

This memo sets forth key statistics and information for the benchmark and draft proposed districts in Section 5 areas of the state per the request of the CRC. We present data for the benchmark (2001/existing) districts as well as draft “proposed districts.” The draft proposed districts analyzed here are the official first draft districts approved by the CRC on June 10, 2011.

The statistics provided for each district are as follows:

LPOP: Latino population

LVAP: Latino voting age population

LReg: Latino registered voters

BPOP: Black population

BVAP: Black voting age population

APOP: Asian American population

AVAP: Asian American voting age population

AReg: Asian American registered voters

POP: these statistics are derived from 2010 Census PL 94-171 data. They show the percentage of the total population of a given district that is of a particular background. For example: $\text{Latino population} / \text{Total Population} = \text{Percent Latino Population (LPOP)}$.

VAP: these statistics are derived from 2010 Census PL 94-171 data. They show the percentage of the population aged 18 or over of a given district that is of a particular background. For example: $\text{Black Voting Age Population} / \text{Total Voting Age Population} = \text{Percent Black Voting Age Population (BVAP)}$

Reg: these statistics are derived from voter registration (2010 General Election) data maintained by California’s Statewide Database (<http://swdb.berkeley.edu/>). They are surname-matched registration data, meaning that the surnames of registered voters were compared with a list of surnames associated with a given race/ethnicity to identify voters. For example: $\text{Registered voters with Asian Surnames} / \text{Total Registered voters} = \text{Percent of registered voters with Asian surnames (AReg)}$. As there is no surname list for black or African American, we do not provide a BReg statistic below.

I. Assembly Districts

A. Kings:

Measure	Benchmark District (AD 30)	Proposed District (KINGS)
LPOP	68.8%	68.89%
LVAP	63.39%	63.64%
LReg	48.15%	49.66%
BPOP	5.8%	6.46%
BVAP	6.77%	7.33%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	3.5%	3.53%
AVAP	3.85%	3.85%
AReg	3.51%	3.24%

Proposed district deviation: 0.253%

Notes:

- ◆ None of these measures decreases in the proposed district.

B. Merced:

Measure	Benchmark District (AD 17)	Proposed District (MRCED)
LPOP	51.95%	54.22%
LVAP	47.03%	48.50%
LReg	33.72%	34.21%
BPOP	6.19%	3.67%
BVAP	6.21%	3.67%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	11.24%	6.85%
AVAP	11.49%	6.95%
AReg	6.17%	4.54%

Proposed district deviation: -1.011%

Notes:

- ◆ For Latinos, none of the measures decreases in the proposed district.
- ◆ However, the measures for black and Asian populations do decrease.
- ◆ The decrease in black and Asian populations results from the elimination of the “Stockton Finger” (a portion of the benchmark district that included part of the City of Stockton).
- ◆ A version of this district maintaining the “Stockton finger,” and therefore the population distributions, was presented to the CRC and rejected.

- ◆ We attempted to compensate for the decreases by including portions of Modesto with higher black (at least 5% BPOP) and Asian (at least 12% APOP).
- ◆ The benchmark district does not contain any part of the City of Modesto.

C. Yuba:

Measure	Benchmark District (AD 3)	Proposed District (YUBA)
LPOP	14.09%	21.63%
LVAP	11.72%	17.75%
LReg	6.26%	9.31%
BPOP	2.32%	1.74%
BVAP	2.16%	1.46%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	3.96%	5.80%
AVAP	3.37%	5.50%
AReg	1.44%	2.96%

Proposed district deviation: 0.764%

- ◆ No decrease in measures for Asian or Latino populations.
- ◆ Small decrease in BPOP and BVAP.
- ◆ The benchmark district included black populations in Butte and southeast Lassen counties, raising the BVAP. The proposed configuration does not. We could attempt to reverse this by splitting Butte county to include higher density black residency areas and moving all of Yolo county south with the Solano County-based district.

