

Extend to which race can be considered in COI:

- AVOID use of race as the principal factor in defining a COI
- 14th amendment prohibits it
- Refer to a community in terms of ethnic make up but must drill down into what makes that area a community (shared culture, shared churches, school, languages, business, etc)
- sec 5 or 2 might require that a section in drawn then race becomes more relevant and more valid a criteria

Sec 5 retrogression: How do we evaluate minority group that are a smaller % in benchmark district and in a new district there is a difference in their #'s.

- need to make sec 5 #'s same or greater. If any minority #'s fall you must dig deeper to support why that is necessary

further discussion of proposal from African American redistricting collaborative

- want to leave existing boundaries alone
- Opinion: no legal basis to support their request to leave districts alone
 - o Sec 5 argument does not apply to LA county and there is no racially polarized voting that exists. They alledge that there is coalition voting and that Af. Am. Have been successful in voting for candidates of their choice

How many sec 2 districts in san diego / imperial area?

- Area that included san diego, national city, chula vista that had >50% latino cvap which could rise to sec 2!
- Proposed drawing that included san diego county (n along hwy 80), some or all imperial county. Geography raised a compactness question. Therefore best considered not as sec 2 area. But commission could still draw one if COI testimony was extremely robust
- Coachella valley and imperial county area. Is there geographically compact >50% latino pop? There is around salton sea, but raises question about compactness in sparsely populated areas. So no definitive answer at this point.

Name and ID of district we are talking about

Comment on why we did or did not like any of the listed visualizations

And comments that might be useful / or helpful nuances of discussion of each visualizations



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

STURGES PRA #13 - Fwd: OC/RIV/SBR MAP NOTES - 6/2/11

([REDACTED])

DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]>
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Aug 18, 2011 at 11:19 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jun 4, 2011 at 2:01 PM
Subject: Re: OC/RIV/SBR MAP NOTES - 6/2/11 ([REDACTED])
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Jodie--
I think it's unlikely that we can get Fullerton/Brea/Placentia/Yorba Linda into an Assembly district b/c of population, but we can take Anaheim Hills out of the Diamond Bar district and get them together in the Senate.

--}cyn

On Fri, Jun 3, 2011 at 9:53 PM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I've shared [OC/RIV/SBR MAP NOTES - 6/2/11](#)

Message from [REDACTED]

RIV/ANA/SBR June 2, 2011 Notes

Click to open:
[OC/RIV/SBR MAP NOTES - 6/2/11](#)

Google Docs makes it easy to create, store and share online documents, spreadsheets and presentations.
[Logo for Google Docs](#)

--
Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--
Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov





Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

GENERAL MEETING 6-2-11 (Lonn.Leitch@crc.ca.gov)

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Tue, Aug 16, 2011 at 7:16 PM



I've shared [GENERAL MEETING 6-2-11](#)

Message from [REDACTED]

PRA #13 Sturges 5 Response

Click to open:

[GENERAL MEETING 6-2-11](#)

Google Docs makes it easy to create, store and share online documents, spreadsheets and presentations.





Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

pra 13

7 messages

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:43 PM
 To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Filkins-Webber, Jodie** <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, Jun 3, 2011 at 5:55 PM
 Subject: Re: Notes from yesterday?
 To: "Galambos-Malloy, Connie" <[REDACTED]>
 Cc: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Lilbert Ontai
 <[REDACTED]> Gabino Aguirre <[REDACTED]> Commissioners
 <[REDACTED]>

Sorry ladies, but as you know I missed my flight last nite, got up at 3:45AM today to catch a flight and drive straight to my office and I am still in my office now. I will have the notes summarized and sent to them no later than 9:00pm this evening, if that is ok.

Thanks for your understanding,
 Jodie

On Fri, Jun 3, 2011 at 5:45 PM, Galambos-Malloy, Connie <[REDACTED]> wrote:
 It came to my attention that Q2 may be awaiting notes still?

