole and Vallejo in
13 another and then you have Martinez and Bay Point and
14 Pittsburg and then you have Antioch and Oakley. That is my
15 fundamental concern about this when I talk about the
16 fragmentation of all these very similar low-income
17 communities that are now in our visualization here in five
18 different Congressional districts.

19 I don't think we can - when I talk about the four,
20 I don't think that they can be in just one but what I would
21 like to see is how to not - that plus the fragmentation of
22 Richmond. It's like altogether what it shows is a
23 fragmentation in that entire region, which I find troubling
24 in terms of compared to other parts of the state where we
25 have at least tried to keep some parts of a community of

1 interest together. Here it's completely fragmented.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner Barabba,
3 Commissioner Dai and then Commissioner Galambos-Malloy.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: One of the thoughts might be
5 to move Richmond into Contra Costa, take that portion of
6 San Ramon and Danville, whatever population equals it, drop
7 it into the lower district there, and then take San
8 Leandro/San Lorenzo and move it into Oakland to make up for
9 having lost Richmond. Clockwise.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: So clockwise rotation.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, I was going to say
12 something similar. I think we're going to have to go
13 between at least three districts to rotate the population
14 around.

15 MS. CLARK: I believe that the switch that
16 Commissioner Barabba described is what is represented in
17 the first draft maps.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But within this area.

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: But it doesn't necessarily affect,
21 say, San Francisco-Marin?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: No.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Correct. Okay.

24 MS. CLARK: But Richmond is still split.

25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But if you moved - you said

1 there was a hundred and something in Richmond that is
2 outside of Contra Costa?

3 MS. CLARK: There is 71,000.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay.

5 MS. CLARK: And then I'm not sure what the
6 population of this area inside of Richmond is.

7 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay, so if we moved all of
8 that in the Contra Costa, whatever that number is, then you
9 hit the equal number around San Ramon, dropping that into
10 the Alameda District, and then taking San Leandro, an equal
11 number out of Alameda, and putting it in with Oakland. I
12 mean, that would be possible, right?

13 MS. CLARK: Yes.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Galambos-Malloy
15 and then Commissioner DiGuilio.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: My sense is that a
17 clockwise rotation makes more sense based on the nature of
18 the communities than does a counter-clockwise rotation. I
19 still think then we're going to have to loop back down
20 farther south and how does this affect the south Alameda
21 County district and where does that - for example, the Tri-
22 Cities area, how does that fit into the entire picture?

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, is that a question? Or are
24 you implying that there would be a change there, that it
25 would be desirable or undesirable?

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, I would still
2 like to see a visualization that is able to have the Tri-
3 Cities together, right? So what we're effectively saying
4 is we would drop that Oakland boundary down south, we'd
5 pick up San Leandro and then - but you're basically
6 equalizing the population over on the east side, right? So
7 you're saying that there would be no change on that
8 southern boundary. So then we still have to have a
9 discussion about the Tri-City portion of the county.

10 But I feel comfortable with the northern suggestion
11 that Commissioner Barabba proposed.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, any comments from Q2 on what
13 occurred so far?

14 (No response.)

15 So Commissioner DiGuilio and then Commissioner Dai
16 and then Commissioner Yao.

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I want to make clear. So
18 if we are going to focus on the first northern part what
19 we're doing is, again, we're trying to balance different
20 COIs here, because we heard clearly from the Tri-Valley
21 area and San Ramon Valley area about kind of their
22 preferences. So we've already broken up the Dublin-
23 Pleasanton-Livermore and then we will reach up to grab San
24 Ramon and break that away from the San Ramon Valley in
25 order to get the - I'm assuming there is COI testimony

1 about Richmond going into Contra Costa, so that's kind of
2 the trade-off, is what I understand it is. So then those
3 two COIs are the ones that we're discussing as well as we
4 talked about last week, as I recall, about San Leandro and
5 there was a big discussion, I believe from Commissioner
6 Galambos-Malloy, about San Leandro being linked with the
7 Eden Valley. And we tried really hard to put it together,
8 not just because - because we kept it whole in a lot of
9 ways but it didn't go with the Eden Valley.

10 So another aspect of this would be we would break
11 San Leandro, the one place we tried to keep it with the
12 Eden Valley, it will be broken again. So, again, I'm just
13 trying to focus on the trade-off. Because there are COIs
14 all the way around here, we just have to do the balancing
15 act of what we see the implications of all of these.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Dai then
17 Commissioner Yao.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I was going to say the
19 same thing. They will effectively have broken up the Eden
20 area, which this is the only incarnation of the map that we
21 were able to keep them whole.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think there would
23 be an opportunity, though. I mean, again, Congressional,
24 this is the first set of maps that we're looking at today
25 so we do have the opportunity to revisit. For example, if

1 we were going to prioritize keeping the Tri-Cities together
2 in the Congressional, you know, then the Senate is more
3 flexible when we revisit that. If the Eden area gets
4 broken up in Congressional in our attempt to balance all
5 these trade-offs then we could look at reuniting them in
6 another type of map.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just for the sake of
9 consistency, here we are trying to keep a big city whole
10 and accept the consequences of dividing up a smaller
11 community. What I probably would suggest is try to move
12 entire cities, whether it's San Ramon, Norris Canyon or any
13 one of these things and make the adjustment with Richmond,
14 even though it's not in its entirety. In other words, try
15 not to split the small community but do the rotation the
16 way it's proposed. In terms of trying to keep Richmond
17 whole at the expense of the other community I think we run
18 into a consistency issue with all the other decisions that
19 we have made so far.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't know why - maybe I'm
22 not being clear on my perspective. This is not just about
23 keeping Richmond whole, I don't know how else to describe
24 it. I'm talking about the fact that we fragmented an
25 entire area up in that northern part of Contra Costa and

1 down to Richmond, I'm not just talking about the City of
2 Richmond. I just want to make that clear. Because if we
3 do reduce it to that being the conversation then I
4 understand the conversation about trade-offs and a big
5 city, but that's not my point.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, no accusation about what
7 you proposed. The motion as put on the floor right now is
8 to put entire Richmond in the Contra Costa County.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, we don't have quite a motion
10 on the floor but there is certainly a proposal.
11 Commissioner Blanco, if you have something to suggest,
12 because it's not clear how that configuration would work at
13 this point. I understand it's a very strong concern,
14 certainly. But we need to have some moving parts in order
15 to implement that.

16 Commissioner DiGuilio?

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm just going to go back
18 again to Commissioner Barabba's - the one aspect if you do
19 include Richmond and then you go into San Ramon you still
20 have five districts in Contra Costa. You're not going to
21 reduce the number of districts, you just change the split.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I'm going to go back to my
24 original thought, which was a counter-clockwise move which
25 would move - that's, I think, the only chance we have to

1 reduce the fragmentation in that area. But it would have
2 the effect of booting Richmond out of the Oakland District
3 but it would put it with San Pablo, Pinole, Hercules,
4 Rodeo, you know. And then we might be able to keep
5 Martinez together with, you know, Clyde, Bay Point,
6 Pittsburg along that corridor. So that would reduce the
7 fragmentation with a counter-clockwise move.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: What do you do with Napa,
9 the loss of Napa population?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Where is Napa involved in this?

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: The Napa District, NEBAY.
12 If you go into -

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: It would acquire Richmond,
14 that's my point.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, so Richmond goes into
16 that, okay.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Richmond would go into Napa but
18 at least it would be in there with that whole corridor.
19 And then the Highway 4 corridor would be more complete and
20 in Contra Costa. So if the point is to reduce
21 fragmentation I think that's the only way to deal with
22 reducing the fragmentation. You know, it doesn't address
23 the fact that we are having a relatively low income urban
24 area with Napa but at least they would be in there in some
25 numbers. Vallejo is also in there. It would be a

1 significant number of communities in there.

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: What are you going to take
3 out of Napa?

4 MS. CLARK: Perhaps -

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Martinez.

6 MS. CLARK: - Martinez, Benicia and part of
7 Vallejo?

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: That was a general murmuring I
9 think at that point. Well, okay, let me see some nods
10 here. We have sort of the Barabba proposal and - and,
11 again, we can go to motion if we want to - and then sort of
12 the Dai proposal. One is counter-clockwise and one is
13 clockwise. And some different concerns are being
14 addressed. I'm not getting a good sense of who wants what
15 at this point. Again, we can go to motion and simply try
16 to get some formal votes here.

17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Just another clarification,
18 if I could.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If we did what Commissioner
21 Dai is indicating would that allow us then to start moving
22 population up from down south into Alameda and maybe then
23 affect the Tri-Cities area? Because you are going to be
24 able to pull population up, I think.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Ask Q2. I think the answer is it

1 wouldn't necessarily do that?

2 MS. CLARK: If the 70,000 people were pulled into
3 Napa or into NEBAY -

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Oh, I see, okay.

5 MS. CLARK: - then -

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: You're equal.

7 MS. CLARK: - assumably the population would be
8 sort of exchanged through here unless it was going to be a
9 70,000 person ripple effect through all of Northern
10 California.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber and
13 then Commissioner Forbes.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: My concern is - and I
15 certainly appreciate the Chair's efforts to move us along
16 regarding the possibility of a motion - I would have a
17 difficulty considering a motion on a recommended change to
18 a district without seeing a visualization of its potential
19 effects on every other district we're looking at there.
20 Because we have seen throughout this entire process that as
21 we request changes we have to see what the potential impact
22 is on surrounding districts. So I would be unable to
23 consider a motion on a district that is changing without
24 seeing the potential impact throughout. So I just wanted
25 to put that on the record.

1 We can talk about it esoterically, which is this
2 population will flow here and this population will flow
3 there but we certainly never see the broader aspect of the
4 potential effect on so many other communities of interest
5 that might be affected.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Forbes and then
7 Commissioner Barabba.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I understand the interest in
9 moving Richmond to make it less chopped up. But to me to
10 take a population that is, if you will, on the north side
11 of the Carquinez Straits and put it on the south side so
12 you can take something that is already on the south side of
13 the straits to put it on the north side, that doesn't make
14 any sense to me.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, I would suggest we
17 direct Q2 to make a quick assessment of Commissioner Dai's
18 suggestion and the one I suggested and see what they look
19 like. Not vote on either one of them but just to see what
20 the implications are so that we can make a better judgment.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let me ask Q2 what that entails, if
22 that were to -

23 MS. CLARK: Right now Tamina is working to prepare
24 a quick visualization of Commissioner Barabba's proposal.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so in terms of timing how

1 quickly can these be done in terms of just live changes?

2 MS. CLARK: Pretty quickly.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

4 MS. CLARK: It's close.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: So Commissioner DiGuilio?

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: While she is working on
7 that I would like to get a little more visualization from
8 Commissioner Dai. I understand that you're trying to - one
9 of your proposals was to kind of keep the integrity of the
10 4 a little bit more. So you are dropping in those
11 communities -Martinez, and I'm not sure if Concord is in
12 there - anyway, okay - dropping those back down in. And I
13 can understand how you're trying to bring Richmond back up
14 in there. But there still is a population. If you put the
15 4 area back into the COCO District you have to put from
16 COCO into something else. Is the switch going between just
17 COCO and the Napa one or is it a three-way switch with
18 Oakland too?

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think it has to be a three-way
20 switch.

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah. So something from
22 COCO has to go into Oakland then at the same time?

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, I was suggesting counter-
24 clockwise.

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: That's what I'm saying.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Something from Oakland needs to
2 go into COCO.

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I see. Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Is that right?

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: No, because you are taking
6 the population out -

7 MS. CLARK: That would be -

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: - of Oakland. Excuse me.

9 MS. CLARK: The portion of Richmond that is in COCO
10 is approximately 32,000, I believe. And I know that it
11 would also entail moving San Pablo and perhaps El Cerrito
12 depending on contiguity issues.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

14 MS. CLARK: So if that was about 60,000 then that
15 would entail moving 60,000 from the Oakland District,
16 probably from the City of Oakland, into COCO and then
17 moving - and then that would be the switch, is the two-way
18 switch?

19 (No response.)

20 Is that right? If this area was moved into OKLND
21 and then maybe part of Berkeley or a part of Oakland was
22 moved into COCO then it would be a two-way switch.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. We were suggesting a
24 three-way switch.

25 MS. CLARK: Where does the third district come in?

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: We were talking about acquiring
2 Martinez into the COCO District, right? So that would
3 affect the bottom of the Napa District, too.

4 MS. CLARK: So if this line was moved north to
5 acquire Martinez into COCO -

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: Then we could -

7 MS. CLARK: - then this line would move south about
8 30,000?

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, 35,000 in Martinez.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: And then what goes from Oakland
11 into COCO?

12 MS. CLARK: And then about 30,000 would come out of
13 Oakland or Berkeley into Contra Costa.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: On that point, it could be
15 along 13?

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: It feels like -
17 Commissioner Blanco, I would like your feedback on this -
18 it feels like it's still fundamentally not impacting the
19 fragmentation that much. Maybe I'm reading it wrong. I
20 was really listening during the rotation piece but I don't
21 know that it gets us that much farther than where we are.

22 MS. CLARK: The visualization of Commissioner
23 Barabba's proposal is ready. Would you like to see it?

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes.

25 MS. CLARK: Okay, so this differs from the

1 visualization that we were just looking at in that the
2 entire City of Richmond is in this Contra Costa District.
3 And then, as you can see, San Ramon was moved in with the
4 Fremont-Newark District and San Leandro is moved in with
5 Oakland. If we look at the 4 corridor, now the 4 would be
6 running through only four districts. And either way - I
7 just want to point out that either way, whether we're
8 talking about this proposal or Commissioner Dai's proposal,
9 the 4 would still be running just through the three
10 districts.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Comments on this?

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I like this in the sense that
13 even you have Martinez - is Martinez now with Pittsburg?
14 And that's an improvement. And, as we've mentioned before,
15 Martinez is the county seat for Contra Costa County and we
16 had them up in a separate county before. So I think having
17 the county seat with its county is a good thing.

18 MS. CLARK: Quickly, sorry. This was built off of
19 the first draft map lines.

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh.

21 MS. CLARK: This doesn't have the updated districts
22 to the north and Martinez would still be north, would still
23 be with Vallejo, Benicia and so on.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: With Solano?

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, okay. So really this,
2 what we've gotten here is we've gotten Richmond whole and
3 in Contra Costa instead of into -

4 MS. CLARK: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Not only not split but all in
6 one county.

7 MS. CLARK: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Everything else remains the
9 same, basically?

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: But the San Pablo-
11 Cerrito, that configuration that it's together with
12 Richmond, I think, is -

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I think San Pablo -

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: - new and -

15 (Crosstalk)

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, I would agree with that.

17 MS. CLARK: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And where is Pinole? Pinole
19 is not in there but we have San Pablo, which is really kind
20 of so similar, they're like, you know, twin sister cities.
21 And all of Richmond, yeah. And El Cerrito, yeah. That's a
22 better configuration for those three areas that you're, you
23 know, like three minutes away from each other.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Yao and then
25 Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: What's the approximate impact on
2 the Napa District?

3 MS. CLARK: There would not be an impact on the
4 Napa District.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I'm looking back at
7 another community of interest that might be impacted here
8 that may not be respected at any level when this change
9 comes about, which is San Leandro, again. I went back and
10 looked at - I think they are with Oakland at the Assembly,
11 they are with Oakland at the Senate and this was an
12 opportunity at the Congressional level to put them with
13 their communities of interest, which I thought were to the
14 south. And so with this configuration we're not respecting
15 San Leandro at any level potentially. So, again, I
16 understand that this is a balance but sometimes we've tried
17 to consider a balance by respecting a community of interest
18 at least at some district level. So I wanted to point out
19 that that might be some consideration. Again, I'm not
20 entirely familiar with, you know, geographics, but that's
21 my recollection of the community of interest testimony that
22 we've received.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Is it divided in this
24 visualization, San Leandro?

25 MS. CLARK: No. However, the three districts are

1 not fully balanced, for the sake of time.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: So that's the Eden area that we
4 worked hard to try to put together again in configurations
5 and we basically reverted back to what we had before.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think Commissioner
8 Barabba's proposal that we have here, the configuration on
9 the north end works significantly better than what we had
10 before. I would recommend then as we move forward to
11 looking at our Assembly and our Senate maps for the region
12 that if this is the configuration we go with that we make a
13 note to ourselves about this Eden area and look at
14 opportunities to make shifts in either Assembly or Senate
15 to ensure that they also have an opportunity to be joined
16 together.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuillio?

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I just had a question and I
19 will kind of defer to some of the commissioners that know
20 this area. But we have enough COI testimony to support
21 putting together San Pablo and Richmond and putting that
22 with the rest of Contra Costa because we are breaking some
23 COI testimony that we have on record for some of those
24 other areas in the San Ramon Valley and the Tri-Valley area
25 and San Leandro. So I just want to make sure we have

1 enough - not just our own personal knowledge, which is very
2 important as well, too - but that there is some COI
3 testimony from which we can base this on.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I think we had a lot of
5 testimony about not splitting Richmond and we had a lot of
6 testimony about Richmond being in Contra Costa although,
7 like Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, that one worries me a
8 little bit because it was about wanting to be with a
9 particular elected official. But we did have a lot about
10 splitting and we did have, I believe, testimony about San
11 Pablo being with Richmond. And one thing I just want to
12 say about not having a lot of testimony, this area is a
13 really - you know, an area with a lot of problems in the
14 Bay Area. And I don't think that we should take the fact
15 that there hasn't been a lot of weighing in on this process
16 to be what keeps us from keeping an area that those of us
17 who know this area well know is a community of interest,
18 just because we haven't had residents weigh in in the same
19 large numbers they have in other parts of the state.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Are we prepared to move
21 forward with this particular revision? Any objections at
22 this point?

23 (No response.)

24 Okay, so we will -

25 MS. CLARK: We are just switching machines again.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: So, Kyle, you were able to capture
2 that instruction?

3 MS. KUBAS: So the direction is to work off of the
4 last visualization that Tamina presented, that was
5 illustrating Commissioner Barabba's -

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Clockwise rotation.

7 MS. KUBAS: - clockwise rotation.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: We're okay, then?

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: With a note that we're going to
10 try to deal with the Eden area in another district.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

12 MS. CLARK: And the rotation is Richmond into COCO,
13 San Ramon and Norris Canyon into FRENE, and San Leandro
14 into Oakland.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Correct.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And San Pablo as well as
17 Richmond, right? San Pablo-El Cerrito.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Is that correct, San Pablo would
19 also go with Richmond in the rotation?

20 MS. CLARK: Yes.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: That's confirmed? Okay.

22 MS. MACDONALD: I would like to just talk about the
23 scheduling for this. When would you like to see this?
24 Because at this point you would see it next week for the
25 live line drawing, I guess.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Well, what we're saying
2 right now is if that's what we're giving direction to this
3 is it, right? We've changed.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes.

5 MS. MACDONALD: Correct. I just wanted to verify.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It isn't just like we want
7 to see this option. Everyone has to understand that this
8 is what we're agreeing to.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: This is it.

10 MS. MACDONALD: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Again, there can be, you know,
12 minute detail changes but this is basically the
13 instruction.

14 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: In adjusting for the population
17 we're basically saying it's acceptable for that division to
18 happen wherever it happens. Because we are approving the
19 direction and the map that are going to be given to Q2 at
20 this point.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. I mean, there may be -
22 again, because the deviation is to basically go to zero.
23 We could probably tweak a few things at the street level.
24 But that's basically the orientation, right?

25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yep.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Let's get back into our sort
2 of sequence of summarizing the districts. Did we get to
3 OKLND? Actually, we're - okay. So where did we sort of
4 leave off? I've lost track.

5 MS. CLARK: I believe next is OKLND.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so with the revision why
7 don't we have a summary description. So Commissioners Dai
8 and Galambos-Malloy, you want to just summarize?

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: In order to do that
10 could I actually see the visualization we had before -
11 basically the Barabba visualization - well, I think I can
12 do it from memory, right? Because it basically starts at
13 the Albany border, is that correct?

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And then we move
16 south and then we encompass everything we see here in the
17 Oakland District but with the exception that we pick up San
18 Leandro.

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, that's correct.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay. So we had had
21 significant COI testimony linking Oakland and Alameda
22 similarly with Emeryville. We had had some COI testimony
23 that actually linked parts of Oakland moving north, talking
24 about flatlands communities, linking Oakland, Emeryville,
25 Berkeley, regarding API community and services that were

1 located in those areas that linked those communities. We
2 had had testimony regarding San Leandro that was
3 conflicting, that San Leandro was linked to the Eden area
4 but that San Leandro also had strong links to Oakland.

5 What would you add, Commissioner Dai?

6 (No response.)

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: This visualization
8 would respect the -

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Oakland is whole in this one,
10 right?

11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yes. And respects
12 the hills.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: And the bay.

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And the bay. The
15 geographic boundary that we're looking at on the west side
16 is San Francisco Bay and on the east side are the Berkeley-
17 Oakland Hills which go along that eastern border of the
18 district. And so we've been able to keep the integrity of
19 both of those boundaries, which we've heard significant
20 amounts about, particularly the hills. Another thing that
21 I would add, just knowing the area really well, is this is
22 a strong district that respects the 880 corridor, which is
23 known as a very significant both commuter corridor and also
24 heavy transportation corridor in terms of the Port of
25 Oakland

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any other comments or additions?

2 (No response.)

3 Okay, so we go to FRENE, Fremont-Newark?

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: This is the area
5 where I feel like it might be useful to see the Barabba
6 visualization. Because I'm just trying to estimate, is the
7 only difference we're seeing is that San Ramon and Norris
8 Canyon go south?

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, and the swap with San
10 Leandro.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And San Leandro goes down.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And the swap with
13 San Leandro, okay.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: So this keeps Dublin, Pleasanton
15 and Livermore together with Sunol, has most of the Eden
16 area minus San Leandro now. And so that's the different
17 transportation corridors.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: The aspect of this
19 district that I think could be improved upon, of course, is
20 the configuration of the Tri-Cities on the south side of
21 Alameda County. I think, you know, depending what we would
22 want to consider as a Commission, we had several different
23 versions of what that could look like. We had always the
24 Tri-Cities of Newark, Union City and Fremont considered as
25 a unit. We have had additional COI testimony that linked

1 those three cities with Hayward. We've had additional
2 testimony that's linked those cities farther south,
3 potentially with Milpitas and Berryessa.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuillio?

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Just talking about the one
6 we were on, FRENE, I think it's an interesting district. I
7 think, again, the one above it and this one kind of are
8 trying to pull together areas that in some ways are a
9 little bit hard to fit together. But I think one of the
10 reasons in some ways I was a little reluctant to pull San
11 Ramon Valley down is because the Dublin-Pleasanton-
12 Livermore are there and there is not much place for them to
13 go based on some of the other decisions, but the integrity
14 of San Ramon with them, you know, it's a home for San Ramon
15 to go to. And it's maybe an awkward pairing between the
16 Hayward, Union City and those parts in some ways. But I
17 think that's probably under the current constraints that we
18 have, that's the most realistic - and I think, again, to
19 try and pair the Tri-Cities together you would have to - I
20 don't know what you would have to do. You would have to go
21 way down into Santa Clara and back around into San Jose. I
22 don't personally see - I understand the issue very much and
23 I understand it at the Congressional level and we've heard
24 it and we've listened and we know. But I just cannot see
25 how we can put those together without some serious

1 implications in the rest of the area.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Forbes and then
3 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here we have Union City and
5 Newark in different districts and the Fremont split. Would
6 it make any sense to trade out another 42,000 out of
7 Fremont and put Newark with Union City so you would have
8 Union City, Newark and - I don't know, whatever - half of
9 Fremont - I don't know what the dividing line would be -
10 in one district? At least you would get most of it in one
11 district.