D. Monterey:

Measure	Benchmark District (AD 27)	Proposed District (WMONT)
LPOP	23.53%	27.16%
LVAP	19.86%	22.95%
LReg	10.86%	12.65%
BPOP	2.46%	2.40%
BVAP	2.32%	2.28%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	7.78%	7.70%
AVAP	7.76%	7.71%
AReg	4.10%	4.15%

Measure	Benchmark District (AD 28)	Proposed District (MONT)
LPOP	65.77%	65.48%
LVAP	60.93%	60.55%
LReg	44.93%	45.43%
BPOP	1.89%	1.98%
BVAP	2.19%	2.30%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	10.35%	12.11%
AVAP	10.91%	12.91%
AREg	9.34%	10.93%

Notes:

*Monterey County is split between two districts in both the benchmark and proposed configurations.

AD 27 (2001)/WMONT (2011)

Proposed district deviation: 0.759%

- No decrease in measures for Latinos.
- Slight decrease for African Americans
- Slight decrease for APOP and AVAP, but a slight increase for AREg.
- Due to the relatively small population of Asian Americans and African Americans in Monterey County, increasing AVAP and BVAP numbers to meet the benchmark will significantly decrease the LVAP numbers to below their benchmark.

AD 28 (2001)/MONT (2011)

Proposed District deviation: -0.187%

- No decreases for Asian American or black populations.
- Slight decreases in LPOP and LVAP, but slight increase in LReg.
- LVAP: Move the eastern border of WMONT further east within Monterey County; move Prunedale to WMONT from MONT.
- Shifting the border will not cause WMONT’s LVAP to decrease below the benchmark.

II. Senate Districts

A. Kings:

Measure	Benchmark District (SD 16)	Proposed District (KINGS)
LPOP	70.88%	71.62%
LVAP	66.19%	66.82%
LReg	51.51%	51.47%
BPOP	5.56%	5.49%
BVAP	6.15%	6.09%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	5.49%	4.56%
AVAP	5.61%	4.72%
AReg	3.50%	3.22%

- ◆ No decrease in LPOP or LVAP, but very slight decrease in LREG
- ◆ Very slight decreases in measures for black and Asian American populations. These could be addressed by incorporating more 5%+ BVAP tracts in Bakersfield or the city of Fresno, but that could decrease Latino proportions.
- ◆ BVAP decreases by 0.06%.
 - Could boost BVAP to 6.18% by adding tracts in east Bakersfield. This would decrease AVAP to 4.71%.
- ◆ AVAP decreases by 0.89%.
 - Could boost AVAP to 4.75% by adding tracts in east Bakersfield. This would decrease BVAP to 6.05%.
 - Could boost AVAP to 5% range by adding Sunnyside (east of city of Fresno). This would require either splitting the south Fresno COI or removing Sanger or Reedley, ultimately reducing LVAP to below benchmark.
 - Could possibly boost AVAP and BVAP numbers by splitting the southwest Bakersfield COI.

B. Merced (& East Monterey):

Measure	Benchmark District (SD 12)	Proposed District (MERCED)
LPOP	59.14%	59.87%
LVAP	53.48%	54.61%
LReg	37.80%	39.60%
BPOP	3.04%	2.82%
BVAP	3.14%	2.97%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	5.38%	9.49%
AVAP	5.64%	9.97%
AReg	4.13%	7.61%

- ◆ No decrease in measures for Latino or Asian American populations

- ◆ Very slight decrease in BPOP and BVAP. This could be addressed by including areas of Modesto or San Jose, but this might decrease Latino proportions.
- ◆ BVAP decreases by 0.18%. Could be boosted to the 3% range by further splitting Modesto and removing Census Blocks with less than 5% BVAP. Testimony on where to split Modesto would be helpful.

C. Yuba:

Measure	Benchmark District (SD 4)	Proposed District (YUBA)
LPOP	16.37%	17.59%
LVAP	13.41%	14.44%
LReg	7.31%	7.38%
BPOP	1.71%	1.84%
BVAP	1.48%	1.66%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	5.25%	4.55%
AVAP	4.75%	4.13%
AREg	2.35%	2.10%

- ◆ No decreases for African American or Latino measures.
- ◆ Very slight decreases for Asian American measures.
- ◆ AVAP decreases by 0.62%. Could avoid the decrease by including areas in western Placer County and excluding the easternmost counties in Northern California. This would break up the integrity of the Mountain Cap district.