12 MS. ALON: We did that before. Everyone called it
13 the Fremont finger and told me to change it.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: And not only that, Fremont and
16 Newark have a closer relationship.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Oh, I know they do. It just
18 was an effort to try to get most of them together.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Could I ask Ms. Alon
20 if we were to say let's explore the Tri-Cities at this
21 point, given some of the other direction that we've given,
22 really what options would we be looking at? What would it
23 take to unite the Tri-Cities and what impact would that
24 have on our surrounding districts?

25 MS. ALON: Assuming that the districts above are

1 already set?

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yes.

3 MS. ALON: If the districts above are already set
4 with the San Leandro move and the San Ramon move then what
5 you would be looking at is trying to create a district
6 which takes these two up into here, essentially. Because
7 you couldn't isolate them from Eden because Eden would have
8 nowhere to go. So really what you're looking at is
9 swapping this out for these three or possibly Sunol and you
10 would move them south. And so it would be Dublin,
11 Pleasanton, Livermore, possibly Sunol and they would either
12 be connecting with San Jose over here or they would be
13 taking an inland route down this way somewhere, connecting
14 -

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Monterey.

16 MS. ALON: Connecting down here somewhere, probably
17 coming down to Santa Clara. I believe when I visualized
18 this it took these three kind of down and then came down
19 into this part of Santa Clara. Or you can come up into
20 this part of San Jose, though it might break up some of the
21 San Jose COIs, but it would be kind of doing something like
22 this, something inland.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Thank you. The
24 reason I ask is because when I look at the direction we've
25 given thus far with the districts above, to a certain

1 extent what we've decided was that in this visualization
2 for purposes of Congressional we have made a decision that
3 we were going to join sort of the bayside, the Hayward
4 corridor, with east county of Alameda; which it's clear
5 here we are making a trade-off, there is significant COI
6 that says don't cross over those hills but we said we're
7 going to cross it. So at that point if we have already
8 said that's a sacrifice we may be willing to make in the
9 Congressional maps, to take that one step farther, you
10 know, I'm willing to look at other pairings of this east
11 county area. Because already it's not exactly what they
12 had requested.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's true. But, I mean, I
15 don't think it's just that. I mean, when you look at
16 whatever district, to not have Dublin, Pleasanton,
17 Livermore and Sunol basically in an area that goes along
18 the 580, which is what that area is -

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: 680.

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: - and then it goes, you know,
21 580 until it hits the - you know, either it goes up on the
22 580 or over to the 880. To have Pleasanton, Livermore,
23 Dublin and Sunol go down to a district south of it, it
24 seems to go most for me against gravity. Given that this
25 really the 580 corridor. I mean, maybe it's true that

1 there is testimony about it not being with Hayward. But
2 it's kind of like when we talked about those other places
3 where they didn't want to be somewhere but that didn't mean
4 they wanted to be with something completely unrelated. And
5 I just think that we are not just disregarding COIs, we're
6 also putting Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore and Sunol in an
7 area connected with a transportation corridor that's a
8 natural for it, instead of going south it's going along the
9 580.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Ms. Alon?

11 MS. ALON: If I could correct myself just slightly,
12 what it would be is Livermore and Pleasanton. Dublin would
13 be able to stay with San Ramon, which gets pushed down this
14 way, and those two would be the ones moving south. I
15 probably wouldn't need Sunol or Dublin.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: When I look at this
18 district I feel like we have a lot of disparate parts. It
19 feels like we have - you know, we have the Tri-Valley area,
20 we have the Eden area minus San Leandro, and we have a
21 portion of the Hayward-Union City-Newark-Fremont area. I
22 mean, I think the same argument that you could make about
23 the 580 corridor, you could make that same argument about
24 the 880 corridor and it might even be a stronger argument
25 to be made if you take into account other economic factors

1 like the Port of Oakland, which it really is the 880
2 corridor that's the arterial there. So I would be
3 interested in hearing other commissioner's perspective on
4 this district.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Forbes?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: We've had a fair amount of
7 discussion about economic status and I think a Hayward-
8 Fremont-880 corridor would maintain probably a somewhat
9 more uniform economic status than would a Hayward-Livermore
10 axis. So, I mean, I would be open to at least seeing the
11 Pleasanton-Livermore south configuration. I wish there was
12 a better road that went down there because I think that
13 maybe you might be able to create your Hayward-Newark-
14 Fremont-Union City district.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber and
16 Commissioner DiGuilio.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I just want to make
18 sure that I'm not missing anything. Because we have seen
19 so many different visualizations. The public comment that
20 we've received today from this area seemed to suggest that
21 it is in consideration of the surrounding districts. And
22 Mr. Aziz's map - and so I think we have that. I was
23 wondering if we could just put it up real quick and see if
24 - I just want to make sure we're not missing anything
25 because this has been proposed to us in several iterations,

1 post-draft map. So I think we have it on the computer. Or
2 we had it up earlier today.

3 MR. AZIZ: I only have a JPEG of it.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I'm sorry,
5 Commissioner Filkins-Webber, what were you asking for?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Mr. Aziz had made a
7 comment that his maps for this area in this district are in
8 consideration of the surrounding districts. See, most of
9 the difficulty that we've had is the impact on all of the
10 surrounding districts. And so as I understood the public
11 comment earlier today is that it is taking into
12 consideration this visualization that we have for the
13 surrounding districts. And so I was wondering if, as we've
14 been struggling with this area I don't want to be remiss in
15 not taking a look at this or at least having my memory
16 refreshed as to the impact. If all the surrounding
17 districts of the Northern California area and the Southern
18 California into Monterey, which is where we have a lot of
19 the pressure, if that's not being impacted by this map then
20 this might answer some of the questions. Or we could take
21 a look at what the problem is.

22 Because this visualization actually does put
23 Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore to the Santa Clara - I
24 mean, down into that district, as Ms. Alon had mentioned
25 might occur.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: That was my point. I
3 just didn't want us to miss this if that's possible.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: And you have a hard copy right now,
5 I believe?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Yes, I do. And I
7 don't think there have been any changes to this. So I'll
8 take a look at it.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio?

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: You know, I know we are all
11 struggling with this a little bit. But, you know, the COI
12 here of these four communities is 500,000 people, this is
13 not a small COI, right? This is a very large ship to try
14 and have to steer. I think we are trying to fit a very big
15 COI into a very small geographic area with no deviation
16 allowed. So, you know, I would be willing to see what
17 other commissioners would like to do with this. But, just
18 for the record, I have a very hard time putting Pleasanton
19 and Livermore down with communities in San Jose just to
20 meet a COI of 500,000 people. There is some difficulty
21 with Livermore, Pleasanton and Dublin in with Hayward but I
22 think there's more problems with them down with San Jose
23 communities. And I do believe - I think there were some
24 issues when we had done this before, when we looked at this
25 what happened in San Jose in terms of breaking up those

1 communities as well, too. Because it does affect that
2 SANJO district, too.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy then
4 Commissioner Barabba. And then I want to move forward with
5 something.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Similar to
7 Commissioner Forbes, I would be interested in seeing the
8 alternative that Ms. Alon referred to. I think we have
9 gotten so much COI testimony in this corridor. And if you
10 think about the western side of the corridor, even just,
11 you know, the economic piece which we talked about earlier
12 today but also demographically; even if you go down across
13 the Santa Clara line what a dense Asian-Pacific Islander
14 COI this is and a very diverse API COI. So I think we have
15 some flexibility if we are to look at trying to create more
16 of this Tri-City district, again, if we cross the county
17 line or not. But I would like to see something that
18 attempts to do that given what a priority, again, it is at
19 the Congressional level. And I'm more than willing to look
20 at - I think at the Senate level we had taken efforts to
21 keep the Tri-Cities together. And so we may want to look
22 at revisiting that so that we are able to provide more
23 communities in other places an opportunity to have better
24 representation in the Senate and Assembly versions.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba?

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, as a person who has
2 been recently traveling a lot on Highway 580, I can tell
3 you there is a lot of traffic going both ways between
4 Livermore-Dublin-Pleasanton, Castro Valley and San Leandro.
5 That highway is jammed all of the time and it's going both
6 ways. So it's not that they don't have anything in common.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, is there support for moving
8 either forward with the recently updated visualization or
9 do we want to have Ms. Alon's alternative?

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Would it be possible
11 like we did with the Barabba concept to do a rough cut of
12 what it is?

13 MS. MACDONALD: We are working on that already.

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay.

15 MS. MACDONALD: Actually, it's done already.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let's take a look at it then.
17 If they can do it fast, let's take a look.

18 MS. ALON: So this takes Dublin-Pleasanton-
19 Livermore - sorry, part of Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore
20 and Sunol and connects them with these areas of San Jose.
21 In this visualization the different neighborhoods of San
22 Jose are intact and so they have not been broken apart or
23 away from each other.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Would you be able to
25 give me a rough idea of how much of the population is on

1 the Alameda side and how much on the Santa Clara side?

2 MS. CLARK: The initial switch was 123,000, I
3 believe. So somewhere between 120,000 and 156,000 in
4 Alameda County.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Forbes?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: While this is not a perfect
7 district, it does - I mean, I was most concerned about what
8 was going to happen in San Jose. This configuration to me
9 seems like we're able to keep the San Jose COI intact as
10 well as meet the - I'll call it the Fremont area as well.
11 Those are two very significant gains. The fact that
12 Pleasanton is a little bit - you know, the connection is
13 not great, there no obvious freeway connection between
14 them, and the fact that there is a variance between the
15 population in Livermore versus San Jose, that is true. But
16 I think in this one we maintain the neighborhoods in San
17 Jose as well as achieve the COI in Fremont.

18 MS. ALON: And if I may just comment, I can clean
19 up this part down here to be able to get this in with the
20 green district and then take off a little bit of the city
21 split on the western end. So it won't look so - whatever
22 it looks like.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber then
24 Commissioner DiGuilio.

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Although there is a

1 part of me that likes what I see in the Fremont area, my
2 concern now - again, it just does go back to my
3 unfamiliarity with this area, so I would defer to those
4 commissioners that actually know the area - but if
5 Livermore and Pleasanton had a problem going over within
6 their own county to Fremont and Hayward, are we doing more
7 of a disservice potentially in putting Pleasanton and
8 Livermore on that side down with San Jose? So I just
9 thought I would put that thought out there. It just seems
10 like that is even a further distant community, even though
11 I do like the Fremont-Union area. But, again, we're just
12 trying to balance what we can see. Thanks

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio then
14 Commissioner Barabba.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And, again, I think just in
16 trying to balance COI here you've taken the Pleasanton-
17 Livermore-Dublin-San Ramon, that whole area, you now have
18 three Congressional districts from Contra Costa down into
19 Alameda, three Congressional districts so one COI of
20 500,000 people can be kept together. I think if you split
21 the Tri-Cities, even if it's in half, you still have a
22 significant block of people, 250,000 people that can
23 influence two different Congressional districts versus a
24 much smaller area that has just been fractured in order to
25 keep one very, very large COI together. I just don't see

1 how that's - for me it's not a reasonable trade-off at all.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would just reinforce that
4 all of a sudden San Ramon is tied in with Newark and
5 Fremont and split away from Dublin, which is now a split
6 community.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Two separate
9 observations. One is that I think from the beginning we've
10 known that keeping the Tri-Valley area together has been
11 very key. Even though in this representation it represents
12 a smaller share, the truth is this is a very important hub
13 for the region in terms of housing and in terms of jobs and
14 is connected. People live there and commute down to Santa
15 Clara County, commute other places in the Bay Area. So
16 it's very much connected. The concern I have with this one
17 - and I just trying to revisit our earlier conversation -
18 was I think if there was a way that we could fix the San
19 Ramon orphan I would feel pretty good about this
20 visualization, again with the idea that, yes, we are trying
21 to accommodate a very large COI at the Congressional level.
22 But, again, at the Senate level and at the Assembly level
23 we can look at other configurations. But, again, I felt
24 like the map in which we prioritize keeping them together
25 is not the map in which they need effective political

1 representation.

2 So San Ramon is the piece I would like to see if we
3 could fix.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. I will add a comment myself
5 after Commissioner Blanco.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I was just looking. Even
7 though I know that today they said they submitted new maps,
8 the CCAG original maps way back when we started were sort
9 of a mixture of this. They did have Livermore, Pleasanton,
10 Sunol connected to parts of Santa Clara. Now, they did go
11 all the way out to pick up parts further west but it was a
12 map that envisioned parts of Santa Clara together with
13 Livermore, Pleasanton and Sunol. I don't know what the one
14 today did, but the early map did go down to that area. So
15 there have been - we have been presented maps that include
16 this eastern part down with Santa Clara together.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, having worked in San Jose for
18 quite a while, I find the southern area quite disparate
19 from the Tri-Valley area. I often joke when people say
20 communities have nothing in common, I find these
21 communities have nothing in common, frankly. I don't say
22 that lightly. Although, again, as Commissioner Galambos-
23 Malloy mentioned, there probably is some commuter traffic
24 going down the 680 into the Silicon Valley area. But as
25 you get into the heart of downtown San Jose and the east

1 side they are very different communities there. I'm not
2 sure they really belong together.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Could we ask Ms.
4 Alon, you had mentioned a second alternative which, if I
5 understood it correctly, would be more of an inland
6 district and so would go and connect with, I believe it was
7 Morgan Hill. Could you just talk us through what that
8 version was?

9 MS. ALON: Sure. So what that version would be
10 would be taking this same Livermore, Pleasanton, part of
11 Dublin, Sunol area and just kind of going straight south
12 and then picking up Morgan Hill down in kind of southern
13 Santa Clara. So you get kind of more of a straight
14 district but it's a little longer.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

16 MS. ALON: Sorry, it would not include those San
17 Jose areas which are currently visualized in green.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So those San Jose
19 areas would then orient north?

20 MS. ALON: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If you took the current
24 district, which I'm not getting very comfortable with here,
25 and get it lowered a little bit and you - in that purple

1 area, if you would put San Ramon and all of Dublin in the
2 green area you would then be able to knock off the green
3 area on the bottom and put it into the purple area?

4 MS. ALON: You would be able to take what out of
5 the bottom? Sorry.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Put San Ramon and split part
7 of Dublin into the green area. And then because you're
8 short of people now in the purple area you go into the
9 green area in San Jose to make up for what you took out of
10 San Ramon and Dublin. What would that look like?

11 MS. ALON: It's about a 90 to 100,000 people. So
12 there is a deviation but also it would affect the northern
13 district that you took - it would affect the north as well,
14 if you are moving that around.

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But, like Milpitas is
16 66,000, is that right?

17 MS. ALON: Right. And San Ramon by itself is
18 72,000.

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So that whole area is
20 Milpitas?

21 MS. ALON: Just this little area down here.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I guess my question is, when
23 you add everything that's down there does it get close to
24 San Ramon and Dublin?

25 MS. ALON: You might be able to take Berryessa with

1 Milpitas.

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And they would be whole?

3 MS. ALON: In exchange.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I'm most comfortable
5 with something along the lines of what Commissioner Barabba
6 was exploring. If we look at sort of an east counties
7 district and then a west counties district and that may be
8 able to allow us to bring San Ramon back in with some of
9 it's sister cities and respect a significant number of COIs
10 on the west side and on the east side. I feel very
11 uncomfortable with the previous iteration that we had and I
12 feel that we may be able to get to a compromise here in
13 this area. And, again, I'm happy to, you know, defer on
14 the Tri-City areas in other maps.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I don't know if there is
17 something that needs to be done at some point with this.
18 Because I think even if there is some way of bringing San
19 Ramon into that area I still have a problem with it being
20 linked with San Jose. I still think you're trying to put -

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It wouldn't be. It would be
22 to the east.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: No, you have to - that's
24 not -

25 MS. ALON: It would still be linked with southern

1 San Jose, the Milpitas area, possibly the Berryessa area
2 would move into the Fremont-Newark-Union District.

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

4 MS. ALON: But south of that would still be a part
5 of the green district.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So you would only be
7 getting this section between the purple and the green which
8 would go up into the Fremont. There would still be a
9 portion of San Jose that would be linked with that area.

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: San Ramon and Dublin would
11 be in the green area.

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct. And then you
13 would have to push - but you couldn't get all of San Jose
14 back up into that district as a result.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think by the time
16 we start to look at this east-west configuration it
17 functionally makes more sense in terms of what communities
18 are linked. I agree with Commissioner Ancheta's point
19 earlier that you really think about, you know, Milpitas and
20 East San Jose connecting with the Tri-Valley, you know,
21 people commute on that corridor but there is certainly not
22 a strong community of interest between the two. But when
23 you think about folks commuting back and forth the link
24 down with San Jose proper makes more sense, which then
25 allows Milpitas and Berryessa, et cetera, to be with their

1 community of interest in the Tri-City area.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right, do we have any strong
3 sentiments at this point?

4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I still think this
5 distinction between trying to get something in a
6 Congressional and to release something in another district
7 is not an either or, it's dealing with what we have in each
8 district on a unique basis. Simply put, if an opportunity
9 arises in a district to put a group together we will try
10 and do that, if it doesn't we will try, you know, the best
11 that we can. But it's not a switch here, We'll give you
12 this if you give us that. There is a very big context for
13 all of this. So I think there are people that have
14 preferences for districts all throughout the state and
15 we'll do our best.

16 But what's driving it for me is not just a
17 particular area that wants it in one district, it has to be
18 based on what's best for the whole region in each district.
19 So I can understand, I completely understand, but there is
20 only so much we can do at times.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, I think with
22 the discussion that we've had here that there is something
23 that we can do. And I don't think it's what we're seeing
24 here -

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: - I think it's the
2 other alternative that Ms. Alon was speaking of and I think
3 that it manages to balance a number of very large and
4 competing communities of interest. And, you know, I would
5 say move forward with this, not what we're seeing here but
6 again this version that is the inland version, the eastern
7 side and the western side, for lack of a better way of
8 putting it. And that makes much more sense to me than what
9 we had had initially. And, you know, we will cross the
10 other bridges in the other districts when we get to them.

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can somebody repeat to me how
12 the east-west would go again, that Commissioner Barabba and
13 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy are describing?

14 MS. ALON: It actually is up here. So San Ramon is
15 in with the pink area, San Leandro is now in with the blue
16 area.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Oh, I'm sorry. I
18 think she was referring to this, if we were to link the
19 Tri-Valley area looking farther inland. So not linking
20 Tri-Valley area with Milpitas and Berryessa but going down
21 into the more inland side.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The way I would describe it
23 is to include San Ramon and all of Dublin into what you are
24 now calling San Jose - which would probably be changed to
25 be called East Alameda - and then cutting off that green

1 part, Milpitas, and to the left of Milpitas, put that into
2 the Fremont-Union until they balance out. And then you
3 would have an east and a west district that would be much
4 more amenable to the people up in Hayward and everybody
5 south there. Is that clear? You have that look on your
6 face.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: I'm not clear about where the east-
8 west demarcation is.

9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Well, you went straight down
10 from San Ramon -

11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Roughly using the
12 hills.

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Using the hills. You would
14 keep San Ramon in the Livermore because you need the
15 population, it's what we had before. And then you take
16 Milpitas and have that replace San Ramon into the Fremont
17 and Union district.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: So where does San Jose, the core
19 downtown San Jose, go?

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I don't think it's - I don't
21 know, I can't see it.

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So is what you're saying
23 then, San Ramon becomes green -

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: - and Milpitas becomes

1 purple?

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: In just gross terms.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, what about -

6 MS. ALON: Purple or pink?

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I could -

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Whatever that color is.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If you want to call it pink,
10 I'm happy.

11 MS. ALON: So this area that Jamie is circling is
12 kind of the odd man out in that configuration?

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It stays green.

14 MS. ALON: So it would be that Berryessa, Milpitas
15 area going into the purple probably. So then you would
16 just kind of come down and get that green area? Or would
17 you want to go straight down instead, the more inland side,
18 and try to get population that way?

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The more rural and eastern
20 you can keep it, the better.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Or suburban.

22 MS. ALON: Even if it goes all the way down to the
23 Monterey County border?

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Well, then that's probably
25 too far down, I would say.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Chair, that was my
2 point. How much population can you get from Livermore all
3 the way down? You would have to go inland again at Morgan
4 Hill, is what I'm looking at, and Gilroy. And that seems
5 to be a much further stretch to get population and is far
6 different than looking at the Milpitas and Berryessa areas
7 attached -

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Wait, wait. You're going to
9 gain population from picking up San Ramon. That's what the
10 key element is. Then you have to give up some population
11 and you take Milpitas and you give it to the Fremont and
12 Union District. It's as simple as that.

13 MS. CLARK: Can I try to repeat the idea just to
14 make sure that it's clear between the Commission and Q2?

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

16 MS. CLARK: Which would be to add San Ramon and
17 western Dublin, which is currently split in this
18 visualization, into this district that is currently green
19 called San Jose. And then to move population from Milpitas
20 and this Berryessa area into this district, which is called
21 Fre-New-Union. And perhaps for contiguity to add some
22 population here in this area to sort of round out the
23 district.

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, that's it.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yes.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So San Jose still stays in
4 the green?

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So again you still have San
7 Jose to San Ramon, yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But, wait -

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I understand, Commissioner
10 Barabba. You're taking 70 whatever thousand that is in San
11 Ramon and just shaving off the bottom part of Fremont-Union
12 into San Jose to take that population, whether it's
13 Milpitas or -

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Pull up the San Jose area
15 there. Now blow it up.

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: You can't take all of San
17 Jose and put it -

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: It seems like
19 perhaps this is something that Ms. Alon could do a mock-up
20 of. I don't know, it seems like at this point we have an
21 idea of what the concept is but it may be helpful to see a
22 visualization. Do folks feel like we have enough to be
23 able to give direction and have them move forward with
24 this?

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, let's take some more

1 comments. I would oppose this. Commissioner Blanco and
2 Commissioner DiGuilio?

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Parts of this are I think,
4 Oh, great. And then I think about San Jose being with
5 Pleasanton and Livermore and Sunol and I say, no. I mean,
6 it just doesn't make sense to me at all to have San Jose
7 with eastern Alameda County.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If San Jose is 945,000
9 people how could it possibly be all of San Jose be in this
10 district?

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It's not, it's a portion of
12 it.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, but a large percentage of the
14 district will be San Jose-based. So, Commissioner
15 DiGuilio?

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I feel like I understand
17 the concept is a trade-off between San Ramon and whatever
18 portion of that is in San Jose, the northern part. But I
19 wouldn't support it. So I feel like if we need to give
20 direction, we need to make a choice. And maybe there is
21 some type of motion that has to be made about this. So
22 both ways, I guess.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I feel like we're really
25 contorting here to try to accommodate a single large COI.

1 The previous, what we had before, at least kept most of
2 Alameda County together and now we're - I think we are
3 really running into a compactness issue plus very, very
4 different communities, trying to put them together. So I
5 wouldn't support this, either.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I wouldn't support it with
7 all of San Jose in it. I don't know how you do that.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah, I don't believe all of San
9 Jose would be in it. But I think the majority of the
10 population of the district would be San Jose, I believe,
11 just given - okay.

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Then I wouldn't support it,
13 either.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so we have at least five or
15 six commissioners who would not support this alternative,
16 which is significant enough that we probably couldn't go
17 forward with it.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think if we knew more about
19 San Jose. But I would like to know what portion of San
20 Jose is in this district, that would make a big difference
21 to me.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I agree, that would
23 be helpful.

24 MS. ALON: Currently in the green you have
25 Berryessa, you have the Golden Triangle, you have Little

1 Saigon, you have Evergreen, you have the east foothills,
2 Alum Rock area, eastern San Jose area, and just east of
3 downtown San Jose.

4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Of the population exchange
5 San Ramon is about what, 70-something it looked like?

6 MS. CLARK: Including the western area of Dublin,
7 it's between 90 and 100,000.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So what part of the green
9 part in San Jose would you have to take? I'm assuming you
10 would kind of move from that northwest corner because just
11 for -

12 MS. CLARK: It depends on whether you would want to
13 keep Milpitas and Berryessa together or if you would want
14 to move here.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So you could break Milpitas
16 and Berryessa. Because otherwise you would come down and
17 wrap down into San Jose and back up the other side, right?

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And that portion to
19 the west, where it says Milpitas but to the west where it
20 says San Jose, I believe you had mentioned that there
21 wasn't a lot of population there. Is that true?

22 MS. ALON: That yellow area there in the eastern
23 side probably has about - that whole census tract, which
24 goes all the way down at the inland area, has 1000 people.
25 So that northern part, you're probably looking at about

1 400.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And what about the
3 part on the northwest side, right adjacent to the raspberry
4 pink colored area, where it says San Jose - no, to the
5 left, to the left.

6 MS. ALON: Oh, that has -

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yeah, that area.

8 MS. ALON: It's between five and nine thousand, I
9 don't remember the exact number. But it's not that many.

10 MS. CLARK: To address the previous question, in
11 the San Jose District there are about 380,000 people from
12 the City of San Jose, it's 40 percent of the city.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so it sounds like we don't
14 have significant support to go in that direction. Do we
15 have an alternative? Do we want to go back to the
16 original?

17 (No response.)

18 Does anyone want to propose that, to go to the
19 earlier visualization?

20 (Inaudible comment from a commissioner, off
21 microphone.)

22 Right, it's the post-Barabba -

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Pre-Barabba.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, it's post-Barabba.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, it was the

1 first Barabba proposal.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right, I'm sorry. The Barabba
3 northern Alameda County, that one.

4 MS. ALON: And just to comment also on this is that
5 these configurations and where you're looking at kind of
6 having to go south with Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin are
7 because of the lines that you drew previously that you said
8 not to touch. So we looked at a visualization last week
9 that had them in their own district going north with the
10 San Ramon corridor and the Fremont area together but it was
11 problematic in the Richmond area. So just to make it clear
12 that there are ways of these two areas being preserved,
13 just depending on the other decisions you make further
14 north.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Let's go back to the posted
16 visualization, is that correct?

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, I mean, as we
19 talk about the different visualizations that we've done I
20 think that the decisions we made just north of this area
21 were sound ones. But, again, if there were a way - that's
22 why I was reluctant to make so many hard decisions up north
23 without having looked at the south. Because if there were
24 aspects of what we decided that might be flexible in order
25 to accommodate what we're seeing at the south end of the

1 county I would like to think that we had not, you know,
2 closed it down as such hard lines given, you know, what a
3 fluid area this is between the different counties.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, is this reflected - again, the
5 first Barabba, the clockwise adjustment, is this -

6 MS. ALON: This does not reflect the Barabba 1.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: But would the Barabba - the Barabba
8 configuration, let's just use that term, the one that was
9 posted, would that reflect the southern areas as well? I
10 mean consistent with that change?

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It hasn't changed.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: In other words, can we look -

13 (Multiple commissioners talking off microphone,
14 inaudible.)

15 Okay, I'm still the official speaker. So that's
16 all murmuring, it doesn't count. It wasn't recorded
17 properly. So the question is, again, we implemented or
18 made some directions based on Commissioner Barabba's
19 earlier suggestion to move a certain set of areas in a
20 clockwise rotation. Would that visualization that we did
21 look at be more useful than this one in terms of looking at
22 the adjacent districts?

23 MS. ALON: It does not impact any other districts
24 moving south. So it doesn't matter, you can look at this
25 one.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so this one would be
2 sufficient for us to look at.

3 MS. ALON: As long as you can imagine San Ramon and
4 this area going south and San Leandro going north, then
5 you're fine.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, does that work for people in
7 terms of discussion purposes?

8 (Affirmative responses from commissioners off
9 microphone.)

10 Okay. Commissioner Barabba?

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: But we also had Richmond
12 coming over into Contra Costa, that's what started the
13 whole thing.

14 MS. ALON: Yes, that's right.

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, okay.

18 MS. ALON: Sorry, I just assumed we were done with
19 this area.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Again, for purposes of discussion
21 we are - if you're looking at FRENE and south and west and
22 east just sort of imagine that San Ramon and San Leandro
23 have switched a bit.

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, okay.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: But the remaining districts are

1 basically -

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The same.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: - as is.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I just think this is
5 a stretch. I think we have very clear and consistent
6 testimony about not linking over the hills and that's
7 exactly what we've done here. And we've gotten that
8 feedback from both sides of the hills. So I don't think
9 this is a strong district. I mean, in terms of fair
10 representation at the Congressional level, the interests of
11 Hayward and Livermore are so different, so different. You
12 know, I think even though we sent San Leandro north we even
13 this morning had a couple of speakers from San Leandro
14 speaking about their unique needs in that area. And it's
15 drastically different from the testimony that we have had
16 for many months from the east county area, from the Tri-
17 Valley area. And I just think this is a disappointing
18 district and it doesn't really reflect my experience of
19 Alameda County nor the robust COI testimony we have from
20 Alameda County.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, for those commissioners
22 supporting the configuration, would you care to speak on
23 this? Because we have to settle on something.

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It would be a lot easier if
25 we could see what we actually did rather than - or is that

1 on a different computer, is that the problem? Okay, all
2 right.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Again I understand
5 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy's concern about this. There
6 are some very distinct differences. You know, as
7 Commissioner Barabba said, there are some links. You know,
8 transportation does go back and forth. And I don't think
9 it's the most ideal district, but I think we saw the
10 consequences of what happens otherwise and I just think
11 this is the lesser of the harm that's done. It's not the
12 best by any means but it's just the alternatives were
13 unacceptable.

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think that we are
15 really treading dangerous ground here. Because this is a
16 situation in which we are equating a transportation
17 corridor with fair and effective political representation.
18 I mean, we've had people come to our hearings and talk
19 about, you know, challenges being from the inner bayside,
20 being an urban resident trying to get jobs in the Tri-
21 Valley. You know, I've had personal and professional
22 experience of challenges around affordable housing
23 restrictions in the east county that have just very
24 different growth patterns and interests and policies than
25 they do in the urban areas. I mean, when I think about the

1 west side and the east side of these districts, it's night
2 and day. And I don't think it serves either side well.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: There is a great deal of silence
4 here. I would like to get a sense that this is in fact
5 supported by at least nine members of the Commission.
6 Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Although I recognize
8 the concerns raised by Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, we've
9 just explored all of these variations and we're also
10 considering respecting county lines here in a county that
11 would have a voice as a whole. Because I think in trying
12 to consider putting together maybe one area of
13 socioeconomic levels then it's to the lack of
14 representation to other socioeconomic levels, especially if
15 we consider those earlier iterations of putting the eastern
16 side of Dublin-Pleasanton-Livermore all the way down to
17 practically Gilroy. And we just don't see any other
18 option. But these are residents that reside in the same
19 county and based on our prioritization that we have and
20 this considerable work and discussion that we have taken
21 today we've really looked at various options here. And I
22 think that at other levels we are able to respect the
23 concerns that are mentioned and so we can balance out these
24 concerns at the Assembly level and the Senate level but may
25 be stuck at this point. But we are still respectful of

1 county lines. Thank you.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: I would like to echo that
4 message. What exists in the district right now is a county
5 issue. The county itself has the difference in community
6 of interest and to try to address it at the Congressional
7 level when something exists at the county level, I find
8 that maybe we are overextending our influence here. So I
9 would like to basically stay with the configuration that we
10 have now.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Same comment on most of the
13 county is together. Alameda is a big county, it has very
14 different parts to it. We've tried to address it as best
15 as we can here. I think we just have to acknowledge that
16 we have some different communities of interest here but at
17 least they are in clusters together. And I just think
18 that, you know, with the units that we have for
19 Congressional I think this is the best alternative of the
20 choices that we've seen. And this is not going to be the
21 first time that we're not going to like a district. But I
22 think it's a reasonable district given that it's mostly an
23 Alameda County district.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I just want to
25 clarify. We did not exhaust our options, we did not

1 consider looking north, we basically said every decision we
2 made north stays. So this is an area where the Commission
3 does have significant latitude in terms of counties and
4 communities of interest are weighted equally in terms of
5 our constitutional mandate. And so to acknowledge, yes,
6 we've managed to respect some of the county boundaries but
7 we've done so at the expense of a number of very
8 significant and diverse COIs, I think is really a misstep.
9 And I couldn't feel comfortable voting for this map.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Just in saying that, do you mean
11 for the - if this were to go into place you would not be
12 able to support, let's say, a final map? Or just this
13 particular district?

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would not at this
15 point - I mean, I think there are other options we maybe
16 have not looked at, looking at - in terms of just
17 representing how the area actually functions. I think this
18 idea of the 680 corridor, there may be other options that
19 would impact how we were flowing north. But in terms of
20 just looking at this district, I don't feel comfortable
21 with it.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If we took that position on
24 every district there would be hardly any that we would go
25 along with because you just go right down California and

1 there are several districts that have very disparate groups
2 in them, a couple of which I am familiar with.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I am troubled by any
5 commissioner that contends that based on one district that
6 we cannot consider voting on a final map, just simply
7 because of one district. We are trying to balance a number
8 of interests here and I don't feel that it was part of our
9 recognition - all of our duties as a commissioner and the
10 recognition that there has to be compromise. And although
11 we may not be satisfied with some districts, I would never
12 put myself in a position to consider not voting on a map
13 just simply due to one district. So I would like to ask
14 that my fellow commissioners keep that in mind, that this
15 is a compromise of all interests and for the benefit of all
16 the citizens of the State of California and not just one
17 community of interest.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, now in terms of moving
19 forward, at least from this particular visualization, maybe
20 this is - perhaps, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, we could
21 simply note it for the record that you would oppose this
22 particular district and we could move forward, or we can
23 call a vote and you can vote no, of course, on this
24 particular visualization.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I mean, either

1 accomplishes the same thing.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I don't feel a need
4 to necessarily call a vote on it. I think I would be
5 surprised if my fellow commissioners felt like that we had
6 not been compromising all over the state as we've gone
7 through looking at districts. My concern lies in that I
8 don't really feel like we have exhausted the options of
9 looking at the northern quarter or other options. Clearly,
10 I'm in the minority on that. But I do think we could have
11 done a better job with this district, significantly better.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And not in terms of
14 just this district but thinking of it as a region, which,
15 you know, of course we've been doing.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Aguirre?

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Well, let me just chime in
18 on the issues that are being brought up by Commissioner
19 Galambos-Malloy. And that is that, you know, the reality
20 of a have-not district and a have district juxtaposed on a
21 have-not district, is that typically the have-nots continue
22 to lose out on political representation. So I don't know
23 this area very well but the arguments that Commissioner
24 Galambos-Malloy is bringing up in terms of fair and
25 effective representation for those folks who have been

1 politically disenfranchised historically is a concern of
2 mine.

3 I know, I've driven through Hayward and those areas
4 and I can see that they are very working class. Coming
5 into San Jose from Sacramento a couple of weeks ago,
6 driving through Livermore, Pleasanton I can see that that
7 is a more upper income, more professional area of that
8 particular county. So as far as - I don't have a solution
9 to offer at this time but I'm concerned about that lack of
10 representation for working class.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco and then
12 I think we should move on.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I think my concern,
14 besides the substance about this district having such
15 different cities and communities in it, I guess I'm
16 troubled by the same thing Commissioner Galambos-Malloy
17 mentioned about the exploration of other possibilities. I
18 think that it's a lot easier when we're in areas of the map
19 like in the north where you have big stretches of very
20 similar communities to some extent to sort of, you know,
21 move around easily. I think once you get into these urban
22 areas you really get into these situations where you have
23 these situations of inequality in a county. And so to just
24 say a county is whole really doesn't say much when you
25 consider that, you know, communities of interest include

1 socioeconomic status, transportation, things that are meant
2 to say, Are these people going to receive fair and
3 effective representation if they are in a district like
4 this?

5 So I'm troubled because when we lock in everything
6 else, which I know we have to because we've got deadlines,
7 we've locked in things that at some level - I know it
8 doesn't seem like it - but at some level seemed easier
9 because we didn't have these complex juxtapositions when
10 we're up in the MTCAP or on a sparsely populated area in
11 Yuba. Here we start getting into really complicated
12 situations. And I think these are the situations that sort
13 of test our mettle about are we going to really try and
14 deal with fair representation and not just geographic lines
15 and sort of mechanical ways of trying to resolve problems.
16 And so I don't want to move forward - I mean, I will go
17 forward but I really feel like, Have we explored how to not
18 have these areas become sort of the things we don't feel
19 good about because everything around them is kind of
20 settled? And that's the thing that I'm having a hard time
21 with.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, very briefly Commissioner
23 DiGuilio and Commissioner Barabba. But we have to move on.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think part of the
25 issue is there is this idea that we could fix things maybe

1 by moving north. But I think if what we're trying to do is
2 to put like a coastal district - if you're trying to get
3 the Fremont-Newark-Hayward-Union City together and maybe
4 looking to go north for population what you still do is you
5 isolate population in the bottom of SANJO that will have to
6 go somewhere. So whether you go east or west, if you cut
7 the SANJO off you're still going to have the bottom part of
8 that population that will have to be linked up and around.
9 And that's the discussion we just had, right? So even if
10 we were to look north at some options, if the goal is to
11 try and link part of that then we've seen the trade-offs,
12 right? The consequences of that. You can't isolate that
13 portion in the south.

14 So, you know, again I recognize - I think we could
15 probably look to just about most places in the state and
16 find places that have very different types of populations
17 in them and I think as long as it's balanced to some degree
18 then hopefully one group will not overrun the other one.
19 You know, it's always a concern but I think as long as
20 you're just not throwing one group in with a larger group
21 and have fair and effective representation being taken away
22 from it, it may be that two groups are going to have to
23 work together. There's an idea.

24 And, you know, I think to some degree this is
25 always an issue when we are trying to balance things as

1 much as we can. But sometimes the consequences of that are
2 more difficult than the issue you're trying to address in
3 the first place. It's not a lack of recognition of the
4 problem, it's that the consequences can be more painful
5 than what's trying to be solved in the first place.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba then we
7 will -

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I'll pass.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so let's move over to the
10 west part of the bay just to stay within the region. We
11 can get into San Francisco and then -

12 MS. ALON: Do you want to do SANJO and go up
13 instead?

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: It's up to you. Is that a switch-
15 out or are you okay?

16 MS. ALON: It's the same map.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

18 MS. ALON: Which district did you want to do?

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let's go to the San Jose one.
20 Commissioner Barabba, do you want to -

21 (Discussion off microphone, inaudible.)

22 Sure. Well, we've had - why don't you just quickly
23 summarize the areas because we've got a couple of areas of
24 Alameda County and then the heart of a lot of San Jose. So
25 you can describe what cities we're looking at.

1 (No response.)

2 Tamina.

3 MS. ALON: Oh, sure.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sorry.

5 MS. ALON: We have Newark and about 100,000 people
6 in Fremont over here. And then here is Milpitas and the
7 northern part of San Jose. This triangle here is known as
8 the Golden Triangle. Berryessa is right over here. And
9 then down here we have Little Saigon and Evergreen, which
10 have to be kept together. This visualization was not able
11 to keep east, kind of Alum Rock area, with the downtown,
12 though the eastern San Jose area is whole and downtown area
13 is whole, as is San Jose State. And this area here
14 reflects the LGBT community, as was submitted the EQCA
15 lines. So they are whole with the downtown.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: So the district as configured has a
17 number of different sort of multiple communities of
18 interest. We've heard from folks in the Fremont, Milpitas,
19 Berryessa neighborhoods. We've heard from folks in the
20 east San Jose, Alum Rock area. Although, again, some of
21 the testimony would have liked to have linked downtown with
22 east San Jose and, again, maintain the integrity of various
23 smaller neighborhoods, including Evergreen, the Little
24 Saigon commercial district. The LGBT area, which sort of
25 goes into part of downtown San Jose as well - I'm sorry,

1 it's in the adjacent district, right?

2 MS. ALON: Right.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, now is that why the east San
4 Jose and downtown aren't necessarily linked, was it to
5 maintain that particular -

6 MS. ALON: Well, there are two reasons. If you
7 were to add in more of this area and keep downtown then you
8 would split Evergreen.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

10 MS. ALON: So this visualization was to keep these
11 different neighborhoods whole if not necessarily together.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: And then you have part of Santa
13 Clara, it looks like, for population purposes?

14 MS. ALON: Yes. The Golden Triangle over here
15 actually takes part of Sunnyvale and part of Santa Clara.
16 And so there are those two city splits in order to keep
17 that COI together.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

19 MS. ALON: And this southern part is just for
20 population.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional thoughts?
22 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I like what you've
24 done in terms of the communities of interest within Santa
25 Clara County, both trying to keep their integrity and then

1 trying to link up multiple of them. I still think on the
2 north end if we look at where we ended up with the COIs on
3 the north end we've split the Tri-City COI and we've put
4 half of them with a disparate community on the east side of
5 the county that doesn't really want to be with them and
6 then we've put the other half of them in as a minor share
7 in what's really a Santa Clara County district. So in
8 terms of representation I am having trouble figuring out
9 which of these districts the Tri-City area will actually
10 get a fair shake in.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: It could be both. I mean, as we
12 know, one of the challenges is that we have multiple Asian-
13 American communities. And we've had testimony regarding
14 the various Milpitas, part of Fremont, and then there is
15 the Tri-City configuration as well. So, again, we're
16 trying as best we can to reconcile the two. It is
17 obviously difficult to try and accommodate because of the
18 size of the asserted interests. This district, I think,
19 encompasses at least one element of the Asian-American
20 dimensions but obviously we've had a compromise in
21 splitting Fremont.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And I think the
23 additional piece that we have to acknowledge is that the
24 connection between Hayward and the Tri-Cities in regard to
25 the African-American and Latino communities we've also

1 split those COIs.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any further comments on the San
3 Jose area?

4 (No response.)

5 What is the southern one called? Is that going
6 down into Monterey as well?

7 MS. ALON: No.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

9 MS. ALON: This ends at the county line, most of
10 it, and then hopping over Gilroy.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: And just to note, Gilroy, I'm
12 assuming, is also partly for Section 5 compliance.

13 MS. ALON: Yes.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: So we have the remainder of San
15 Jose. It tends to be more somewhat more suburban, Campbell
16 and Los Gatos being more suburban communities. A lot of
17 land, obviously, but sparsely populated. Morgan Hill being
18 more of a bedroom community but also a transitional area
19 going into San Martin and Gilroy. So starting to pick up
20 agricultural bases but, again, largely the City of San Jose
21 is built in here. And distinct in many ways from the
22 adjacent district in terms of socioeconomic status. As you
23 move toward those agricultural areas in the south, the
24 income levels tend to drop. But Morgan Hill is still
25 largely a bedroom community for the San Jose area. And a

1 lot of open space here. That kind of captures it, I think.

2 MS. ALON: Mm-hmm.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so SNMSC. Are we straddling
4 our teams here?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: A little bit.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Maybe Commissioner Barabba can
7 describe parts and Commissioner Dai can describe parts.
8 Part of this is also sort of Silicon Valley or it's a
9 strong Silicon Valley-based district.

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And in essence we've
11 included the coast with the inner bay area, which I don't
12 think we had much of a choice on. And we did a pretty good
13 job of keeping those communities - we split a couple, as I
14 recall. What did we do with East Palo Alto and Menlo Park,
15 did we -

16 MS. ALON: Menlo Park and East Palo Alto are whole
17 and they are with Redwood City.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, okay.

19 MS. ALON: Oh, sorry. Menlo Park has this odd
20 little non-contiguous area which is not a part of the San
21 Mateo District.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: So this has Sunnyvale and
24 Mountain View together and I guess most of Santa Clara,
25 there is a part of the - along with Cupertino. So I think

1 the closest that we come to keeping the west valley cities
2 together.

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yep.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: And we have most of the Stanford
5 area together, although it is split from Menlo Park and
6 East Palo Alto. But the trade-off is that we are putting -
7 we did get testimony about putting East Palo Alto with
8 Redwood City. So in this incarnation we're putting them
9 together there. But, again, around the Stanford area you
10 have Woodside and Atherton together as well. Menlo Park
11 would be the missing city in that incarnation but it looks
12 like we - I seem to recall they were together before and
13 that must have been at the Assembly level.

14 MS. ALON: They were together before but then I was
15 directed to move East Palo Alto back with Redwood City even
16 if it included Menlo Park.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: You mentioned a non-
19 contiguous part of Menlo Park, I believe?

20 MS. ALON: Yes, see this little bubble right here?

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Is there significant
22 population there?

23 MS. ALON: Let me check.

24 (Pause as Ms. Alon accesses database.)

25 It's 4200. So about 13 percent.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I don't know that
2 particular part of the Bay Area well so I would defer to
3 Commissioners Dai and Ancheta, if you had any feedback
4 about that portion.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I mean, I actually didn't
6 think we gave that direction because I thought we had kept
7 it together in another incarnation. Menlo Park and
8 Stanford and Atherton are pretty tied together. The
9 problem is, you know, East Palo Alto is in there as well.
10 I thought we had a discussion last time that East Palo Alto
11 also had a relationship with Palo Alto. So I actually
12 thought we had left that.

13 MS. ALON: This was a revert to the first draft
14 maps so anything that was given in instruction last week
15 kind of got erased with the revert.

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Because I would say that
17 we have Emerald Lake Hills in there, that's probably more
18 affiliated with San Mateo but that's not very many people
19 so I don't know if that gets us much. North Fair Oaks,
20 too, I think that's considered more San Mateo.

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: We could always split San
22 Mateo, Menlo Park.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, it's already split. How
24 many people are in that kind of finger down from East Palo
25 Alto?

1 MS. ALON: Roughly 4000.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: So you could do an exchange with
3 Emerald Lake?

4 MS. ALON: Well, West Menlo Park is here and that's
5 another 3600. So you would have to take Emerald Lake and
6 split either Woodside or North Fair Oaks.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: So just to be clear, the 4000,
8 could you mark where the 4000 is?

9 MS. ALON: It's right here.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Oh, it's that part there.

11 MS. ALON: It's separated by West Menlo Park.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. Menlo Park itself has
13 32,000 people. I was just wondering if you were to reduce
14 the finger, the blue finger. Yeah, how many are in that
15 area?

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: I mean, do you see any division
17 between Menlo Park in terms of - obviously, East Palo Alto,
18 it's a classic example of east of the freeway very
19 different from west of the freeway. I don't know Menlo
20 Park as well. Is it similar in that sense? Is there a
21 divider there?

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I'm thinking about the
23 part that's close to Stanford. I mean, that part is very
24 tightly aligned with Stanford and Atherton and Woodside.
25 To be honest, I don't know much about Menlo Park that is

1 east of the freeway. But I do think, you know, the
2 downtown area is where University Avenue is. So that's
3 kind of right now with East Palo Alto.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Commissioner Dai, would you
5 consider using 101 as a split for Menlo park then?

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, that's a possibility. What
7 I'm thinking also is that Emerald Lake Hills, I don't
8 believe that's generally considered part of that community.
9 It probably would make more sense to put that as part of
10 San Mateo. That's four thousand-some people right there.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, it's all San Mateo County.
12 Do you want more of the coastal rather than the -

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm just saying it's not really
14 part of that kind of Stanford area, that's a pretty tight
15 community, that I'm aware of. I'm also not aware of North
16 Fair Oaks being part of that. So I'm just thinking we
17 might be able to put more of Menlo Park back with Stanford
18 and Palo Alto.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I do think in a
20 district of this size, a Congressional district, that the
21 feedback we got from the public about having East Palo Alto
22 linked with Redwood City, I think we should consider that
23 just because parts of Redwood City and East Palo Alto are
24 so different than many other parts of the district. I
25 would hate to isolate them.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm not suggesting putting East
2 Palo Alto back, I'm suggesting putting Menlo Park back.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, it seems like a - can we give
4 a direction? Is there sufficient -

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: You can't put all of Menlo
6 Park back -

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, you can't.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: - you have to cut it off.
9 And I would suggest at the 101.

10 MS. ALON: Just this finger, putting this finger
11 area back?

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: If you can do a swap, I think.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: And that's at the 101.