D. Monterey (West Monterey, for East Monterey, see II.B above)

Measure	Benchmark District (SD 15)	Proposed District (COAST)
LPOP	30.85%	31.11%
LVAP	26.22%	26.21%
LReg	13.79%	13.89%
BPOP	1.97%	2.33%
BVAP	1.99%	2.32%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	9.87%	5.92%
AVAP	9.51%	6.00%
AREg	6.53%	3.36%

Notes:

*Monterey County is split between 2 districts in both the 2001 map and the 2011 1st Draft Map

- No decrease for LPOP or LReg. Tiny decrease (0.01%) for LVAP.
- No decrease for black population measures.

- Decreases for Asian American population measures. Due to the relatively small population of Asians in Monterey County, we were not able to meet the benchmarks. Increasing AVAP will decrease the LVAP and BVAP numbers so they no longer meet their benchmarks.

III. Congressional Districts

A. Kings:

Measure	Benchmark District (CD 20)	Proposed District (KINGS)
LPOP	70.36%	70.96%
LVAP	65.72%	65.85%
LReg	51.90%	50.67%
BPOP	6.21%	4.67%
BVAP	6.95%	5.36%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	5.35%	3.62%
AVAP	5.41%	3.97%
AReg	3.43%	3.72%

Notes:

Deviation: 0

- ◆ No decrease in LPOP or LVAP, but very slight decrease in LReg
- ◆ Small decreases in BPOP and BVAP. Could be boosted by incorporating areas with 5%+BVAP population in Bakersfield or the city of Fresno. This might decrease Latino measures.
- ◆ Small decreases in APOP and AVAP, but slight increase in AReg. APOP/AVAP could be increased by incorporating areas of Bakersfield or the city of Fresno with 5%+ AVAP populations, This might decrease Latino proportions.

B. Merced:

Measure	Benchmark District (CD 18)	Proposed District (MRCED)
LPOP	52.66%	58.01%
LVAP	47.23%	52.85%
LReg	33.86%	38.41%
BPOP	5.98%	6.13%
BVAP	5.92%	6.23%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	9.37%	8.83%
AVAP	9.54%	8.66%
AReg	5.03%	4.01%

Notes:

Deviation: -1

- ◆ No decrease in LPOP or LVAP, but slight decrease in LReg.
- ◆ No decrease in BPOP or BVAP.
- ◆ Slight decrease in Asian American measures, mostly caused by the elimination of the “Stockton finger.” AVAP could be boosted by including areas in the city of

Fresno with 10% or more AVAP. This might decrease Latino measures. It would also split the south Fresno (city) COI.

- ◆ Since the Merced and Kings Congressional Districts are adjacent, so any action to raise AVAP must be analyzed on its effect on both districts.

C. Yuba:

Measure	Benchmark District (CD 2)	Proposed District (YUBA)
LPOP	18.96%	28.62%
LVAP	15.48%	23.76%
LReg	8.36%	11.28%
BPOP	1.67%	2.12%
BVAP	1.41%	1.92%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	4.92%	5.85%
AVAP	4.57%	5.65%
AReg	2.41%	3.11%

Notes:

Deviation: 0

- ◆ No decreases.

D. Monterey:

Measure	Benchmark District (CD 17)	Proposed District (MONT)
LPOP	50.43%	48.75%
LVAP	44.16%	42.58%
LReg	27.52%	26.07%
BPOP	2.36%	2.27%
BVAP	2.50%	2.40%
BReg	N/A	N/A
APOP	6.04%	5.89%
AVAP	6.51%	6.31%
AReg	4.21%	4.05%

Notes:

Deviation: -1

- Small decreases for Latino measures
- Slight decreases in proportions for black and Asian American populations
- The decrease in LVAP might be avoided in the following ways:
 - Option 1: Split Monterey Bay, split Santa Cruz city, include Gilroy (splits Morgan Hill, San Martin, Gilroy COI); Splits Santa Clara County
 - Option 2: Go north from MONT into Santa Clara County; Split Alum Rock area away from San Jose; Cut some areas out of Santa Cruz County

IV. Board of Equalization:

Will be addressed in a forthcoming document.