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think 101 is about the
17 midpoint of the finger there.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: No, it's right about there.

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, it's right about there.

20 MS. ALON: 101 is up here.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Oh, is it? Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that's a reasonable
24 split.

25 MS. ALON: And where would you like to take

1 population out from in the gray district?

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Emerald Lake Hills and North
3 Fair Oaks.

4 MS. ALON: Okay. I'm not sure exactly how much
5 population is in this area right here. But I will take
6 first Emerald Lake Hills and then North Fair Oaks if I need
7 more.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: And is North Fair Oaks a census
9 place or is it a city?

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think it's a place.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Place.

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It's not a city.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Do we know? It's a census
14 place, right?

15 MS. ALON: Yes, I believe it's a census place.

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yep.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, because Menlo Park is a
18 city and it's a pretty small city.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, do we have enough direction
20 on that? Again, it's not a large change to the district.
21 Is that sufficient to go ahead with this district?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yep.

23 MS. ALON: Sorry, North Fair Oaks is a census place
24 as is Emerald Lake Hills. And this area is 20,000 people
25 so you would be taking North Fair Oaks, Emerald Lake Hills

1 and probably some of this area in here.

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Sounds good.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Sounds good.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay with that? Okay. Want to
5 keep going north? We still have to come back to Monterey,
6 but - so the SNMAT District, San Mateo. Commissioner Dai,
7 do you want to describe that?

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm sorry. So this is mostly a
9 San Mateo County district. At the top end it maintains the
10 API COI between South San Francisco, Daly City and Colma.
11 It keeps the peninsula cities together and also most all of
12 the San Mateo coastline, which we received testimony about
13 as well.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: LGBT community, how is that in this
15 district? Obviously, we're looking at the San Francisco
16 District as well.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Can I ask to zoom
18 in? I think you're doing so, yeah, right there. Thank
19 you.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: So this top district is most of
21 San Francisco. And, of course, San Francisco is too large
22 to be in a single Congressional district. So it looks like
23 we put Lakeshore and Twin Peaks - yeah, if you could
24 superimpose the EQ California lines it would be helpful.
25 It looks like we have Diamond Heights, west of Twin Peaks,

1 Lakeshore, Outer Mission in with San Mateo. One slight
2 discrepancy, I think we had Crocker Amazon going south
3 before because that's kind of very similar to Daly City. I
4 just want to make sure we're kind of consistent with what
5 we did with the Assembly.

6 MS. ALON: Right. So this is the first draft map
7 iteration. And so we made a bunch of changes in the
8 Assembly line.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Did you make the same changes
10 here? Probably, I think, you could swap out Crocker Amazon
11 and then be able to go around those lines a little bit
12 better. And that would respect both COIs better.

13 MS. ALON: So the direction is to swap out Crocker
14 Amazon from the San Francisco District and then in exchange
15 follow the EQCA lines to try to maintain the integrity of
16 this area, the EQCA area?

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. As well as the integrity
18 of the API COI.

19 MS. ALON: If Crocker Amazon is not enough
20 population then Excelsior or Visitacion Valley?

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, I think to
22 be consistent we should just equalize it as best as we can
23 with Crocker Amazon and leave Visitacion Valley and
24 Excelsior in there with Bayview?

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes, I would agree with that.

1 MS. ALON: Okay, so the direction is to take
2 Crocker Amazon and follow the EQCA lines as much as Crocker
3 Amazon's population will allow?

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct.

5 MS. ALON: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I want to note, too,
8 that after we had had our previous direction given to San
9 Francisco that we had gotten public comment regarding the
10 possibility of Outer Mission also being linked. I know we
11 had gone back and forth and made the decision on this
12 iteration but Outer Mission actually does share a similar
13 community of interest with the Excelsior, Visitacion
14 Valley, Bayview side. So, for the record.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, this is sort of a
16 definitional issue. Because very commonly Outer Mission
17 sort of refers to a lot of area that would include
18 Excelsior and Crocker Amazon and Vis Valley. We are using
19 the planning name for it, that's actually a much smaller
20 neighborhood definition. Again, the more common one would
21 - it's almost sort of Bernal Heights south is sort of -
22 running along Mission Street is sort of what's considered
23 the Outer Mission. So I think we're capturing a lot of
24 that. And, again, often the 280 is sort of a divider there
25 where you might look at the way it splits the Outer Mission

1 neighborhood right now might be also part of that - or
2 linked up with Excelsior and Crocker Amazon. I think for
3 population purposes what we just instructed is probably a
4 good way to go.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, we're not going to be able
6 to respect both COIs exactly. So I think we're trying to
7 do a little bit of a hybrid and hopefully the public will
8 tune in and give us some finer alliance because it will be
9 a compromise.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, this is the type of
11 thing where I think if we go to next week we can - these
12 are the kind of tweaks we can work with at the street level
13 which hopefully wouldn't take too long. But it's that
14 level and the basic framework of the district would be
15 intact.

16 Okay, so was Monterey the only one left over?

17 MS. ALON: Yes.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: So we have Section 5 district,
19 we're above benchmark, I believe?

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yep. This is an almost
21 perfect district. By the way, I notice on this map it
22 shows 45.71 and not 46. Will they allow us to round up?

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: I'm sorry, and I can't remember the
24 - I always ask this so I should have the sheet in front of
25 me.

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think the benchmark was
2 46, as I recall.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, I think it was 44 for
4 Congressional, is that right?

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If it was 44 we would have a
6 perfect district.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: I thought it was 44. It's above
8 the benchmark.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: And I apologize, I don't have my
10 notes in front of me in terms of the exact numbers.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: In any event, other than
12 having to split the City of Santa Cruz, this district is
13 pretty solid. Obviously, you wouldn't normally want to
14 sneak into Santa Clara to pick up Gilroy but that was
15 required to meet the CVAP, or VAP in this case, I think.

16 MS. ALON: The benchmark is 44.16.

17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: 44. Okay, that's right,
18 then we were at 43. Okay.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: The alternative was lower, it was
20 about two points lower.

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: We're up about by a point or -

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Percent and a half.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, did -

25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So other than that I don't

1 think anybody would complain, but we're going to get a
2 little heat out of Santa Cruz, but understandably so.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Commissioner
4 Barabba, have you worked with Q2 on the street level detail
5 of where we are splitting?

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I looked at it and they
7 followed pretty much the river, as close to the river as I
8 think she can get and still get the population. But it
9 looks like that road there along 1, that's sometimes called
10 the West Santa Cruz area. And so I think we will be -
11 there is not a way to cut that city properly to keep
12 everybody happy. So this is about as close as you can get,
13 I think. We will probably get some suggestions but at
14 least now they can actually see the streets when they go to
15 these maps.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Where is the University in
17 this?

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It's in the other district.

19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's in the other?

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, the only thing other
23 that is a difficulty, there is a significant Monterey Bay
24 community that - not a community, it's a scientific center
25 that's right there on the coast in the other district. But

1 I'm sure they are capable of - they are tight with the
2 University.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, did we miss anything?

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Whatever we missed we're
5 going to hear.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, just a district, we might have
7 missed a district. I just want to make sure we -

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The district is pretty solid
9 other than that.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Did we go all the way around the
11 Congressional?

12 MS. ALON: Yes.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let's take a ten minute
14 break. And try to keep it shorter, if we can keep it to
15 five that would be ideal. We are way behind.

16 (Ten minute break at 4:08 p.m.)

17 Okay, we are back from our short break and we are
18 now moving - we're behind schedule but I'm hoping that a
19 lot of these very challenging discussions about many of
20 these regions are not obviously settled but we've worked
21 through a lot of the tough ones and that as we look at
22 these districts at the state level that a lot of the issues
23 have been worked through at least in terms of how we look
24 at these districts.

25 So, Commissioner Raya, do you want to chime in?

1 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I just wanted to make a comment
2 as we're going forward. This morning I made the
3 observation that I hoped we were going to take the time to
4 look especially at areas that are problematic for any
5 particular commissioner. And I think what is concerning me
6 a little bit is, yes, we know everybody isn't going to get
7 what they want, we know that there are trade-offs, we know
8 that there are consequences to different changes we might
9 make and then we have to evaluate what are those changes.
10 But I think there are different ways that you don't get
11 what you want.

12 Some people might not get exactly what they have in
13 mind but they can fend for themselves, they can take care
14 of themselves. Other communities might not get what they
15 want and may be left at a disadvantage. So I think it's
16 important for us not to lose site once we make - you know,
17 start making those tough decisions. You know, let's not
18 lose sight of our basic goal, which is to provide fair and
19 effective representation. And if we need to do some hard
20 work, okay, it's painful but that's why we're here and this
21 is the last chance to do it. So I just ask that we give
22 consideration to the real impact of some of our decisions
23 and not just an easy, well, everybody has to sacrifice.
24 Because in real life some people sacrifice more than
25 others.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, thank you. And we are going
2 to be more clock conscious as we go forward, obviously.
3 But, again, I'm hoping that a lot of the harder questions
4 we've been able to talk through and we can look at these
5 state districts in that light. And, again, we will sort of
6 go with the same sort of sequencing in terms of the teams
7 highlighting. And, again, if you sort of say ditto in
8 terms of what was in the Congressional, that's fine, too,
9 in terms of just giving the basic description of the
10 district.

11 So shall we start?

12 MS. CLARK: Sure. This is the Assembly plan for
13 Northern California. I can describe it. Here in this
14 DMNDO District the Counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity
15 and Mendocino. Sonoma is split per CRC direction. Last
16 time that I saw you the direction was to split the City of
17 Santa Rosa, which was to avoid having sort of a hook/curl
18 in this Marin District.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Forbes?

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's good. You know, that
21 was the suggestion that we had made and you did a fine job.
22 I think this is a good district.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, for the reporting
24 purposes it's similar demographic and geographic interests
25 there. So that can be sort of reinforced.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: We had lots of testimony
2 about keeping Mendocino and Sonoma together.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, moving on.

4 MS. CLARK: Moving onto this district called Marin,
5 it's the entire County of Marin, Petaluma, Cotati, the City
6 of Sonoma and southern City of Santa Rosa, and also
7 Sebastopol.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again, I don't think - is
9 Marin mine?

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: I think that is the Dai-Galambos-
11 Malloy team.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. So that kept most of the
13 101 corridor together, that was what we attempted to do
14 with that reconfiguration.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And again respecting
16 the Golden Gate Bridge.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, you can go back up north
18 again, north and eastward.

19 MS. CLARK: If we look at this district named Napa,
20 it is Lake and Napa Counties. In Sonoma County it takes
21 Rohnert Park, Kenwood and then there is a split in
22 Fairfield, it is split along the 80 and then down
23 Pennsylvania Avenue, and also includes the cities of
24 Vallejo and Benicia.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again, that was - we tried to
2 keep the wine growing region - at least part of the wine
3 growing region - with Sonoma. So we have Napa, Sonoma and
4 Lake together, it's not all the wine growing area but a lot
5 of it.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And remind me, we
7 had Fairfield whole in Congressional, is that correct?

8 MS. CLARK: Fairfield was split in Congressional.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Split.

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: We looked at the streets and
11 Pennsylvania was a good street to go down.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so we're okay with this
13 district?

14 (No response.)

15 Going to the northern one, I guess. Is that also
16 MTCAP?

17 MS. CLARK: If we look at this district, YUBA, it's
18 the Counties of Tehama, Glenn, Yuba and Sutter, which are
19 all whole. Colusa and Butte Counties are split. This
20 Butte split is the same as last time you saw this district,
21 the difference is that Sutter previously had been split and
22 now Colusa is split per CRC direction.

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again we kept Sutter and Yuba
24 together like they had said they wanted to. The Colusa
25 split was just to be sure that that happened. If you

1 recall, there was a finger that had gone up into Sutter
2 County. And it remains an almost exclusively agricultural
3 district.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: And also a Section 5 county and the
5 benchmark is okay?

6 MS. CLARK: Yes.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, next district.

8 MS. CLARK: If we move onto this -

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Sorry, could I just ask one
10 very quick question?

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So in YUBA, what part of
13 Butte is that? I'm trying to see the communities exactly.
14 Are those still valley floor communities?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, Chico is one.

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I see, yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And there is no way to
19 split the - to fix the Butte split with the Colusa split?

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No. Because Butte has way
21 too many people, Butte has ten times the population of -

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I know that we had chosen to
23 split Colusa instead of Sutter even though Sutter is a much
24 larger county. And I just want to make sure everyone is
25 still okay with that. Colusa only has 21,000 people, it's

1 a lot smaller than most of the cities that we've looked at.
2 And Sutter, I believe, further south has more kind of
3 suburban new developments, the southern end of Sutter. So
4 I just wanted to check in and make sure that we're okay
5 with this decision. We are splitting a very, very small
6 county.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay, what is the
8 population - who is the population in south Sutter? Maybe
9 we can look at that.

10 MS. CLARK: The split previously in Sutter County
11 went pretty much all the way up to here. It's about 13,000
12 people. The majority of the population in Sutter County is
13 just right -

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: In the Marysville -

15 MS. CLARK: - here.

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: - Yuba City area.

17 MS. CLARK: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Which we kept whole.

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: One question: What was the
21 population of Butte County that was not included in this
22 district, do you know that offhand?

23 MS. CLARK: I can look in the County Splits Report.
24 One moment, please.

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: So before we leave Colusa, again

1 I just want to make sure that we're comfortable with
2 splitting a county that is only 21,000 people.

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Commissioner Forbes, are
4 you familiar with the lower part of Sutter? I mean, I
5 think we had given - you know, going back and forth.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, it would like to be a
7 suburb of Sacramento prior to the housing bust.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Again, I'm just trying to
9 go off of Commissioner Dai's point of whether - again,
10 trying to minimize the harm. The big part for Sutter and
11 Yuba was to keep the communities of Marysville and Yuba
12 City together. And I think we could -

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, I think if you came
14 in in sort of a straight line, I think it was the finger
15 component that was a problem. I think if you came up, you
16 know, gradually from the south you could do that and pick
17 up all of Colusa. But I was trying to see whether or not
18 there was population in Glenn that could be traded out with
19 Colusa.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Butte, you mean?

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, Butte County, right.
22 And I didn't know whether that was -

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, but then you have a
24 shift of population.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, you have to have

1 rotation, shifts.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think if -

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: But there is only about 7000
4 - how many people are in the light green part of Colusa?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: 13,000 people.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: 13,000 roughly, more or less?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, half the county,
8 basically.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, if you wanted to
10 shave off 13,000 of Sutter on the south you could do that
11 and that wouldn't be a problem, I don't think.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: So that's what we had before.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right. No, we had a finger
14 that went up into Sutter County, it was not a sort of a
15 straight line.

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, it can't be a straight
17 line because it's very sparsely populated.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: So -

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't think - I still think
21 this is better than the finger.

22 MS. CLARK: Just to answer a previous question,
23 this part of Butte County that is in the MTCAP District is
24 approximately 20,000 people of 220,000.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, I have concern about the

1 finger. Because if you are splitting a county to make it
2 more compact I think you're raising one criterion over
3 another. In other words, we should try to fix the county
4 split if it's for compactness reasons. If there is
5 something else going on, that's different. But if the
6 finger is simply a compactness issue then I think we ought
7 to try to keep the county together.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, which is the way that Ms.
9 Clark had it when she showed it to us before. That's why -
10 this came to me as I was trying to write the draft
11 narrative example and I looked at the population of Colusa
12 and said, Ooh, should we have split that?

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Is there something else going on
14 with the finger in terms of any community of interest being
15 split or -

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, I mean, the Marysville area,
17 Yuba City area is kept whole in both incarnations. So
18 really it's a trade-off between splitting Colusa or
19 splitting Sutter. And Ms. Clark had chosen to split Sutter
20 because it's a bigger county.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Could I ask you two
22 to just show us, remind us where the finger exactly would
23 be and how far up it would go?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: It goes to about the same level
25 as Colusa.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I just think with a
2 county that small as Colusa it definitely falls in the
3 category of the discussions we've had about trying to avoid
4 splitting small cities as well. Of course, not knowing the
5 county as strongly other than the connection between the
6 two major cities, with Sutter and Yuba I would defer to
7 Commissioner Forbes, but I would be interested in trying to
8 reunite Colusa.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, I don't think it's -
10 it's sort of a Tweedledee and Tweedledum kind of thing. I
11 don't think it's a problem to make Colusa whole and put the
12 finger back into Sutter.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: We still have the split of at least
14 one of the counties -

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: One of them is split.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: - anyway. Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: We will be splitting a county
18 regardless. It's just that Colusa is a much, much smaller
19 county.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If the Commission feels
22 better about that, that's fine.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio?

24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: This goes back to my
25 original question of Commissioner Forbes. Is the southern

1 part of Sutter more connected with that ECC District than
2 the southern part of Colusa?

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, it's probably more
4 considered with the WSAC District.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, or whichever it would
6 go. Well -

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, you would commute
8 from Sutter County into Sacramento.

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay, I'm just curious,
10 then. Because I thought when we were saying switching
11 Sutter for Colusa then that southern part of Sutter would
12 go into the - is it ECC, is that the correct label?

13 MS. CLARK: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: As I recall, the issue was
16 the road that they had wrapped it around came down into
17 Woodland rather than down into Sacramento. As I recall, it
18 was like 99/70, they were not on that road. That's the
19 main north-south road into Sacramento.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Which kind of goes back to
21 my original question. I can see some of the southern - I
22 think this is why we made that decision originally, right?
23 Was that the southern part of Sutter probably has more in
24 common with Sacramento City but not necessarily with Yolo,
25 Davis I'm assuming -

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So the question was, was
3 the southern part of Colusa more in common with Davis?

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Because it's a choice of
6 who is going with Davis more than with Sacramento.

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, then that's correct.
8 Now, if the original line had been coming down the 99,
9 which is that road that bisects the southern part of Sutter
10 County, you know, if you come down that road then you could
11 hook that into Sacramento. Because that's their
12 connection. There is not much connection down the other
13 road that goes to Woodland, there's not much traffic down
14 that road.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So even though Colusa is
16 taking a bigger hit proportionate to its population, I
17 think the question comes down to, even though it's split
18 are there more commonalities with Colusa -

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: And Yolo.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: -- and Yolo than with
21 southern Sutter and Yolo?

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think that's why we
24 made that decision originally.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right, and that is the case.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: So that's what we need to
2 articulate, is that we split Colusa not only for population
3 but also because of its commonalities with northern Yolo
4 County.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Is that instruction clear?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And can we state what those
7 commonalities are?

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Sure. They are agriculture
9 of different kinds, rice and almonds.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay?

11 MS. CLARK: Okay.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: So proceed?

13 MS. CLARK: Sure. If we move on to this district,
14 ECC, it's the southern area of Colusa County, all of Yolo
15 County with the exception of West Sacramento, eastern
16 Solano County, Vacaville, and Fairfield is split. And then
17 also this delta area of Sacramento County and it moves into
18 east Contra Costa County, picking up Oakley, it splits
19 Brentwood, it does include Byron and Discovery Bay.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's a good district. Not
21 only is it an agriculture district that combines - keeps
22 Yolo County whole, it's an agriculture district and also
23 the delta is encompassed by that district in part. And
24 that's good.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, we cut out West
2 Sacramento, again, because that identifies with Sacramento.
3 And, of course, Fairfield is split but that's a population
4 issue.

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: How significant is
6 the split down Brentwood?

7 MS. CLARK: One moment.

8 (Pause)

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: And I think the split is along
10 the 4.

11 MS. CLARK: Forty-five percent is in ECC, that is
12 23,000.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Could you trade that out with
14 Fairfield?

15 MS. CLARK: If we traded - the split is similar in
16 population, I believe. If we traded that out with
17 Fairfield then we would have -

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Have to come around.

19 MS. CLARK: - to pick up population by crossing the
20 Carquinez Bridge and splitting Martinez.

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Forget it.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, ignore that potential
23 direction.

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Ignore that comment.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we're good on that district.

1 MS. CLARK: If we look at the MTCAP District,
2 Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Plumas, this 20,000 people
3 in Butte County. Sierra County is whole, Nevada County is
4 whole and this is eastern Placer County. Per CRC
5 direction, Lake Tahoe basin is split.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It has the same virtues as
7 before, we've reunited the Tahoe with respect to counties,
8 Truckee is whole, and it has the same standards that we had
9 for the Congressional district. It's mountainous and
10 remote. We did keep Siskiyou together.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber and
12 then Commissioner DiGuilio.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: And this was also in
14 anticipation that we would link El Dorado and Placer at the
15 Senate level, if I'm not mistaken, to keep Lake Tahoe
16 whole.

17 MS. CLARK: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think also there is
19 an element of the communities that are know as the Mother
20 Lode counties, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: There is a split between El
23 Dorado and Placer in some ways in terms of that Mother Lode
24 distinction. So I think this gives them an opportunity to
25 be whole in the Assembly. And, as Commissioner Filkins-

1 Webber said, they can be reunited in a Senate district.

2 But we have heard some COI testimony, particularly

3 recently, about those Mother Lode counties.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, next.

5 MS. CLARK: If we turn to Sacramento County, this

6 district, WSAC, is west Sacramento. This Oak Park

7 neighborhood of the City of Sacramento and then the census

8 places Antelope, Elverta and Rio Linda.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again, that's the core

10 district of Sacramento. I looked at the streets in there,

11 the streets look right.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any additional comments?

13 (No response.)

14 Okay, next.

15 MS. CLARK: If we look at NSAC, it's this west

16 Placer County area, including Citrus Heights - no, I'm

17 sorry, not including Citrus Heights. Including Orangevale,

18 Folsom, El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park. We heard some

19 COI testimony about keeping this Folsom Lake area intact.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Again, that's an appropriate

21 district.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so -

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, Roseville, Lincoln,

24 up 80, right where the 65 is, Thunder Valley Casino. And,

25 again, the Folsom Lake area is kept together.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I just have one
3 question. And, again, this might just be a micro issue, as
4 to what the significance is of taking the line right into
5 the lake.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Because it also
8 shows, at least on the Statewide Database, that you have
9 Folsom Lake State Recreational Area -

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: - and I suspect
12 there's not much in the way of population. But it may be a
13 clean-up issue with Mr. Forbes later on.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's right. That's just a
15 natural hiking area. So that point could be flattened out.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Again, that's something we can work
17 with.

18 MS. CLARK: Is -

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Is there a direction, actually,
20 specifically?

21 MS. CLARK: Yes, is there direction?

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, can you do that?

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I had the same concern.
24 So I guess the direction would be whether that point that
25 right now appears to go out into the lake, correct,

1 Commissioner Filkins-Webber? You and I are looking at the
2 same thing, I think. And there doesn't seem to be any
3 population there.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No.

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Unless there's a
6 census tract and houseboat there that needs to be in
7 Foothills.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So just the direction would
9 be to try and flatten that point that goes into the lake
10 and bring it in to just capture the population; what is
11 actually the little tip, you know, that goes down through
12 the recreation area and ends right at the tip of the lake
13 without Summit Village.

14 MS. CLARK: Okay. The point could be - okay,
15 following - sorry, this looks crazy, these are the census
16 blocks. Sure. I was just pulling that up to double-check
17 that that wouldn't isolate the City of Auburn. I was just
18 double-checking that the census blocks don't move all the
19 way up here.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

21 MS. CLARK: But certainly I can do that.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we can fix that and then we
23 can move on to the next district.

24 MS. CLARK: This district, ESAC, Citrus Heights,
25 Arden-Arcade, Rancho Cordova, Vineyard, and then this east

1 Sacramento County area, Wilton, Herald and Clay.

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's a Sacramento County
3 area. Citrus Heights, Carmichael and Rancho Cordova are
4 separate little small cities. Arden-Arcade is a suburb.
5 But they are all suburb communities of greater Sacramento.
6 The biggest concern with this one is - and we talked about
7 this before - is that Vineyard is outside of Florin and Elk
8 Grove. But that was a decision that we chose to make in
9 order to keep Lodi and Galt, as I recall, in the district.
10 Because the population would be distorted if you put
11 Vineyard in with Florin, then you would have to get rid of
12 Lodi and/or Galt and there was no good place to put them,
13 as I recall.

14 MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's right. Another option
15 could be to move Vineyard into this district and then move
16 population here in South Sacramento into WSAC and then
17 either move this little area of the census place North
18 Highlands or split the census place of Antelope to move
19 into ESAC.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The only issue would be - and
21 this is an open question - are you encroaching too far into
22 the main part of the city? You see where it says Florin
23 there, that is the - that's not terribly far from where we
24 are now, several miles, but not very far. So if you begin
25 to go north very far you begin to encroach into the city

1 proper.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco then
3 Commissioner Dai.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: For those who know this area
5 how does this SACEG district do in terms of the testimony
6 we heard this morning, keeping Elk Grove and South
7 Sacramento together?

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, with South Sacramento
9 there we got some emails regarding El Dorado Hills, which I
10 didn't think made any sense at all. But we are pretty far
11 into South Sacramento there. You see Florin, which is
12 clearly south Sacramento. So Elk Grove and South
13 Sacramento are connected in this map quite well. The only
14 thing that's outside is (unintelligible as voice trails
15 off).

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: There was a higher
17 level of specificity in one of the emails that we got
18 today, which talked about the areas south of Sutterville
19 Road -

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: - within Sacramento.
22 Is that currently reflected in this visualization, that
23 that part is included down with SACEG?

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don't think it is. And I
25 don't know that I would agree with that characterization.

1 I mean, I grew up basically a block away from Sutterville
2 Road and that's not my perception of that part of the
3 community. I think the community really starts from
4 Florin.

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, what I'm
6 wondering, though, is that we have multiple layers of
7 districts to work with - there might be different ways of
8 characterizing the community - but do we feel confident
9 that in either Congressional or Assembly or Senate, if this
10 is how some members of the community view their community
11 that we've offered that opportunity for them to be joined
12 together in some map? I didn't think it happened at the
13 Congressional level.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, it did not.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So it's not
16 happening at the Assembly level. So I would just encourage
17 that we, you know, look to do it at the Senate level. And
18 it might make a better argument to do it at that very local
19 level if we're talking about communities that are connected
20 at this geographic scale.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio and
22 then Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think we had heard the
24 gentleman, when Commissioner Forbes had asked him kind of
25 what the northern boundary of Elk Grove linked with South

1 Sacramento, I think Florin Road was a safe bet. So right
2 now it is included, Elk Grove with Florin. But I am
3 curious about the comment about maybe we could put Vineyard
4 in. And I'm wondering how far you could bring that line
5 down to Florin so that you would still keep the integrity
6 of the Elk Grove with South Sacramento, as the gentleman
7 had mentioned that would link it, that switch. I don't
8 know if anyone else is interested or Commissioner Forbes, I
9 just am curious in exploring that option as well if -

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean -

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: - we wanted to try and
12 improve -

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- I think it's worth
14 exploring. I just would then have to see how far north we
15 had to go to get the population.

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Because, for example, the
18 South Sacramento area, the brown map, if you go up the 5
19 and you see this bulge out to the left, that's called the
20 pocket area. You know, that's considered to be clearly
21 Sacramento. I mean, they would clearly consider themselves
22 Sacramento, they are not a part of Elk Grove.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So maybe it would work to
24 the benefit to drop that line down and put the pocket with
25 Sacramento?

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If you could. But I'm not
2 sure how you would. I mean, you're adding -

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Then you would - I think
4 Ms. Clark had mentioned there is a shift that would happen
5 in the top of the West Sacramento District.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You could put Vineyard in the
7 light brown, pull the pink south or the salmon colored
8 south, and then take the Elverta-Antelope area and add that
9 into the lavender. You could do that, that would probably
10 be a good move, actually, at least to take a look at. More
11 than take a look at.

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Is that pretty good, Ms.
13 Clark?

14 MS. CLARK: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Does that seem doable?

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Does everyone feel
17 comfortable with that?

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You know, that actually I
19 think would be a good move.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: You had mentioned
21 also, Commissioner Forbes, earlier today when we were at
22 the Congressional level, this Arden-Arcade neighborhood, in
23 discussion of the trade-offs between the two areas, would
24 you think that northern area makes more sense to go into
25 the pink area than does Arden-Arcade?

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Um - hmm.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Actually, are we trying to
3 take out of the pink? I think we're taking from the pink
4 and putting into the purple.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Up in the north.

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So you would be more inclined
8 to try to take the Elverta-Rio Linda, I think, and put it
9 in the Arden.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Got you, versus
11 taking from Sacramento proper?

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right. I'm trying to protect
13 the core area.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: You're trying to replenish.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: We're expanding the core,
16 which is good. But I would not want to take more from it
17 at the same time.

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So I think you are trying
19 to replenish the Vineyard that was in the purple.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Got you.

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Replacing it up north.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I had multiple
24 questions. But I'll just get to this point. As long as in
25 this rotation, Ms. Clark, that Galt and Lodi are not

1 affected down in the brown -

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: -- because I thought
4 we had this discussion last week. But if the population
5 rotation is still okay, that Lodi and Galt are together,
6 then I have no further comment.

7 MS. CLARK: Yes, as long as the population moving
8 from SACEG is going north then this Lodi to Galt area is
9 not touched.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Did you have some other points you
11 wanted to bring up?

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: When we get to the
13 other - Commissioner Forbes had made a comment about El
14 Dorado Hills but I don't think we're at that district yet.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so is the instruction clear?

16 MS. CLARK: I believe that the instruction is to
17 move Vineyard into SACEG, to move population along I-5 in
18 SACEG north into WSAC, and then to move population in the
19 northeast regions of WSAC into ESAC.

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Correct.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. That's perfect. Shall we go
22 on?

23 MS. CLARK: Sure. We had previously discussed
24 this El Dorado Hills, okay. Maybe we could move onto the
25 Foothills District. The City of Auburn from Placer County

1 is included in this visualization, the Mother Lode
2 counties, the Counties of Mono and Madera are intact.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, the northern part of
4 that district is the Foothills District that we wanted to
5 create. It's connected by Highway 49, it has very much the
6 commonality of interest, dealing with forest fires and snow
7 and recreation.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think it's also worth
10 noting when discussing this district part of it is taken in
11 consideration again when you have Merced Section 2
12 Assembly, Fresno, there are two Section 5's and a Section 2
13 in here. So you're trying to work around that and trying
14 to keep the integrity of the COIs of those foothills and
15 the remaining parts of the counties together. So I don't
16 mean to skip ahead, but that's partly why these were linked
17 and why in this case the whole of Madera County - while
18 Madera County is whole here versus the split between the
19 valley and the hills in prior iteration.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And Mono was generously
22 given over by Commissioner Dai and Commissioner Filkins-
23 Webber.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Mono wanted to be with the
25 Foothills.

1 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Mono did, I have to say,
2 yes, actually they did.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: It was not mine to give.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let's continue.

5 MS. CLARK: If we look at this district, STKTN,
6 since last you saw it, Morada and Garden Acres have been
7 returned to this district with the City of Stockton and
8 that swap was for Lathrop, which is now back with Manteca
9 and east Stanislaus County.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Again this was partly a
11 result of the western part of Stanislaus County was linked
12 with Merced to meet the benchmarks for Section 5. And
13 therefore we looked at what would be a good partner with
14 eastern Stanislaus County. And really you had San Joaquin
15 County above. So what we tried to do was to maximize the
16 connections between the south County of San Joaquin with
17 Stanislaus County. As you recall, the one discussion was
18 prior Lathrop was included with the Stockton District and
19 the eastern part of that STNSJ District was brought in
20 closer to metropolitan Stockton.

21 But I felt that the determination was that the
22 areas that they excluded, the Morada and Garden Acres that
23 Ms. Clark mentioned, were more linked with metropolitan
24 area. There is really no distinction between those smaller
25 communities and the City of Stockton. So we made the

1 decision to switch out Lathrop back in with the south
2 counties to maintain the integrity of the greater Stockton
3 area.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, very good. Next.

5 MS. CLARK: So again a lot of this was just
6 described, STNSJ is east Stanislaus County, the City of
7 Modesto is split, it does include the City of Turlock,
8 which is whole, Manteca and Lathrop and Escalon from San
9 Joaquin County and it moves all the way up in eastern San
10 Joaquin County to the Sacramento County border.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio, do you have
12 something?

13 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, I think it's the same
14 situation again, trying to partner the eastern part of
15 Stanislaus County without having city splits in San Joaquin
16 County. The only thing, you know, if I could I would like
17 to bring that northern boundary, including Lockeford and
18 even down into Linden, with Stockton. But I think the
19 result would be you would have to split the City of Tracy.
20 So I think at this point I felt more comfortable with some
21 of these smaller communities being able to be linked
22 together on the eastern part of both of these counties and
23 to not split the City of Tracy.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Blanco, did you
25 have a point?

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I wanted a little description
2 of where and how and, you know, what was our thinking on
3 where we split Modesto.

4 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: That was for Section 5
5 benchmark, I believe.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I know the reason. Where in
7 the city?

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, I'm sorry.

9 MS. CLARK: Would you like me to put the streets
10 layer on?

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm looking at them, I don't
12 know - it was more an explanation of the thinking behind
13 which streets were used as the dividers between the two
14 districts.

15 MS. CLARK: I've had no direction from the
16 Commission on where to split the City of Modesto, except in
17 trying to boost the VAP numbers for Black and Asian
18 populations.

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And this was one, as you
20 recall, we have gotten a lot of feedback that we did split
21 the county well in terms of Ceres and the western part of
22 Modesto being with western Stanislaus County. And I think,
23 again, Ms. Clark had - it's split this way just to try and
24 reach our benchmark in balancing it with the least amount
25 of dissecting of the City of Modesto.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Do any of us - I'm only
2 slightly familiar with the City of Modesto. I would like
3 to - in other places where we've done city splits we've had
4 people that know the area look at it to say, Well, yeah,
5 this is a natural division in this city, or it's not. You
6 know, we've had some thinking, we haven't just, you know,
7 done it without some thought. So I think I would like to -
8 maybe we can do this next week because we will try and keep
9 the population the way we have to for Section 5. But maybe
10 we could do something to have - do some research or
11 something that gives us some basis for where to divide the
12 city.

13 The reason I feel strongly about that is, I know
14 there are a lot of issues in the City of Modesto, it's a
15 city that has a lot of unincorporated areas within the
16 city, they are like little - you know, people refer to the
17 City of Modesto as being like a Swiss cheese. And so
18 within the city you have places that aren't in the city and
19 then you have, as in other cities, sort of east-west, sort
20 of wealthy-less wealthy. So there are a lot of tricky
21 issues in the City of Modesto. There is litigation because
22 of this in the City of Modesto. I know there is a
23 discrimination lawsuit in that city about some of the
24 divisions. So I would like for us to be mindful of that if
25 we could do something before the next iteration.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yes, and this is the kind of sort
2 of street level checking into - and, you know, an
3 invitation to public comment as well that's appropriate for
4 the next round. Because, again, the basic configuration
5 we're feeling comfortable with but an appropriate street or
6 shift might be worth looking into.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And maybe if Ms. Clark in
8 preparation for next week can tell us how much wiggle room
9 we have even to work with.

10 MS. CLARK: As far as population or all of the VAP
11 groups, or -

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm assuming that the split
13 in the greater Modesto - I see that the downtown Modesto
14 and up McHenry is all intact. But I'm just wondering based
15 on your experience if there are areas for us to consider
16 moving that around and you would still be able to reach
17 your benchmark, where that would most likely take place.

18 MS. CLARK: I think that there is room to meet the
19 Latino VAP benchmark and move the lines around a bit. The
20 visualization of right now is based on direction trying to
21 boost the Black VAP and Asian VAP numbers. So if those
22 don't need to be regarded as much as the Latino VAP
23 benchmark, then there is room.

24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So you're saying part of
25 the split is because of trying to - even though we

1 retrogressed in API VAP that we would retrogress more - it
2 would be more damaging to the Black VAP and the Asian VAP?

3 MS. CLARK: Yes. Previously the split in the city
4 was closer to following the 99 and also the 132. It was
5 just - right, it was more straight lines, I guess, than
6 right now. And then I received direction from the
7 Commission to boost the Black VAP and Asian VAP numbers and
8 that is how the split came to be as it is now.

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So maybe we need to talk to
10 Mr. Brown about - because I know there has been some - you
11 are concerned about the reduction of that VAP in those
12 other areas besides the LVAP so maybe that could be
13 something we could flag for tomorrow's question.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Just to see. Okay, thank
16 you.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let's move on.

18 MS. CLARK: Next is the Merced Section 5 Assembly
19 District. It's the entire County of Merced and west
20 Stanislaus County, again Modesto is split.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any further narrative beyond the
22 Section 5 considerations?

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think we've had this
24 discussion kind of early on and I think people probably
25 understand and feel good about - well, as good as it's

1 going to be for - yeah.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

3 MS. CLARK: If we look at this district, FSEC2,
4 this district is the western County of Fresno, the south
5 Fresno COI is intact and then it extends past the 99 to
6 pick up some cities here.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Anything else to add. There are
8 VRA issues here.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I think it would be
10 appropriate to note it's between two Section 5 counties as
11 well.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Aguirre?

13 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Does that include Sanger?

14 MS. CLARK: Yes.

15 Next, if we look at this district, FRSNO, it's
16 eastern Fresno County and the remainder of the City of
17 Fresno, and for population moves into northern Tulare
18 County. I should say for population and also so that Inyo
19 can fit with TLRE, which we will get to in a second.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Again I think this was a
21 result of being next to the Section 2 districts and
22 basically we had the Foothills in the northern part. So it
23 was a way to try and keep the City of Fresno and the county
24 as closely linked as it could and for population went up
25 into Tulare.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Are we ready to continue?

2 MS. CLARK: Sure. This is the Kings County
3 Assembly District. It's a Section 5 district, the entire
4 county of Kings, northwestern Kern County and then the City
5 of Bakersfield is split. This visualization includes the
6 farming communities in Bakersfield and outside of
7 Bakersfield.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Again, a fairly stable district
9 drawn to meet benchmark for Section 5. Next.

10 MS. CLARK: This district, TLRE, is most of the
11 County of Tulare, all of Inyo County and then some areas in
12 north Kern County.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Now, this is very close to
14 deviation, right? You're right at, close to one percent?

15 MS. CLARK: Yes, to fit Inyo County this district
16 south of it is closer to zero percent and this line could
17 be moved north to sort of even those out, make them both
18 closer to 0.5 percent.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And on that eastern
20 side of the purple district, that's where we have the China
21 Lake, Ridgecrest, that whole eastern portion, is that
22 correct?

23 MS. CLARK: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Don't touch it.

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So if we do move that line

1 up that you were just suggesting, would it better link
2 Ridgecrest on its way down into Bakersfield, then?

3 MS. CLARK: I believe that COI testimony said that
4 this line - or, I'm sorry, this highway, the 14, is more of
5 the transportation corridor.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: We had talked a little bit about
8 picking up some of the other communities there perhaps to
9 make the one down, the purple district, a little more
10 compact. How would that affect - I think they are
11 relatively small communities there.

12 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So closer to the Tulare-
13 Kern -

14 MS. CLARK: Do you mean the Lake Isabella area?

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: As I recall, we did
17 talk about that last week with Onyx and Lake Isabella.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: So would that - is that too many
19 people?

20 MS. CLARK: I believe that all of this area would
21 be too many people. But, yeah, I could look into just
22 taking some of them and moving it into here.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, that would equalize the
24 deviation.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so that's the direction, just

1 to try to equalize the deviations between the two
2 districts. Okay.

3 MS. CLARK: Next is this district, BKRFD. It does
4 have Ridgecrest and China Lake, the majority of the City of
5 Bakersfield, Tehachapi, it follows the Tehachapi Mountain
6 Range and then picks up Taft and these areas near the San
7 Luis Obispo County border.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think, again, only
9 for population that southeastern part of Kern County was -
10 I think, I'm trying to remember right, if it was linked up
11 with the high desert.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: High Desert District, yeah.

13 MS. CLARK: That's right.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

15 MS. CLARK: If we look at SLOSB, the only change in
16 this district - this is the entire San Luis Obispo County
17 and then Santa Maria down through Vandenberg Air Force Base
18 and the City of Lompoc. The line has changed here in Los
19 Padres National Forest, this is just how the blocks look,
20 this is attached to a much larger block. And the attempt
21 here was to pick up the Santa Barbara-identified area of
22 Los Padres National Forest.

23 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And there was an issue with
24 the Lompoc split also?

25 MS. CLARK: Lompoc is now whole.

1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah.

2 MS. CLARK: I believe that there are some non-
3 contiguous zero population blocks here.

4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, thanks.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think they were happy
6 with being whole.

7 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Very happy.

8 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Do we have any further narrative on
10 this?

11 (No response.)

12 Okay, next.

13 MS. CLARK: If we move onto this district, SBWVE,
14 it is the majority of Santa Barbara County, it includes
15 Buellton and Santa Ynez and then Carpinteria, Goleta, the
16 City of Santa Barbara and includes the Santa Barbara and
17 Ventura County Islands. In Ventura County the Piru to
18 Santa Paula corridor is intact and it also includes the
19 City of Ventura and the City of Moorpark, the Santa Rosa
20 Valley is included. Oxnard and Port Hueneme are not
21 included in this visualization.

22 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And even though there was
23 some COI testimony and concern about the Santa Clara Valley
24 being with the Oxnard plain, still in looking at how the
25 population, you know, rolls down it just - I think this is

1 the best that we can do.

2 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think this also prevented
3 earlier - in the earlier visualizations both Thousand Oaks
4 and Oxnard -

5 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Were split.

6 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: - were split. And so this
7 option prevented both of those from being split, even
8 though it did again link maybe Moorpark and eastern Ventura
9 County with Ventura. It was an effort to minimize the
10 splits that were happening between Oxnard and Thousand
11 Oaks, and Oxnard away from Port Hueneme.

12 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: There is also a strong
13 connection, a strong agricultural base between the Santa
14 Clara Valley area. Some of the - on the outskirts of the
15 City of Ventura, along the Santa Clara River and then Santa
16 Maria certainly is a very strong agricultural area. So
17 there is a relationship there.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Very good. Let's move to
19 the next district.

20 MS. CLARK: The last one for me is this EVENT
21 District. The City of Oxnard and Port Hueneme, El Rio,
22 Camarillo, Casa Conejo, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village and
23 Oak Park are included in this visualization. There are no
24 city splits.

25 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And the previous iterations

1 split Oxnard and Thousand Oaks and I think this corrects
2 those splits. Also Simi Valley, there was concern with
3 either 2000 or 7000 people that were, you know, split out
4 from the city and this also keeps Simi Valley whole.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber, do you
6 want to add?

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I just have a
8 question and just again to reinforce what the basis has
9 been for our decision as I've been swapping on the
10 Statewide Database between a number of districts, even
11 though I know we don't have the rest of Los Angeles on
12 here. But, if I'm not mistaken, most of the iterations
13 that we have and most of the districts we've looked at have
14 split this eastern Ventura County. In particular, Simi
15 Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, which we have received
16 quite a bit of community of interest testimony as well as
17 their link to the Santa Clarita Valley. And so I just want
18 to recognize, unless there was some option either at a
19 Senate level - but it looks like in the Congressional we
20 weren't able to do that, either, except to put Simi Valley
21 with Santa Clarita. At any of our levels do we have a
22 respect for that community of interest or was there just
23 too much in the way of population between Simi Valley,
24 Moorpark and Thousand Oaks?

25 MS. CLARK: That's right. There are no

1 visualizations in which Simi Valley, Moorpark and Thousand
2 Oaks are together and with the rest of Ventura County.
3 There are hard lines for Assembly and Congressional between
4 Monterey County and San Luis Obispo County as Monterey
5 County is a Section 5 county, and also hard lines between
6 San Luis Obispo and Ventura and Kern Counties. So the
7 population has to move south, this way along these coastal
8 counties. And basically the balancing act is trying to, of
9 course, keep all of these COIs intact but also when that is
10 not possible because of population restrictions to keep the
11 cities intact as much as possible.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio and
13 then Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I think to answer
15 Commissioner Filkins-Webber's question, I believe in the
16 Congressional all the county is together with the exception
17 of Simi Valley. And then in the Senate I believe the
18 eastern Ventura County is together; Thousand Oaks, Simi
19 Valley and Moorpark, it was that question that we've had as
20 to where to pair them. Prior we had paired them with
21 Malibu and I think, you know, one of the things we had
22 looked at was trying to pair that eastern Ventura County
23 with Santa Clarita. So I'm sure we will be able to see the
24 outcome of that tomorrow.

25 So I think there is different points when they are

1 together in different ways. And, again, I think the one
2 where the eastern Ventura County, Moorpark, Simi Valley,
3 Thousand Oaks were trying to be paired together more in the
4 Assembly and it required a split both of Thousand Oaks and
5 Oxnard and maybe even a little bit of Simi. There was a
6 lot of splitting going on. So I think this is a way to
7 minimize the cities.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, even though we kept
10 Moorpark whole, all the cities that Moorpark is connected
11 to, Simi Valley to the east, Thousand Oaks to the south
12 and, going around the lengthy way, Oxnard to the west are
13 all in different districts. So Moorpark is really not
14 connected to anybody. Going north you have to go through a
15 country road before you can get up to Fillmore. So it
16 really is just totally isolated. If there is anything we
17 can do about that, put them in one or the other county
18 probably, would be a lot better than leaving it the way it
19 is.

20 MS. CLARK: The alternative to this would be to
21 split Oxnard, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks or Simi Valley.

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: So not splitting a city versus
23 keeping Moorpark isolated, those are the trade-offs that we
24 have to do?

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: We are also keeping it
2 whole, too.

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Well, that's what I'm saying.
4 Keeping it whole is the only reason we are keeping Moorpark
5 where it is. And where it is right now, they are just
6 totally isolated, period. There is nobody that they can
7 reach within their own district.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Forbes?

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, I'm not advocating this,
10 but, Commissioner Yao, would you consider it better to have
11 Moorpark connected down those highways - those red lines, I
12 guess, are freeways - down to Thousand Oaks and split
13 Oxnard? I mean, Oxnard is a city of 200,000 people. And
14 when we have had cities of that size they have been
15 difficult to keep together. So that's just a possible
16 trade-off.

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, in my opinion that
18 probably would be a better choice than it is to leave a
19 city of 34,000 just completely isolated from everybody.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba then
21 Commissioner DiGuilio.

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I'm not sure I understand
23 what isolated means in this case. That's where the city
24 is, it's been there forever, and as far as the
25 representation that's up to the elected official to get to

1 them. I don't quite understand what you mean by isolated.

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Well, in terms of community of
3 interest it's difficult for me to see that Moorpark has
4 community of interest outside of the neighborhood cities
5 that they are connected to. So if you can argue that
6 Moorpark is connected better with the rest of the district
7 as compared to connecting with the three cities I
8 mentioned, then so be it. Otherwise, I think we kind of
9 turn them off by basically isolating them from everybody.

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: We might ask Commissioner
11 Aguirre what his impression would be.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Why don't you go ahead and address
13 that.

14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I would say that Moorpark is
15 kept whole and it's kept together at least in the
16 Congressional district that we've seen previously as part
17 of the east Ventura County grouping of cities. And then on
18 the Congressional level it's part of the Ventura County
19 area as a whole together with Thousand Oaks. So it might
20 look isolated at this level but certainly on the other two
21 levels it's not only made whole but it's directly linked
22 with Ventura County.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio and
24 then Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I was just going to add,

1 too, that the 118 there, I've taken that between the Santa
2 Paula-Ventura border up through Moorpark quite a lot. It's
3 a bit of a dangerous route when you get to the western part
4 because there are a lot of commuters going very fast on a
5 two-lane road. But there are a number of people that
6 commute the back way from Ventura to Moorpark and Simi
7 Valley to avoid the 101/405 interchange.

8 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, they do.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber, did
10 you want to add something?

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Just based on my
12 familiarity with the area as well, I concur with
13 Commissioner Yao. And I am a little concerned about it.
14 It may also be reflective of what we've heard in the
15 discussion about a fair and effective representation for
16 that community in comparison to the rest of the community.
17 But I'm not certain if Ms. Clark has looked at any options.
18 Again, this is an area that we've heard a lot about and an
19 area that we've probably worked on just as much as looking
20 at the Tri-Cities area.

21 So have you considered the possibility of either
22 putting Moorpark with Simi or Thousand Oaks? And if it
23 does result in a split is it in Oxnard? Which, again, I
24 think looking at a city that's nearly 200,000, we've
25 considered that in other counties, cities that large, such

1 again as Riverside, for instance, or Irvine for that
2 matter, have been split in order to respect smaller cities
3 such as Moorpark. So what have you looked at as far as
4 options in that regard?

5 MS. CLARK: Previous visualization that we have
6 shown have Moorpark with Simi Valley. If looking from this
7 visualization, though, and moving from this visualization
8 then depending on whether the Commission wanted Moorpark to
9 be with Thousand Oaks or Simi Valley, then Oxnard either
10 way could be split. If it was moved with Simi Valley, then
11 Thousand Oaks could be split. If it was moved with
12 Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley could be split or Camarillo
13 could be split.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Dai?

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm just going to say that, you
16 know, I think it's more fair to all cities if they are not
17 split. I mean, Moorpark is part of Ventura County. So, I
18 mean, if we have to choose between splitting another city,
19 you know, I think that's great for Moorpark, it's not great
20 for the other city.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy?

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Is there a specific
23 alternative that Commissioner Yao or Commissioner Filkins-
24 Webber would be interested in?

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Well, this was what I

1 would be thinking. Excuse me and correct me if I'm wrong.
2 And, again, I get confused in this population flow,
3 clockwise and counter-clockwise, so tell me if I'm wrong
4 here. But if Moorpark goes down the Thousand Oaks and is
5 together with Thousand Oaks then where - and you do it in a
6 counter-clockwise direction, what does that affect?

7 MS. CLARK: That just depends on which city you
8 would want to split. If you want it to be - if Moorpark is
9 going with Thousand Oaks and you just want the trade to be
10 between these two districts, then, again, Moorpark with
11 Thousand Oaks, Camarillo would be split taking
12 approximately 40,000 people or so into this district.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Well, then could you
14 take 40,000 people from Oxnard?

15 MS. CLARK: Right, or Oxnard. If you wanted to do
16 a three-way rotation then that's possible, too.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: That's where the
18 split of Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks would be if you do a
19 three-way in that corner. Which then would -

20 MS. CLARK: It would just be Simi Valley. But,
21 yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay. So I guess the
23 proposal would be is if Moorpark was with Thousand Oaks in
24 EVENT then the split would be at Oxnard, which is a city
25 that's 200,000. And what the potential ramifications would

1 be in that regard, again, recognizing that larger cities
2 potentially could be split.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Can I just confirm,
4 we did split Ventura, is that correct?

5 MS. CLARK: No.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: No? Ventura is
7 whole on this visualization?

8 MS. CLARK: Yes.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: That's right.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: We had COI testimony about
12 particular neighborhoods in Oxnard. So I would want to
13 hear from Commissioner Aguirre about where there might be a
14 reasonable split, if any, in Oxnard.

15 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, it's a hard call
16 because Oxnard historically has been split three ways with
17 districts not only coming from the north but from the
18 south. So the testimony that I recall was that they have
19 not been adequately represented for, you know, any decade
20 and that indeed they are looking forward to being whole for
21 the first time ever in Assembly districts. As far as where
22 a likely split would be, when you look at Oxnard, even
23 though it's 200,000, you know, it's a low income area along
24 with Port Hueneme, which is one of the poorest
25 neighborhoods on the west side. On the east side is

1 primarily agriculture and that's where the more heavily low
2 income area, south and east side of Oxnard. It's really up
3 above this - you know, it's really up above Gonzales
4 Avenue.

5 So perhaps, you know, maybe Gonzales Avenue, west
6 and north of - west of Oxnard Boulevard and north of
7 Gonzales Avenue would probably be about the only place that
8 would not disenfranchise the low income community in
9 Oxnard.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Can I get a sense of how much
11 support there is for this proposal to sort of connect
12 Moorpark with the surrounding cities, versus the current
13 visualization? I'm not sure I'm getting a sense of numbers
14 here.

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would leave it as it is.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I would also. I mean, you
18 have two cities that are complete, why would you split one
19 just to move one from one district to another?

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think we can recognize
21 that maybe that is not ideal for in some ways Moorpark but
22 I just think the trade-offs for splitting Oxnard or
23 Camarillo, we have whole cities and I don't think there's a
24 reason to do that, to do harm.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: It's a toss-up for me also. But

1 I do feel we need to discuss it as compared to just -

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I'm getting a straw poll that
3 is basically supporting the current configuration.

4 Commissioner Blanco?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I have to say that I am a
6 little concerned that this nucleus of these three aren't
7 together. Are they together in the Senate?

8 MS. CLARK: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay. Well, that's - because
11 I am concerned that we haven't been able to keep them
12 together, but if they are together in the Senate I guess
13 it's better than to split cities.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, but worst of all is they
15 are in three separate districts.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I agree. I'm not - I think
17 it's a little difficult. I am not happy with it.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I think I have at least nine
19 people want to go with the current configuration.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Commissioner Aguirre, can I
21 just ask the question one other way?

22 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: You know, we've said to put
24 in Moorpark to split Oxnard. But there is also an issue on
25 the table, we could put Moorpark in and split Camarillo.

1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: That's another possibility.

2 It's -

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: I'm also getting a lot of shaking
4 heads on that one. I can see all of you.

5 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Camarillo along the 101 is -
6 even though they are connected along the 101 freeway, they
7 are surrounded by agriculture actually. So in that sense
8 it's a hard call to split up a city that's like that.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, based on the number of heads
10 shaking, we're going to move on.

11 MS. ALON: Okay, driver change. For Assembly I
12 received direction only to change parts of San Francisco in
13 my region and so I will put these up for a description but
14 I have nothing further to add.

15 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, again, just for purposes of
16 documentation we can do sort of a quick run-through so
17 we're making sure that we are all on the same page.

18 MS. ALON: Okay, this is the Monterey District,
19 which takes in most of Monterey County and San Benito
20 County is whole and then comes up into southern Santa Clara
21 County and the very corner of Santa Cruz County, including
22 Watsonville. This was taken in order to get up to the LVAP
23 population needed because it's a Section 5 district.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba,
25 anything to add?

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Given the conditions, I
2 think it's a good approach.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It relates into the next
5 district right over.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

7 MS. ALON: This is the West Monterey District,
8 which also has to meet a Section 5 benchmark. And so it
9 has taken the coastline here of Monterey County and then
10 the vast majority of Santa Cruz County, including the whole
11 coastline and the whole Monterey Bay, which is not split,
12 and then comes up into Santa Clara County into just a few
13 communities here in San Jose. And I also should mention
14 that in the Monterey District we have the Morgan Hill-
15 Gilroy-San Martin area all together in one district.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: And that's been supported by
17 community of interest testimony, right?

18 MS. ALON: Yes.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Capitola is indeed the center of
21 the universe, isn't it?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It has always been.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: More so now.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: We'll see if that makes it to the
25 final draft, of course. Every place is the center of the

1 universe, it depends on your perspective. Okay, any
2 additional comments?

3 (No response.)

4 Okay, let's keep going.

5 MS. ALON: SILIV, Silicon Valley District, has
6 Santa Clara, Cupertino, Campbell, Saratoga, Los Gatos and
7 Lexington Hills, it comes down to the count border here,
8 was not able to preserve the Golden Triangle here but does
9 preserve other neighborhoods in San Jose in the neighboring
10 districts.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, I think this is fairly
12 consistent with some of the Congressional lines, smaller
13 district, of course. You know, I think ideally trying to
14 link Sunnyvale and Santa Clara in the Triangle would be
15 great but we are shorter on population here. Okay.

16 MS. ALON: This is the South San Mateo District so
17 it comes down to the county line for San Mateo, takes
18 Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Atherton,
19 Stanford, Woodside, Los Altos, Loyola, up along the freeway
20 and then comes up and keeps most of the coastline together
21 in the western part of San Mateo County and takes Half Moon
22 Bay and El Granada.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Anything to add from the team?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: It looks like the Stanford COI
25 area is together and Sunnyvale is at least with its sister

1 city, Mountain View.

2 MS. ALON: And Menlo Park is not split in this
3 district.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Nice.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Continue.

6 MS. ALON: This is North San Mateo County. Montara
7 and Pacifica and going from Brisbane down the freeway to
8 Emerald Hills, San Carlos and Redwood City. There is a
9 city split in South San Francisco, which was done for
10 population reasons when you are coming from San Francisco.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: It keeps all the rest of the
12 peninsula together, looks good.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

14 MS. ALON: This is the West San Francisco District
15 and it takes the Farallon Islands, which is where my little
16 label must have gone, there you go. And it comes down to
17 Daly City and a little part of South San Francisco.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Would you mind
19 zooming in on San Francisco a bit more so we can remind
20 ourselves of the division?

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So this keeps most of the API
22 COI together between Daly City and South San Francisco and
23 Crocker Amazon area. We did move - last time we moved
24 Excelsior and Vis Valley over to be with Bayview in the
25 East San Francisco District and made some adjustments,

1 moving the Marina and Pacific Heights over and part of the
2 Western Addition over into the Western District. It also
3 respects the EQCA lines.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I remembered we had
5 had some split neighborhoods on the northern side of San
6 Francisco. With making those adjustments on the north and
7 south side are those neighborhoods now whole?

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, except for Western
9 Addition, which is a very large diverse neighborhood.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: We didn't need to move Russian
11 Hill over to the west side? I thought that was one of our
12 thoughts earlier.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, we didn't need to.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: And, again, this is a bit of a
16 compromise line. But I think it's pretty good.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And, again, so the LGBT
18 community of interest and then various Asian-American
19 interests on the east side.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just a question. Is there any
21 benefit in terms of where to put the Golden Gate Bridge, or
22 do you include it with San Francisco or include it with
23 Marin?

24 MS. ALON: Benefit to who?

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Benefit to who?

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Either party. I'm just asking
2 the question. I don't know whether there is any reason to
3 put it with one versus the other. Obviously, there are no
4 people on it.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: There is a contiguity issue so
6 we're putting it with the side it's contiguous to.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, let's check into that. But,
8 obviously, there is a regional authority that governs the
9 bridge. But how it's affected by state policy, I'm not
10 sure. That's something we can look into.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: In other words, we have the
12 Assembly, we have the Senate, maybe we can put one with one
13 and one with the other, if there is any advantage
14 associated with it. I don't - it's just a question -

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: I mean, it's with the Presidio,
16 which -

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: - I have no idea.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: - kind of makes sense to me.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think on the San
20 Francisco side there is only one neighborhood that it
21 actually connects to immediately once you cross over. So I
22 don't think, at least in that district, in that
23 neighborhood, we have a choice.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: And there may be a formal - I think
25 this is actually the formal county boundary that is being

1 used here, is that correct? Which I think may split the
2 bridge, I'm not sure.

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, if it's a county line then
4 that makes a perfect answer.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: We can check into that.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: The county line ends at San
8 Francisco without going into Marin.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: But the bridge itself is all within
10 San Francisco?

11 MS. ALON: This line here is the county line.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Continue.

13 MS. ALON: This WCC District takes from Hercules
14 down south through Pinole and Tara Hills, San Pablo, El
15 Sobrante, Richmond is whole, Albany and Berkeley, and then
16 comes and takes part of Oakland, Emeryville and Piedmont
17 are a part of this visualization, and the green line is the
18 EQCA line and so this split was derived to keep as much as
19 that community together as possible.

20 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: With the split in Oakland,
21 was this something, Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, you
22 worked on in terms of where to do the split? I think this
23 was a discussion we had.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Do you want to walk
25 us through where the split is? You don't have to do street

1 level but in terms of neighborhoods. We had discussions
2 about, you know, Rockridge, Piedmont, et cetera.

3 MS. ALON: This the Emeryville line and this is the
4 Piedmont line and then Rockridge is here. And so really
5 what we had been discussing when we saw this iteration
6 previously was kind of this line and this line and where
7 that should go. And so I was given direction to follow the
8 EQCA lines, so I just really kind of pushed that out and
9 then kept with the Piedmont line and the Emeryville
10 boundaries.

11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: We have had some COI
12 linking north and in other maps we've been able to do some
13 of that. But for this, this is a largely Oakland-based
14 district. I'm sorry, I'm looking at the south end, is the
15 more Oakland-based, but Oakland has an odd shape on the
16 north end so we did not include all of Oakland.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question: The dark line on the
19 left-hand lower corner looks like a small chunk of land on
20 the Alameda Island there. Does that belong to San
21 Francisco?

22 MS. ALON: That is a really good question. I don't
23 know, that is part of the county line but -

24 (Inaudible discussion off microphone.)

25 So this is the county line. Why it's drawn that

1 way, I don't know.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: But the intent was
3 that we would have the core -

4 MS. ALON: It's a tiger (ph) line error.

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Okay. That we would
6 have the port and the airport, all of the island of Alameda
7 would be included with this district.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: And to clarify, Treasure Island
9 was included with the East San Francisco District.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Let's continue.

12 MS. ALON: PTANT, I think it was Pittsburg-Antioch
13 when we made it, Rodeo and Port Costa, some very sparsely
14 populated areas of Contra Costa County over here, taking
15 Martinez, Pleasant Hill and Pacheco and then following the
16 680 corridor through Bay Point, Pittsburg and Antioch. So
17 Pittsburg and Antioch are together and whole in this
18 visualization and Brentwood is split. We also have Concord
19 and the remnant of the sparsely populated areas over here
20 to the county line.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think this is a
22 much cleaner iteration for that 4 corridor that we
23 struggled with earlier in the day.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco?

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I would only mention that

1 this is the second time we split Brentwood. I think we
2 split it in the Congressional and now we've split it again.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Did we?

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Is that right?

5 MS. ALON: I believe Antioch is split and you're
6 just probably thinking of, Jamie went over this already and
7 talked about the split in Brentwood.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, it's not split in the
9 Congressional.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's the same split as before.

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: All right, thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's the other half of the
13 split.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio?

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm just curious, just for
16 the sake of kind of continuing that discussion, if there's
17 a way to - I know it would be kind of a - probably a three-
18 way split, but to put together the Antioch-Oakley-Brentwood
19 area, all that western part of Contra Costa. I know it
20 would have to push back up. I know we were trying to keep
21 some of the delta together but I didn't know if there was
22 any interest in trying to rotate that around or if it's
23 just fine the way it is.

24 MS. ALON: The options for that would be to cross
25 the bridge here and take Benicia and split Vallejo or to

1 come in and take Pinole and Hercules and possibly some
2 parts of Richmond off on this side.

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, I assumed you would
4 have to pop down, the yellow would have to pop down, right,
5 into the brown, is that right?

6 MS. ALON: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I know there's a split,
8 I think it is in Fairfield? I thought maybe that might -
9 or around Fairfield. But maybe it's not worth exploring.
10 I just -

11 MS. CLARK: I think that this is the same
12 population swap that we had discussed when we were first
13 looking at these districts. If we moved Brentwood into
14 this ECC District and tried to make Fairfield whole then we
15 would have to -

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Cross the bridge.

17 MS. CLARK: - cross the Carquinez Bridge.

18 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Dai?

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just did want to mention that
21 there was some testimony from Vallejo, kind of not sitting
22 well in the Napa District. It's a lot of population and
23 you have to go through, you know, either - well, I guess we
24 can go across the Carquinez there. So that was just a
25 thought. Any other people have some thoughts on that?

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's not a thought. When we
3 move on to the next AD down below I have questions about
4 that one, the shape and the, you know, length. So I don't
5 know if when we look at that one whether we should look at
6 that in combination with these concerns that we're raising
7 about both Vallejo and Brentwood. Because I am going to
8 raise some questions about the one that goes from Berkeley
9 and LaMorinda all the way down to the bottom tip of Alameda
10 County with Santa Clara. I want to understand that
11 district a bit more. So I don't know if that's going to
12 play into these other things.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Filkins-Webber?

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I concur. Because I
15 thought, as I understood it, the Antioch-Discovery Bay-
16 Brentwood, we've split them off from Contra Costa, I think,
17 at all levels except for maybe the Senate. So we've split
18 them off in the Congressional, which we discussed this
19 morning, and not we're splitting that community of interest
20 at this point and putting what I believe - and correct me
21 if I'm wrong, because I'm not totally familiar with this
22 area - an urban area which would then be going all the way
23 north all the way up, I guess, the I-5 for this very long
24 Assembly District with just population grab at the bottom.

25 So I'm wondering if there might be some rotation of

1 population that could accommodate this other Assembly area
2 to the south, whose name I can't see, which would be the
3 LaMorinda, you know, north portion. So there might be an
4 ability to work these areas and respect the COIs and
5 respect them with their particular counties.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Maybe we should just proceed and
7 look at the adjacent districts, then. So can you keep
8 going south?

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco,
10 was your concern with the western side with the Berkeley-
11 Richmond district or is it the Contra Costa or Alameda
12 side?

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm trying to figure out what
14 the sort of community of interest is that goes all the way
15 from Orinda down to the Santa Clara County line at the
16 southeast corner of Alameda. It just seems like - I mean,
17 we could always say population but it, you know, just seems
18 a very weird-shaped district and I'm not sure what we're
19 working with to put all this together. It sort of harkens
20 back to the Congressional discussion.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But I'm just looking at this
23 as a region and are these the best configurations for this
24 if you think of this as a region?

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Are you talking about the East

1 Alameda District?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm talking about - yes.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: So that one has the LaMorinda
4 area together with San Ramon Valley, Tri-Valley area, which
5 we got a lot of testimony about.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And what makes it long is
7 the very sparsely populated area.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And I think multiple
9 commissioners have brought up this awkward shape on that
10 side of the county. And the suggestion has been made, I
11 mean, we could cut it lots of different ways because there
12 is really not that many people in the bulk of the area that
13 is the issue in terms of the visual. But the fact is in
14 this visualization it's kept with its home county, even
15 though it's not the prettiest shape. It's kind of - I
16 think one of the considerations that we took in where to
17 place it, too, was, you know, we have the Tri-Valley area
18 and that 580 corridor which we know is a really heavily
19 corridor so, you know, that's really an extension of that
20 same area.

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If you could hit the hybrid
22 version I think we get an idea why it's as long as it is.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Another possibility
24 is you could cut it - you know, if you look at where it
25 says 84. I mean, I don't know how it works in terms of

1 where people actually live. But, you know, essentially cut
2 that bottom tail partially. And I don't know if - it's not
3 going to be pretty no matter how we carve it up.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's okay. I had forgotten -
5 and I'm looking now - that that's where Del Valle is, you
6 know, Del Valle Lake. So that's fine.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I guess the question was, if
8 we go back north again, I did want to take a look at the
9 WCC District and the Solano-based district above it and the
10 Pittsburg-Antioch District and see if there was some
11 interest in maybe linking Vallejo, separating it out from
12 the Solano District and maybe linking it down to the
13 communities below. So I would welcome any thoughts on
14 that.

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry, where would
16 Vallejo - where are you trying to link them up with again?
17 I'm sorry.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, that's my question here.

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Because there were some protests
21 from Vallejo about being linked with Napa and not being
22 well represented there.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Would you push them
24 towards the Contra Costa - wait, what's that district?

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: I was thinking the WCC District,

1 right?

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: The WCC.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that would be a better
4 connection.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: And you're talking about the full
6 city of Vallejo?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, it's a very large city but
8 then if we were seriously considering moving Brentwood and
9 Antioch into the Solano District then there would
10 potentially be some opportunity to do some kind of
11 rotation. So maybe I'm looking at it in the wrong
12 direction.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: So a counter-clockwise rotation?

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah. I mean, I would welcome
15 other people's thoughts on this. Vallejo is a very
16 industrial area. There are a lot of low income areas
17 within Vallejo and we've gotten a fair amount of public
18 comment about not putting it with Napa. And we've put them
19 with Napa in a number of different configurations now.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: All three maps.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio and then
23 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy.

24 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And I don't know the more
25 natural link, if it would be Vallejo with WCC or with

1 PTANT. But I'm thinking that the easier switch may be,
2 like, Vallejo-Benicia over into PTANT. And, again, I don't
3 know if that matches up but then if you do that then what
4 you would do is actually pull probably Antioch and may be
5 part of Pittsburg into - actually you would have to pull
6 that into the Solano, right?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. But then at least, you
8 know, if you would pull the rest of Brentwood in and
9 Antioch then that COI would be whole.

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct, that's my - yeah,
11 so that is - so you're kind of splitting up the eastern
12 Contra Costa but you're keeping those groups together a
13 little more in order to bring down Vallejo and Benicia into
14 that area.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct.

16 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: And then you would probably
17 move over maybe with Fairfield.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let me interrupt the discussion for
19 a moment because we are approaching six o'clock. And I
20 want to check in with Q2 as well.

21 MS. MACDONALD: Well, we decided that we were going
22 to end at six today. So, you know, it's six. I mean, if
23 we can move through the Senate. I just don't know when
24 we're going to do Senate. I mean, if we can move through
25 this in the next half hour I think that's good. I just

1 don't see how there is time to do this tomorrow and on
2 Friday.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, we have the Saturday
4 option. And, again, if the option is to go an extra day we
5 would push back everything a day. But at this point - also
6 we have to do a mapper swap when the - the two other
7 mappers are scheduled to come in for Southern California.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: This approach we're
9 discussing is going to require a big chunk of Solano County
10 going over into the Napa County and along that border
11 there's not much population. So that's going to be a
12 pretty tough one to pull off, other than Fairfield and
13 that's not enough people to move over.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. So let's focus on this
15 question of time right now and scheduling. Commissioner
16 DiGuilio?

17 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: It seems like - I know it's
18 been a long day for Q2 at this point. But I'm just
19 wondering how much time we have for another hour or two. I
20 mean, I just feel like we're just going to need to get this
21 job done. I know it's not optimal but it's better than
22 coming back tomorrow because we can't walk away not having
23 gone through Senate, this is not an option. So I guess
24 it's a matter of how everybody feels today about continuing
25 to go through the SDs or if we roll it over tomorrow. But

1 then that would mean bringing the whole Q2 staff back
2 tomorrow, both northern and southern.

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: I don't think we can afford to
4 rush through Senate because we did that during the first
5 draft and I think we need to spend a block of time on the
6 Senate.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: I agree with that sentiment. Ms.
8 MacDonald, what is your sense at this point? And, again,
9 we acknowledge that we can extend the number of days by one
10 or two days. But, obviously, given how you are set up to
11 do this, it's either going to be an extra hour or two
12 tonight or tomorrow, that's it. There are basically those
13 two options.

14 MS. MACDONALD: I have to - we have to leave here
15 at seven at the absolute latest. I mean, running out of
16 here at seven. That's already pushing it tonight.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: And that is because you have -

18 MS. MACDONALD: That is because we need to leave at
19 seven.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

21 MS. MACDONALD: We absolutely need to leave at
22 seven. There is just no option to go any later than that.
23 We were planning on leaving at six.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Well, if we were to do that
25 and we didn't finish the Senate we would bring you back at

1 some point because we will finish the districts. And,
2 again, the Commission's, I think, general will is that we
3 will extend days if needed to complete the job. So you
4 would want to still end at seven then? We will have to
5 work out some other scheduling, I think that's what the
6 Commission would want to do.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So then Q2 would
8 prefer to add Saturday as opposed to go later than seven
9 today?

10 MS. MACDONALD: I have to check with my people.
11 Because we were not told that Saturday is an option. We
12 have not discussed it. And we need to have the mapping
13 time to implement everything that you give us before next
14 week. So Saturday -

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So you would rather
16 go as late as it takes right now, this evening?

17 MS. MACDONALD: I have to leave at seven o'clock
18 tonight for sure.

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Let's start looking at maps
20 and end at seven.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, why don't we just proceed
22 then. Again, the flexibility built in - again, this is not
23 your exact time, however if we push back into an extra day
24 we would push everything back an extra day. So, in other
25 words, we would not be compromising your mapping time but

1 it would extend the instruction days and would extend the
2 ultimate deadline to complete the line drawing process,
3 that's the point. So we're certainly not trying to
4 compress the amount of time that will be needed to present
5 maps next week. Okay?

6 So why don't we just continue then. Anyway, so
7 regarding this rotation.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So others are much better at
9 this than I in terms of rotations and clock and counter-
10 clock and all that. But I'm just wondering if there isn't
11 something we can do that sort of pulls - that creates a
12 situation where we pull Vallejo more into sort of an 80
13 corridor. It means changing this a little but I think that
14 if it could do that, as opposed to going so - this bottom
15 part of this, these districts being so completely north-
16 south, if we could look at some of those and think of them
17 more as following some of 80. I don't know what that would
18 involve but that way you might be able to get Vallejo - I
19 just looked again and it's not just that it's with Napa,
20 it's the district in Napa that goes all the way up pretty
21 far. I had forgotten that from when we first looked at it,
22 it goes - and so it really does feel misplaced here in
23 Vallejo.

24 And I don't know, the 80 is sort of it's natural -
25 I don't think -- in some ways it wouldn't matter which of

1 the counties it was in if it was in that 80 corridor where
2 it's sort of it's natural home.

3 MS. ALON: If Vallejo is put in with the 80 over
4 here you will either split Richmond or Berkeley. And then
5 you would have to put Berkeley in with LaMorinda and then
6 move that up and I'm not exactly sure what will happen up
7 there.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: My sense is that if
9 these are the options we're considering and the goal is to
10 look at how Vallejo can have - I mean, the entire region,
11 but we've had a particular issue with Vallejo across
12 different maps - is that it's key to keep that 80 corridor
13 intact on that north end as much as possible. So that
14 splitting Richmond is probably not the best way to do that
15 because there are some real similarities in terms of
16 communities of interest between Vallejo and Richmond.

17 So, I don't know, we might look at some type of a
18 Berkeley split. Although, I'm thinking it through in terms
19 of where population is and would there be a Berkeley split
20 that would also allow us to continue to respect the
21 feedback we've gotten about the hills?

22 MS. CLARK: Right. So if we were to move Vallejo
23 into this, just following the 80 corridor then population
24 assumably would have to come out of the southern end of
25 that district just because trying to grab, you know, over a

1 hundred-thousand people somewhere along here is either
2 going to make for a barely contiguous district or just
3 would cause problems. So then the issue would be that
4 Berkeley and North Oakland would move into this LaMorinda
5 area and then Walnut Creek, maybe Lafayette, maybe Alamo
6 would move into this PTANT District.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: I'm getting mixed signals from
8 people's heads here.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that's a decent
10 compromise, actually. I mean, I do think that there are a
11 lot of similarities, as Commissioner Galambos-Malloy said,
12 between Vallejo and Richmond. And there is a more affluent
13 area of Berkeley, too, that would go well with the
14 LaMorinda area.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I just think on the
16 south when we look at actually paring Berkeley and you look
17 at that whole district and you look at - I mean, we're
18 looking, if I'm understanding this correctly, at the Tri-
19 Valley area is now paired with Berkeley?

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think that is -

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: That one is hard.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: That one is really a
24 stretch. I could see potentially linking part of Berkeley
25 or Oakland with LaMorinda but the farther east and south

1 you go for a district of this size I just think it's really
2 probably a misstep on our part.

3 MS. CLARK: Another option, if the issue is in
4 having Vallejo with Napa, would be to move Vallejo and
5 Benicia into PTANT and then to move this line of ECC west
6 so Brentwood, picking up Antioch and then splitting
7 Pittsburg. And then sort of to remove population in ECC
8 perhaps to -

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: Make Fairfield whole?

10 MS. CLARK: -- you know, make Fairfield whole and
11 also to pick up Lake County. Or to split Napa.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think the
13 challenge as we start to get to Lake is that the feedback
14 we're getting is that Lake is really more naturally paired
15 with other wine growing areas, essentially Napa, Sonoma,
16 Marin. And so to pull them over to Yolo-Solano, I think,
17 would have a significant impact on the county. I wouldn't
18 feel so comfortable with that portion of the swap.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we need some tight directions
20 here if we're going to move forward. So we need a very
21 specific set of directions if you want to move ahead here.
22 Can we get a proposal?

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: So can you tell us - and maybe
24 you just need to try it in terms of - it sounds like
25 Fairfield is not enough, basically.

1 MS. CLARK: Could you repeat that, please?

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Basically, making Fairfield
3 whole is not sufficient population, is what you're saying.
4 You would have to take more.

5 MS. CLARK: The entire City of Fairfield has less
6 population than the City of Vallejo.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: I don't know if there is a
8 natural split in Vallejo. I mean, that would be my only
9 other thought -

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, Great America -

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: - is to take part of Vallejo.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: - is there. You know, the
13 amusement park.

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: This is when it gets
15 to a question that, you know, for the City of Vallejo what
16 results in more effective and fair representation on their
17 perspective.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: And I think that if
20 we were able to keep their integrity and move them into a
21 southern district it might make sense. But if the only way
22 we can do that is to split them without having heard that
23 from them I'm a little nervous about us making that
24 judgment call.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I have to say that I wouldn't

1 be that concerned about them being in this district if it
2 was not as long, as extended through all these other
3 counties. If we were talking Benicia, American Canyon,
4 Napa, I mean, that's sort of Bay Area still. You know,
5 that's the greater Bay Area. But when you put Vallejo in
6 with something that's way up -

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Lake County.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: - in Lake County that - I
9 mean, we're talking about, really Vallejo is core Bay Area.
10 And to be up with Lake County in an Assembly District just
11 - I don't have suggestions, I just know that that feels
12 very off.

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, it's
14 interesting when you put it that way. Because I think
15 there is more of an argument for Lake County to be with
16 Solano and Yolo County potentially than for Vallejo to be
17 with Lake County if those are some of the trade-offs we're
18 looking at.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we're still lacking a
20 concrete proposal here.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I think Ms. Clark said it
22 and I guess we want to just check in with the rest of the
23 Commission about that. We can do the rotation, it means
24 that Lake County might go to the Yolo District.

25 MS. CLARK: Will go -

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Will go to -

2 MS. CLARK: - with the Yolo District.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: - the Yolo District. You know,
4 they are an agricultural area. I mean, they would argue
5 their agriculture is different. But it is a better fit, I
6 think, than with the really urban, low income, industrial
7 area of Vallejo.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, straw vote. Who supports
9 that rotation?

10 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm sorry, can you just
11 have maybe a summary of that rotation one more time?

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, go ahead, Ms. Clark.

13 MS. CLARK: A summary of that rotation. Vallejo
14 and Benicia into PTANT; Brentwood, Antioch, part of
15 Pittsburg into ECC; the remainder of -

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: Fairfield?

17 MS. CLARK: Ooo, okay. Yeah, it's the remainder of
18 Fairfield. And then actually we need to move population
19 from ECC into Napa. So we would have to split Yolo County.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba?

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Vallejo and Benicia are
22 going to be a dominant part of that district, population-
23 wise. So it's not like they're going to be left out. I
24 mean, no elected official is going to ignore them.

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. Okay, again, I want a

1 showing of heads or hands or whatever. How many folks
2 support the rotation?

3 (Show of hands)

4 How many do not support the rotation?

5 (Show of hands)

6 Hands higher, please.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I think it's
8 difficult for us to make this call. It would be nice if we
9 were to consider even a Yolo split that we would have some
10 feedback from Commissioner Forbes on what a split would
11 look like. So barring that I wouldn't feel comfortable
12 myself.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I strongly feel that they are
14 not going to be a dominant part of this district. Just
15 because they have the numbers doesn't mean that they will
16 have the clout, given the economy of those other parts of
17 this Assembly District, which are very strong economic wine
18 growing regions. And Vallejo has been decimated since they
19 closed the base, it's really lost political power. It's
20 got a lot of problems in terms of its economy. I don't
21 think it's going to - Benicia or Vallejo will outweigh the
22 rest of that county, those other regions.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I think the majority of the
24 Commission remains unswayed. So we will continue.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I mean, I would be

1 open to it. I would think it's one of those areas, though,
2 I would want to flag for further direction from
3 Commissioner Forbes perhaps. You know, tomorrow he could
4 follow-up with us on some more details if we had critical
5 mass on the Commission. But I think Commissioner Blanco's
6 concerns are valid.

7 MS. CLARK: The split in Yolo County would be north
8 Yolo County going with Napa. So it would be somewhat
9 similar to - Yolo County would look somewhat similar, just
10 in where the splits are, to the first draft map and West
11 Sacramento would still be with the City of Sacramento.
12 That bottom part of Colusa County would be with Napa, the
13 City of Woodland, and maybe - and then, I believe, that
14 Davis could potentially have to be split. But I'm not
15 totally sure about that.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, let's move forward then.

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Are we going to at least bring
18 this to Commissioner Forbes' attention for his input? I
19 mean, is there enough interest?

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, what is -

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, what is the sense of the
22 Commission here in terms of wanting to hold this
23 configuration open until we hear from Commissioner Forbes?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: I mean, Commissioner Forbes is
25 the one who had proposed the split in Yolo County before.

1 So we had had a split with northern Yolo County before, the
2 more agricultural areas.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, being reminded
4 of that then I feel much more comfortable entertaining this
5 option.

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: And remember, it was split
7 before. In our first iteration Yolo County was split.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And a bunch of people showed
9 up and said it wasn't a very good idea, as I recall.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's true. But it is the more
11 agricultural side of it.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, again, I'm doing a head
13 count. I still see nine votes not in favor of the
14 rotation, even including Commissioner Forbes.

15 MS. CLARK: I also, to see it next time, need
16 direction on it today.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Are we willing to look at an
18 option or do we not want to waste Ms. Clark's time?

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I'm willing to look
20 at an option.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: We had the discussion earlier in
23 the day about options when we leave today. So are we
24 revisiting that decision?

25 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, either there - there's a

1 choice. We go with how it is or we entertain a motion to
2 change. And, again, counting the heads I'm thinking there
3 is a sufficient number who would not want to change,
4 although we can call for a motion if you'd like.

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I thought Connie was saying
6 she would like to see what it would look like without any
7 commitment to it. Did I hear you right?

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I would. I mean, I
9 think the concerns that we are talking about here are
10 similar to when we were looking at a configuration where we
11 had, you know, Richmond sent north one or two counties
12 basically with an entirely, you know, more rural,
13 agricultural area.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's exactly the same.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: You know, it's
16 exactly the same situation of what we're looking at with
17 Vallejo now. So I think, you know, to be consistent and
18 take some of those same concerns into account that we
19 should look at an option that provides a better chance for
20 representation, both for the agricultural areas as well as
21 for Vallejo.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: You know, for those that
23 don't know the area I'm trying to think what the equivalent
24 would be. But Vallejo is the Bay Area. It's like if you
25 took a part of - I'm trying to think of what the equivalent

1 would be - a part of LA and you put it with - I don't even
2 - you stretched it out into the Central Valley. I'm
3 serious, that's what it would be like, taking it into the
4 Central Valley.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, point well taken. Let's have
6 Ms. Alon -

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But I just want to point out
8 that it is an urban area and it's completely misplaced
9 here.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. Ms. Alon?

11 MS. ALON: This change in rotation is a bit much
12 for us to do on the fly right now. And so we would need an
13 instruction, either to change it or not, today.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Yao and
15 Commissioner DiGuilio. Again, if we are trying to stick
16 with not going to options for the next session we will have
17 to choose one.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Looked at another way, if we
19 don't feel that Vallejo fits into the wine country and we
20 do move Vallejo out, what western part of the Solano and/or
21 any other county up north of it fits better into the wine
22 country? Because somehow you're going to have to move
23 roughly 150,000 people. And if we don't see any cities
24 further north of here on the ECC or any other county east
25 of it that can go into the wine country I think we're

1 kidding ourselves in terms of being able to find a match.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess I'm just trying to
4 balance. I mean, what we're trying to do is to walk away
5 with a decision but I'm also trying to balance the fact
6 that people still just don't feel comfortable without being
7 able to see either one. I guess I'm looking at Ms. Clark.
8 Is this a self-contained adjustment where you could do it
9 in a reasonable amount of time or is this something that
10 will take too much time in terms of - I guess what it is,
11 is people are hesitant to give up one until they've seen
12 the outcome of the other but we don't want to go back and
13 say, Keep mapping, keep mapping. I mean, at some point we
14 have to call uncle.

15 MS. ALON: Yeah, this rotation is too much for us
16 to do right now. And so this would be - yeah, we wouldn't
17 be able to do this. It would take doing it over a couple
18 of hours.

19 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess my point is, I'm
20 asking if that is something that is a real critical point
21 if you just say, We just want this one area, these two
22 options. But, I mean, like, I'm really hesitant to say
23 give us two options and we just make a choice at the end.
24 I think we just kind of have to, you know, walk away with
25 something.

1 MS. CLARK: I think that this is - if you need to
2 see another option of it I can do it. It is just trading
3 out, like, which more populated areas do you want to move
4 into the more rural areas. And that's really the trade.
5 And then on top of that also splitting Yolo County and
6 potentially splitting one of the large cities in Yolo
7 County.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Do you think there
9 is a way to do it without having to split one of the large
10 cities? Or is that one you won't know until you map it
11 out?

12 MS. CLARK: I won't know until I map it.

13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I can't imagine that that's
14 going to be acceptable. They're relatively small, or
15 smaller cities. I don't know, I guess so now you're
16 looking at balancing how they would be affected versus
17 leaving Vallejo where it is.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Well, I guess, you
19 know, when I think it through, by the time we get into some
20 of these areas of Yolo County there are areas of the county
21 that have more in common with each other, areas of the
22 district that have more in common together, as Commissioner
23 Forbes was showing us, you know, different agricultural
24 interests. It's really this disparate pairing between the
25 southern portion of the Napa District and the northern

1 portion of the district. I mean, sight unseen if you were
2 to go - if Q2 was to take this back to the shop and work on
3 refining this and was able to do so in a way that, for
4 example, didn't split the two large cities, I would feel
5 comfortable with that.

6 So I don't know if there's a way of, you know,
7 putting certain parameters and say, you know, explore it
8 but if X happens then the trade-off might be too great and
9 we would want you to pull back.

10 CHAIR ANCHETA: Can you gauge that at this point or
11 you have to actually map it all out?

12 MR. MANOFF: Chair, I just need a few seconds here
13 to archive.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sure.

15 (Pause)

16 MR. MANOFF: Okay, Chair.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we're back on the record. Do
18 we have a proposal? Or, again, I'm counting heads here.
19 We have a -

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I would go along with
21 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy's suggestion that we ask Q2 to
22 see where it will go. We have kind of a general idea. And
23 maybe even splits might not be terrible if we think we've
24 balanced that against the interests of Vallejo in being
25 with like-minded communities.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: So as a process point, would it be
2 possible to draw a map that out over a couple of hours post
3 it on the website as an equivalency file and then also with
4 the new interactive tool so the commissioners could review
5 it? Could that be done fairly quickly, being within the
6 next -

7 MS. CLARK: Two days.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: - day. Two days.

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think as long as we have a
10 chance to see it before we break during this session so
11 there won't be any surprises next week when we look at the
12 map, that's acceptable with me. But if we can't do that
13 then I think we need to make a decision before we break
14 during this session.

15 MS. CLARK: So if you didn't like that one then it
16 automatically reverts to this?

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: Correct.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: The question is whether that could
20 actually be occurring by, say, Friday. We may be going
21 into Saturday at this point.

22 MS. ALON: This is a lot of work for us, so it
23 depends on how much you want it. Jamie and I will lose
24 sleep over it if you really want it.

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, just a clarification. Would

1 we make Colusa whole in this process? Because we're losing
2 - no, we're adding -

3 MS. CLARK: No. Colusa is still not whole unless
4 we want to also do another balancing act in Yuba County and
5 then MTCAP and then -

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: No. Just wanted to ask.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Ontai?

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So let me ask the mappers, if
9 you were to pursue this option here to what extent would it
10 take time away from you looking at the other options in the
11 other maps we are asking you to do?

12 MS. ALON: We already have no time. We are already
13 severely impacted. And so I'm not exactly sure where this
14 would go.

15 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Chair?

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Raya, go ahead.

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm trying to say this in the
18 best spirit that I can. I am very sympathetic to the
19 amount of work that everyone here is putting in to this
20 process and, you know, we're not doing that job so I can't
21 necessarily weigh how it is to get it done. But I know
22 that we're doing a job, too, and I think we're all trying
23 to hang in there together for just a little bit longer so
24 that we can get this done and not lose sleep over it later.
25 We're trying to do what we think we need to do to give the

1 people of California the product they deserve. So, you
2 know, I hope that we can find a way to just hang on a
3 little while longer and get it done.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: All right, given the resource
5 question, again, I will take a straw pole here. How many
6 would like us to proceed with having Q2 pursue this other
7 option?

8 (Show of hands)
9 How many would not?

10 (Show of hands)

11 Fifty-fifty. And I don't think we have -

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We have a vote behind you.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Oh, I'm sorry. Those who do not,
14 again?

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I don't believe
16 you've been voting, Chair.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, I'm counting. I can count
18 myself. I don't have to raise my hand to count myself.

19 (Show of hands)

20 Yeah, we don't have nine on either direction. So
21 we're basically split.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can we recap for the record
23 how it is that Vallejo ended up in this district, what the
24 thinking was of this district and the decisions that led to
25 Vallejo being in this district? That would be helpful.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Is this Commissioner
2 Forbes' assigned district?

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: I think it's a Dai-Galambos-Malloy
4 district.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: This is a hybrid.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: Yeah, it's kind of
7 where our region meets Commissioner Forbes' region.

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Because, as I recall,
9 it is in the draft map and most of the testimony that we
10 received was about American Canyon. And so maybe someone
11 could refresh my recollection if there was any, you know,
12 significant testimony. But, as I recall, there were some
13 population concerns regarding the pre-draft map, which we
14 corrected and added American Canyon. And then we got into
15 the population issues in the lower PTANT District and the
16 ECC District.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: You know, my
18 perception of this issue is that this is one of those
19 places where we may not have - for example, in regards to
20 Vallejo - as robust of a community of interest testimony as
21 we did for American Canyon, for example. But where we have
22 commissioners who know an area well and have a sense of how
23 the region functions and what some of the impacts are for
24 the pairings that we've created, I would think it would be
25 an area where we would have some responsibility to flag

1 those at this point in the game.

2 So I feel like it falls more in that area. I know
3 both with the Solano and Napa that those southern portions
4 that we have had feedback from the public that they have
5 diverse regions within the counties. And so I think that
6 Vallejo is one of those areas that doesn't quite fit with
7 many of the parts of the county and of the district that
8 fall to the north.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: I mean, we have received
10 testimony. It's been written commentary mostly.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Let me interject. Let me propose
12 the following, and this is a scheduling consideration. We
13 are not going to get to the Senate, clearly, this evening
14 in time to complete the Senate. Again, we've talked about
15 this in terms of mapper availability, we do have - not the
16 whole team is available on Saturday but it is possible to
17 bring back the Northern California team on Saturday, at
18 least for part of the day. And I think at least one of the
19 Southern California mappers can come back on Saturday.

20 So what I would suggest is that we, one, push back
21 the Senate discussion to Saturday for Northern California;
22 that we - and I would like some thinking on this one
23 because, again, we're sort of split about this option and
24 we have an incomplete Commission as well, a number of
25 commissioners aren't here. And it's whether we do want to

1 pursue this option. Now, again, it will take some time,
2 the mappers will not be working on the Senate yet because
3 we will not have discussed the Senate. So to that extent
4 there is a little bit of extra time, so to speak. And,
5 again, what we are essentially doing is pushing back the
6 July 28th deadline. And, again, we built in some padding
7 for that. Again, we do not compress the time between our
8 last line drawing session - the next line drawing session -
9 and the final version.

10 So I think that's where we stand right now. Does
11 anyone want to chime in terms of - I think that's where we
12 have to go at this point in terms of general scheduling.

13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well -

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: But the question is sort of going
15 to - again, it comes back to the option -

16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Right.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: - the second option question.

18 COMMISSIONER RAYA: My question is: Could we have
19 a quick search for testimony on this area from the public
20 and that might give us a sense of, you know, are we trying
21 to make a decision that perhaps the community is not as
22 concerned about as we are?

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

24 MS. CLARK: On Vallejo?

25 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just from the emails alone,
2 there are about 40-some. I did a search on Vallejo in the
3 5000 emails in our account. They do want to be associated
4 with Martinez, Pleasant Hill and Concord. A majority of
5 the emails reflect that desire.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

7 MS. CLARK: I have a very rough visualization.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, that was quick.

9 (Laughter)

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: We took so long that she had time to do
11 a rough visualization.

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: While Ms. Clark is
13 doing that, just in that - again, this goes back to a
14 balance of where we recognize those communities of interest
15 being together. And they are at the Congressional level -
16 and I don't know if we made any changes to that from this
17 morning - and at the Senate level. So they are together in
18 that community of interest, although it might be to the
19 north.

20 MS. MACDONALD: We just searched both databases and
21 there are no comments from anyone from Vallejo.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Really?

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I'm sorry, could you
24 repeat that, please?

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: In searching the

1 real-time emails that we're getting - that was what
2 Commissioner Yao had referred to -

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: So it may be that
5 those haven't all been transferred to the Q2 database yet.

6 MS. MACDONALD: We just searched the database, so
7 whatever has been entered.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: So there may have been much more
9 recent emails.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: It's since the release of the
11 first draft.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, that's quite a while.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: I know that I've read several in
14 the last few days.

15 MS. MACDONALD: We have 5500 records at this point.

16 (Discussion off microphone among commissioners.)

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Sorry. Ms. MacDonald, go ahead.

18 MS. MACDONALD: There are currently 5500 records in
19 that database.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: There are 5673 on the emails
21 since the first draft.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio?

23 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess I'm just trying to
24 take a step back here. This is all very important
25 discussion, it really is. Because we're looking at

1 communities that are greatly impacted. But I'm also trying
2 to just balance the fact that we were - we do have a
3 timeline that's realistic, I mean, that's out there, and it
4 is putting a lot of pressure on us. And I think we have to
5 just continually balance things that maybe aren't optimal
6 versus what's really egregious and see what we can do to
7 solve it. And if we can't solve it easily without some
8 real repercussions then we have to - I guess I'm just
9 really trying to balance getting things really right versus
10 getting something done.

11 You know, how long have we spent on this one area
12 in Assembly? And I don't want to shortchange anyone
13 because we really should feel like we have a chance to talk
14 these things through. But I guess we all have to realize
15 the trade-off because this is Northern California and we've
16 spent a whole day and we haven't gotten through Senate. I
17 mean, that's the reality, right? I mean, if we want to put
18 it on the line we haven't even gotten to Senate yet.
19 What's going to happen in Southern California, what's not
20 going to happen?

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Just to interject, we also have to
22 hit our nine member majority as well. So we are split on a
23 number of these districts. So we have to make sure that we
24 are all moving along, too. So let's look at the
25 visualization.

1 MS. CLARK: So here's the rough visualization. The
2 Napa District, everything is the same except for Vallejo
3 from where it originally was, again this area of Sonoma
4 County, Napa and Lake Counties. Fairfield is whole and is
5 with this district. Colusa is still split, Yolo is split,
6 Woodland is included in this district, Davis is not.
7 Vallejo, Benicia, Martinez and Concord are here in this Bay
8 Area district. Pittsburg is split, this is, I believe,
9 like a 20,000 person split. Antioch and Brentwood are
10 whole with this Discovery Bay, Byron, Knightsen, Oakley
11 area, and that is in the ECC District. Obviously, the
12 lines here have changed in that Yolo County and Colusa
13 County are no longer included and Fairfield is not
14 included.

15 COMMISSIONER RAYA: That does not seem inconsistent
16 to me with what I've heard anyway about Woodland and - I
17 mean, if Woodland and Davis are still whole but they are
18 not together in the county I don't think that's - I don't
19 know. Does anybody else have an opinion on that part?

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think this does a better job
21 of putting the agricultural areas together. You know, I
22 think this is actually better all the way around and it
23 puts the whole Brentwood, you know, Antioch area a little
24 more whole. And it makes Fairfield whole.

25

1 MS. CLARK: I would like direction today on which
2 visualization to go and follow-through with.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao and Commissioner
4 Galambos-Malloy.

5 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, when we looked at the
6 Contra Costa District earlier we felt pretty good about the
7 way it looked. And now we move a couple of the bigger
8 cities on the east side over to the district on the north.
9 So we basically solve one problem on Contra Costa County in
10 terms of moving Vallejo in but then Antioch and - what was
11 the other one that we said? Pittsburg, I think it is.
12 Then we kind of move that away from the Contra Costa
13 beltway, so to speak.

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos-Malloy then
15 Commissioner DiGuilio.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: I actually feel like
17 this is a pretty fair, reasonable alternative for us to
18 consider. My preference would be not necessarily that we
19 split a small city like Pittsburg, although I do think if
20 we're looking at a split there, you know, you could say the
21 split, the part of Pittsburg that is not going with the
22 western part of Contra Costa, they do have a really close
23 relationship with Antioch. So in terms of splits, I don't
24 think it's necessarily a bad split. And when you go up
25 farther north I think the configuration makes more sense

1 than how we had Vallejo paired so far north.

2 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Yao and
3 Commissioner Filkins-Webber. And then I want to move
4 forward. I think we may have at least a working majority
5 here.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: How about trying to keep the
7 smaller city, like Pittsburg, whole and split whatever is
8 necessary in Vallejo to make this happen. Again, Vallejo
9 is a much bigger city.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY: But I think that the
11 challenge there is if you split Vallejo and you send part
12 of it north you're sort of tossing that part of Vallejo
13 away. Because they don't have a strong community of
14 interest with their neighbors, whereas when you're looking
15 at something like a Pittsburg, I mean, you really have a
16 community of interest to the west and to the east, which is
17 what would feed my comfort level of saying, you know, we
18 like to avoid splits at all costs, however in this case it
19 may be for the greater good.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Filkins-Webber,
21 Commissioner Dai and then Commissioner DiGuilio.

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I lost my train of
23 thought. Two things. On the Pittsburg split, was there
24 some issue about maybe at a highway?

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Isn't it the 4?

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: The 4.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: So going to -

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: There is a responsible split.

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Going to the -

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: There is a newer, there is a
7 water side and a non-water side.

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay. My other
9 question then is, based on Ms. Clark's ability to roughly
10 put this together, if this were something that appears to -
11 that most of the commissioners might be inclined to do, are
12 we talking two days work here still to put it together?
13 Maybe we could still see it on Saturday or Friday?

14 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well, could you post the
15 visualization by Friday evening?

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Or are you saying you
17 still need us to make a decision that this is the way we're
18 going to go?

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, thank you.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Right. That's first.

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: And then we can work
23 on the nuances on some splits, like in the Pittsburg area,
24 next week or looking at it closer when we get it up on the
25 Statewide Database. Is that right, Ms. Clark?

1 MS. CLARK: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner Dai then
4 Commissioner DiGuilio. And then we will just -

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: I would like to move that we
6 move forward with this. I think it's really a much better
7 thing for all communities in terms of keeping agricultural
8 areas together, urban areas with the Bay Area.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, is that a motion?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: It is.

11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'll second it.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. I think we might have to
13 repeat - Ms. Sargis wasn't able to catch that. So I think
14 this is - would you repeat the -

15 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Or can we just take an
16 informal vote?

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Can we just - yeah.

18 CHAIR ANCHETA: You don't have to do a motion, you
19 can withdraw the motion and we can just sort of move
20 forward.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: If there is general consensus
22 that people can live with this.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Any objection at this point to go
24 ahead with this - to direct Q2 to work on developing a
25 visualization based on this rough framework? And, again,

1 I think the - Ms. MacDonald, go ahead.

2 MS. MACDONALD: Could I just add, we actually did
3 find one comment from Vallejo just now.

4 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

5 MS. MACDONALD: And just for the record I wanted to
6 just say it was about that it should not be added to the
7 agricultural community but it should be combined with Mare
8 Island. It should be combined. It should not be added to
9 the agricultural community, for example, Napa - I just read
10 the whole thing - because there are different interests
11 basically because it's an industrial city and Napa is more
12 agricultural.

13 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And the commissioners can
14 look at the emails as well to follow-up on that. And I
15 think because we took it off the table, it's not a motion
16 anymore. If you were looking for a public comment, we're
17 not going to take public comment on that. Okay.
18 Commissioner Aguirre?

19 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Just to recognize our
20 mappers for acting under duress and really giving us
21 something that we could work on.

22 (Applause)

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. So we have about fifteen
24 minutes to finish these Assembly Districts.

25 MS. ALON: Okay, Oakland District.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Did we cover this one already?

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: We covered Oakland already.

3 MS. ALON: Okay. Hayward District encompasses all
4 of Eden except for San Leandro, and Union City-Hayward, but
5 has a similar split in Fremont and Newark.

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: So I don't see any way to fix
7 the Eden area split here.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, any other commentary on the
9 district? Again, it's similar to the Congressional.

10 (No response.)

11 Let's keep going.

12 MS. ALON: Okay, the Milpitas District has part of
13 Fremont, Newark and Milpitas and Berryessa all together as
14 well as the eastern part of San Jose and Alum Rock with the
15 downtown of San Jose, which is where they asked to be
16 together, to the county line.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, this is consistent with
18 multiple sets of COI testimony regarding various
19 neighborhoods and communities of interest. Okay, next.

20 MS. ALON: The SANJO District has the remainder of
21 San Jose, takes the Evergreen and the Little Saigon areas
22 together, and this is another part of San Jose down here,
23 to the county line.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Does someone see a nose and a mouth
25 there in this version? Do you see a face there, by any

1 chance? I see one.

2 (Laughter)

3 This is what happens when you get loopy, you start
4 seeing faces and animals and things like that in maps.

5 Trust me, Q2 does this all the time.

6 MS. ALON: Commissioner Ancheta needs sleep.

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Again, very similar to the
8 Congressional in terms of maintaining the southern core of
9 the City of San Jose. And, again, largely unpopulated
10 areas on the eastern section of the district.

11 MS. ALON: Okay, that's it for Assembly.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, very good. Any comments
13 generally on the Assembly Districts at this point?

14 (No response.)

15 Okay. Again, we're not going to try to cover
16 Senate in fifteen minutes, that would be ill-advised of us.
17 At this point - I'm sorry, go ahead.

18 MS. MACDONALD: You know, I mean we could get
19 started. I mean, just because we're coming back on
20 Saturday -

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Well.

22 MS. MACDONALD: -there is still just limited time
23 on Saturday.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, let's do what we can.

25 MS. MACDONALD: And we have two half-days, really,

1 if you're looking at -

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Let's do what we can.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Go.

5 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Let's go.

6 CHAIR ANCHETA: Actually, Ms. MacDonald, because
7 the issue of the numbering will be coming up and I know
8 you've been preparing a memo for us. It will be an issue
9 we will have to address at some point in the next week or
10 so. What is your sense of - because you did prepare a memo
11 or have prepared a memo.

12 MS. MACDONALD: Correct. I sent it to the Tech
13 Committee for review and I hope it's very clear so that we
14 won't spend a lot of time going over it. I think it's
15 pretty straightforward. The deferral issue itself is
16 really straightforward, I mean, how you assess it
17 essentially, that's a statistical process. Then there are
18 a couple of options on how you can number.

19 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay. And just as a - again, for
20 scheduling purposes we're not going to be looking at
21 numbering at this set of sessions. In other words, we're
22 not going to be looking at now or on Saturday, are we?

23 MS. MACDONALD: No, we would not be doing that.

24 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

25 MS. MACDONALD: Because we will look at numbering

1 once the four plans basically are merged into one. And
2 then we would run the deferral report essentially.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

4 MS. MACDONALD: So that would happen next week.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

6 MS. CLARK: If we start in -

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: Actually, was it the Forbes-Ward
8 team - neither of whom are here - was that -

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's okay, we can talk through
10 their districts.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, we'll assume these are -
12 okay, no, that's fine. Again, these are not that
13 inconsistent, obviously, with the existing Assembly and
14 Congressional Districts.

15 MS. CLARK: Okay, if we look at this NORCO
16 District, it's the Counties of Del Norte, Humboldt,
17 Trinity, Mendocino, all of Marin County and the majority of
18 Sonoma County, with the exception of Petaluma and the City
19 of Sonoma.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: It keeps the North Coast
21 together, very similar justification to the other coastal
22 districts.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

24 MS. CLARK: If we take a look at this WINE
25 District, it's the Counties of Lake, Yolo, Napa and Solano

1 whole. Again, it includes Petaluma and the City of Sonoma
2 from Sonoma County, the delta area of Sacramento County,
3 and then crosses the Carquinez Bridge into Contra Costa
4 County, picks up Martinez. There was commission direction
5 last time to incorporate some of these smaller areas
6 outside of Martinez. This if Vine Hill and Mountain View
7 that are included in this visualization.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

9 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, I know this is kind
10 of the issue we just got through talking about, right? So
11 I'm not sure how - I'd be curious to hear how the
12 commissioners feel about this. I guess I feel like the one
13 thing is this is the one part where eastern Contra Costa
14 can be kept whole and with the rest of it. So it's been,
15 as we've noticed, sliced in the AD and the CD. So I like
16 the aspect that it's finally together and put with the rest
17 of its county. But I know there's maybe some issue with
18 Vallejo again. But, you know, it's balanced maybe with the
19 rest of Solano and Woodland and Davis. And so I guess I
20 feel like this seems to be acceptable. But based on our
21 previous conversation I just wanted to touch base with the
22 other commissioners on this.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just scanning through all the
25 public comments, I don't believe Vallejo really wanted to

1 be with the rest of Solano County. So if you're looking at
2 their definition of community that basically is what they
3 are advocating.

4 MS. CLARK: So if we were going to move Vallejo out
5 of this district we run into obviously some very similar
6 issues as in the Assembly Districts. If we wanted Vallejo
7 to go with this Richmond district then you would have to
8 move San Leandro out of this district and then split part
9 of Oakland. If you were going to move - again, if you were
10 going to move it into this Richmond district that would
11 mean moving population from here into this RAMON District.
12 The other option would be to move Vallejo and Benicia and
13 Martinez and Pleasant Hill into the RAMON District and to
14 just do an even swap for population, moving this line in
15 Solano County south and picking up Oakley, Brentwood,
16 Antioch and Pittsburg.

17 CHAIR ANCHETA: Comments?

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think the description that was
19 just given probably meets their stated intent better than
20 the current visualization.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: What does it do to the
23 communities we just moved up into the Solano area, do they
24 want that as well?

25 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I would think - again, this

1 is where you're trying to reach over and get that eastern
2 part of Antioch, Brentwood, Discovery Bay and that's what
3 is going to be pushed up into Solano County, again for a
4 third time. And, you know, I guess I feel like this is the
5 one place where they could kind of be whole again. I know
6 the trade-off is with Vallejo but I'm thinking - that was
7 my question initially, was before it was kind of Vallejo
8 and rural areas in Napa and Lake but this time it's Vallejo
9 and Fairfield and Davis and Woodland. So it's not quite so
10 agriculturally dominated. You know, I think there is a
11 balance here.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Yao,
13 Commissioner Blanco and Commissioner Filkins-Webber, do you
14 want to be in the queue?

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER: I'll just listen.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think to be consistent,
18 because we did it in the Assembly and we are saying that we
19 don't want to do it here, that would be inconsistent. So
20 the way I see it, it's perfectly fine in terms of splitting
21 the Contra Costa and move it up to the Solano district.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm a little less concerned
24 about this because there are some urban areas in here up in
25 Sacramento. But I also - Martinez is in there, Benicia is

1 in there. So there might be - there is a mix. It's not
2 overwhelming, but there is a mix of urban and rural in this
3 Senate District and there are some other Bay Area cities in
4 there with Vallejo, which is a 510 area code. I'm a little
5 - I don't know that Pleasant Hill belongs there, to tell
6 you the truth. But, you know - but I think this could work
7 because they are not isolated as the one and only urban
8 area in a rural community.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Dai?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: I agree with Commissioner
11 Blanco. I don't think this one is as egregious as the
12 previous Assembly District. I would leave it. I think
13 it's the only opportunity that the Highway 4 corridor has
14 had to be in Contra Costa. So I think it's not terrible
15 for Vallejo in this district if we fix it in the Assembly.

16 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, additional comments?

17 (No response.)

18 Let's move forward.

19 MS. CLARK: If we look at the YUBA District, it's
20 Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Sutter and Yuba Counties all
21 whole. Similar to what we saw last time, it's western
22 Placer County, the City of Roseville is included, as well
23 as in Sacramento County Citrus Heights, Antelope, Elverta,
24 Rio Linda, Carmichael, which is not split, and Rancho
25 Cordova, which is split per CRC direction.

1 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, commentary?

2 (No response.)

3 I guess we will, again, rely on our previous
4 descriptions for the districts for the core of this one.
5 Let's go on.

6 MS. CLARK: It's 6:58 and I think we're going to
7 pack up and go.

8 CHAIR ANCHETA: Ms. MacDonald, you want to wrap up
9 now? You got two minutes, what do you want to do?

10 MS. MACDONALD: Well, if you can guarantee that you
11 can pass another district in two minutes, yes. Would you
12 like to pick one?

13 (Inaudible request made by commissioner.)

14 MS. CLARK: Sure, here's SAC. It's the entire City
15 of Sacramento, including the City of West Sacramento, Elk
16 Grove, Vineyard and Florin are included in this
17 visualization as well as Arden-Arcade, North Highlands, I
18 believe, is split.

19 COMMISSIONER YAO: Have we tried to nest the
20 Assembly District in this case?

21 MS. CLARK: We cannot nest in Northern California
22 because the boundaries of the Section 5 districts are
23 different in Monterey and Merced Counties.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I was just commenting on
25 Sacramento City itself. Did we try to nest a couple of

1 districts that involve Sacramento City?

2 MS. CLARK: Because the northern boundaries of the
3 Monterey Districts for Assembly and Senate are different,
4 we can't nest in Northern California.

5 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, several thumbs up on that
6 one. I think we are -

7 MS. CLARK: One more minute. Should we try and do
8 one more district?

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: If Ms. MacDonald is okay with that,
10 we're fine with that.

11 MS. CLARK: So maybe this MTCAP District. It is
12 Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Plumas, Sierra and Nevada
13 Counties all whole, Placer County is split. We saw that
14 split in western Placer County in the YUBA District. El
15 Dorado is whole and included in the MTCAP District as is
16 Alpine County. The City of Folsom and some adjacent census
17 places, Orangevale for example, are included in this
18 visualization. The Folsom Lake area is intact as is the
19 Lake Tahoe basin.

20 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, I believe we have several
21 thumbs up and several not up. It's a thumbs up. Okay, I
22 wasn't sure if that was a question. Okay.

23 So, Q2, I haven't been tracking all the ones you've
24 just covered. We will pick up certainly but you will have
25 tracked the ones we have completed for this evening and we

1 will start up with the ones that are left.

2 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Okay, very good. Thank you.

4 Okay, we're not quite done yet. Q2, you can pack
5 up. Just in terms of our scheduling - again, I think we're
6 obviously going to have to carry over into Saturday - as a
7 preview both for the Commission and the public, the agenda
8 over the next couple of days does include some business and
9 some sessions involving our Voting Rights Act counsel. So,
10 Mr. Brown will be here for open session in the morning
11 tomorrow. There is a memo that is being circulated that
12 will also be posted on the web for the public to see
13 regarding Mr. Brown's opinions regarding certain areas of
14 Los Angeles County and just some general Section 2 advice.
15 We will have a closed session on Friday with Mr. Brown and
16 also with Dr. Barreto, who will be with us. That will
17 probably be about an hour and a half or so at the beginning
18 of Friday morning.

19 Let me ask, just to confirm, we do have some
20 business items. I'm trying to limit those as much as
21 possible to the extent that they can be sort of pushed back
22 a little bit if they are simply reports. We do have some
23 business to conduct, however. So my original plan was to
24 have those in the morning following Mr. Brown's session.
25 But I don't want to - obviously, we only have so much time

1 to work on Southern California. So I'm thinking we can
2 just get as much as we can done tomorrow morning and just
3 move into late morning on Southern California.

4 So, Q2, just as a - Ms. MacDonald, as I mentioned,
5 if you can be here by late morning.

6 MS. MACDONALD: Friday?

7 CHAIR ANCHETA: No, tomorrow.

8 MS. MACDONALD: Eleven o'clock?

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Eleven is fine. And then on Friday
10 probably around ten-thirty would be ideal.

11 Okay, I did assign a little bit of time for public
12 comment so if there are any members of the public who want
13 to give a very quick comment at the end of the session we
14 can take those now.

15 MR. PAYTON: Thank you. This is probably the last
16 time I'm going to be here. I have to actually get back to
17 work, all my businesses, deadline for my newspaper through
18 August.

19 But anyway, Allen Payton again, Contra Costa
20 Citizens Redistricting Task Force. I do want to remind you
21 of the 300 people that gave testimony from the first round
22 of input before the first drafts came out, after the first
23 drafts came out, emails, using the East Bay-Oakland-
24 Richmond Hills as a boundary line, natural boundary line
25 between districts. I am encouraging you do that in the

1 Congressional Districts. You did that in the State
2 Assembly Districts and the State Senate, that looks good.
3 And, again, the other thing with regards to the difference,
4 Livermore-Pleasanton-Dublin, 925 area code. Richmond and
5 that whole west county, 510 area code. They are different
6 area codes, it really is a serious gap between Martinez and
7 the west county as far as miles of roadway. I was on the
8 Transportation Commission that approved that roadway and
9 there is not much traffic going that way on Highway 4
10 westbound into - it's mostly going down 680 and mostly
11 going 24 as far as the traffic from people going from
12 central county and east county.

13 And the last thing on the State Assembly and State
14 Senate - or specifically State Assembly, that we can live
15 with that latest iteration but the agriculture area at the
16 bottom of that district that you created from Vallejo
17 southeast, I guess, should probably go into that other
18 Assembly District. There is not a lot of people out there
19 and there is more commonality with agriculture into the
20 Tri-Valley, Livermore Valley agriculture area. Okay, thank
21 you.

22 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

23 MR. AZIZ: Hello again, commissioners. I just
24 wanted to comment on the Congressional conversation.
25 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy, thank you so much for, you

1 know, being a staunch supporter of Alameda County. But I
2 really just wanted to mention the Livermore to San Jose -
3 or San Ramon to San Jose district that was very, I guess,
4 controversial to this Commission. We actually had kind of
5 regional input into that and there were suggestions from
6 Livermore, suggestions from Pleasanton who came with us in
7 our first rally here who were incorporated in building this
8 map. And also on the 25th there were at least, I believe,
9 a couple of San Jose residents if not one City Council
10 member who approved of the type of changes that were very
11 similar to, I guess, the Barabba draft of the Congressional
12 District.

13 And the reason why the valley won't get kind of
14 minimized in that district is because of the way that - the
15 geographics of the area. If you know much about how the
16 Congressional offices are run, it basically calls for - and
17 the more and more population that's in the valley district,
18 it basically calls for another district office from that
19 Congressional office inside of that valley area, giving
20 them unified representation. Basically, that valley area,
21 you know, a quarter of the district would get one office
22 and would get resources and access. Although, you know,
23 the representatives themselves would be representative of
24 San Jose to Livermore, we think that Livermore and the
25 valley areas will still get good representation, they will

1 get strong district services because there will be need as
2 a good representative to have an office there, and also
3 that it will lead into a strong R&D and economic COI for
4 the Livermore Labs. Pleasanton, they are really big on
5 their R&D projects that are coming up. And that carries
6 into Silicon Valley.

7 So I'm just asking you to revisit that whenever you
8 get a chance. Thank you.

9 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

10 MR. SALAVERY: Good afternoon or evening or
11 whatever it is, commissioners. Dave Salaverry from CCAG.

12 I don't feel we did a very good job today
13 presenting. Our mapper, Chris Bowman, had technical
14 problems, as usual, and it probably didn't help that I
15 yelled at him in the parking lot about being a Luddite.
16 But it is very frustrating knowing how hard we tried and
17 then failing to explain our maps properly. So I'm going to
18 just let you know that we will revisit our CD maps. I'm
19 going to be working with Mr. Bowman and we will present
20 soon on a day when hopefully there are a few comments. We
21 would like five minutes, if we can get two minutes in
22 installments, that's fine.

23 Just to let you know, I think that we have solved a
24 lot of the problems that came up here today. Commissioner
25 Blanco had issues with lower socioeconomic areas from

1 Emeryville to Hercules, I think we've solved those.
2 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy had problems with the Fremont
3 to Livermore Congressional District, I think we've solved
4 those. Commissioner Forbes had problems with the Marin
5 going up to the North Coast Congressional District, I think
6 we solved those as well. Commissioner DiGuilio had issues
7 in San Joaquin and Stockton, I think we've solved those
8 problems. And finally, Commissioner Ancheta will, I hope,
9 be happy with our Section 5 numbers and maps. So, anyway,
10 we will be back to present more professionally/. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

13 MS. HOWARD: Deborah Howard. I have a process
14 request. And that is I completely understand why you meet
15 in closed session with your Voting Rights attorney. I'm
16 not exactly sure why the racially polarized voting analysis
17 conducted for the Commission would have to be discussed in
18 closed session. So if he needs to be a part of that
19 discussion, I completely get that. But if that other
20 information could be shared with the public that would be
21 really helpful and reassuring. So that's my comment.
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

24 MS. HOWARD: And you all did really hard work
25 today. So, as an observer, I think you had really good

1 discussion and I know it was slow but I think it was worth
2 your time invested. So well done.

3 CHAIR ANCHETA: Thank you.

4 And just to address that question, because others
5 may have that question, certainly for the closed session it
6 is on counsel's advice that we meet in closed session with
7 Dr. Barreto. So that's the nature of -

8 MS. HOWARD: If you could make the other
9 information available, that would be great. Whatever can
10 be made available.

11 CHAIR ANCHETA: Yeah. So, Commissioner Blanco?

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I just want to say to the
13 public who has been concerned about us - quote/unquote -
14 going dark that the work we did today and why we needed to
15 have the time to really dig into this to really get things
16 right, I hope they observed that this is why we are taking
17 the time that we are taking, so that we can do the detailed
18 work and really produce good quality maps. And I am very
19 excited that our visualizations are so timely. But this is
20 why we took the time to do what we're doing.

21 CHAIR ANCHETA: And, again, I'm not - you know,
22 obviously I'm trying to watch the clock as well, but I do
23 not want to rush it through just to try to meet a Friday
24 six p.m. deadline. We will do these maps right and if it
25 takes a little extra time we will do that. But I think

1 that's our common goal, is being sure we get these maps
2 right. And this is the week to get them in the best shape
3 we can.

4 Okay, and just as a reminder there are some
5 visualizations that are going to be posted later this
6 evening as well as Mr. Brown's memo. So do look at those
7 in preparation for tomorrow's meeting. Okay, thank you.
8 So we are adjourned.

9 (Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25