Connie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>
 Date: Fri, 3 Jun 2011 13:24:24 -0700
 Subject: notes from yesterday?
 To: Connie Galambos-Malloy <[REDACTED]>
 "Ontai, Lilbert" <[REDACTED]>

hello commissioners galambos-malloy and ontai,
 i have not received notes from yesterday. would you mind following up with
 the note-takers for us?

thank you!
 best,

karin

--

Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
 California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

--

Jodie Filkins Webber
Commissioner
Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:46 PM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Miller, Kirk** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, Jun 3, 2011 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Directions to Line Drawers
To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> "Brown, George H." <[REDACTED]>

Commissioners:

If you were among those who prepared notes to provide direction to Q2, please send me a copy of the notes as well. They are part of our record and they also assist Gibson Dunn with the ongoing analysis.

Thank you. Kirk

--

Kirk E. Miller
Chief Counsel
Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA. 95814
[REDACTED] (o)

[\[REDACTED\] \(916\) \[REDACTED\]](tel:(916) [REDACTED])

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:47 PM
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Claypool, Daniel** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Jun 2, 2011 at 10:01 AM
Subject: Fwd: Bouncing email for Barabba
To: Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]> Christina Shupe <[REDACTED]>

Commissioner,

Mr. Neff has requested that I forward his public comment to you. It is attached.

Christina,

Would you download, review and post the attachment and ensure that Q2 receives a copy as requested.

Thanks, Dan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Chrisrob** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Jun 2, 2011 at 9:54 AM
Subject: Bouncing email for Barabba
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Mr. Claypool,

Would you please pass on my message to Commissioner Barabba. The email he gave me has been bouncing. I have attached to this email the Public Input document that you will find in the original email I sent you last night.

Robert Neff

--- On **Wed, 6/1/11, Chrisrob** <[REDACTED]> wrote:

From: Chrisrob <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Public Comment for May 27 & 28
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: "Laura Andrus" <[REDACTED]> "Walter Klein" <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wednesday, June 1, 2011, 9:12 PM

Hello,

I was instructed by Commissioner Barabba that I would not be able to comment on agenda items at the Northridge Commission meetings so I should send in my comments in writing.

Please find a MSWord document which covers the key areas I wanted to address.

Please make sure all members of the Commission receive a copy and that Q2 Data receives a copy in case part three of my piece creates any extra work.

Robert M. Neff
Culver City

--

Daniel M. Claypool
Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: [REDACTED]

"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

**Public Input.doc**

50K

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:49 PM

To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **DiGuilio, Michelle** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2011 at 11:08 AM

Subject: Fwd: benchmarks

To: Commissioners <[REDACTED]> Janeece Sargis <[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool
<[REDACTED]> "Shupe, Christina" <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Karin Mac Donald** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2011 at 10:47 AM

Subject: benchmarks

To: Michelle DiGuilio <[REDACTED]>

--

Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission*"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"*www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov**California Section 5 Benchmarks.doc**

44K

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 3:52 PM

To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Villanueva, Raul** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2011 at 9:21 AM

Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review

To: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Webber <[REDACTED]>

Vincent Barabba <[REDACTED]> Connie Galmbos Malloy <[REDACTED]>

Michael Ward <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]>

Kirk asked for it to be removed. I believe that it was due in part to having the VRA attorneys in the lead on VRA issues. I may be mistaken.

I wasn't sure to what extent Kirk wanted the Knowledge/familiarity with pertinent laws be removed, so I marked areas that may require additional consideration.

Raul

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 11:59 PM, DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Raul... thank you for working so diligently on this IFB and incorporating our concerns.

I have a quick question as to why the language about knowledge of legal requirements is crossed out? Was this requested by a commissioner or is this your opinion that it should be removed? I, personally, think that any reviewer should have knowledge (or staff with knowledge) of the VRA issues if they're going to comment on the maps but didn't know if you had other recommendations. Is this an area that we will be discussing as a Commission? thanks... Michelle

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 5:49 PM, Villanueva, Raul <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Attached is the latest draft of the IFB for the Inlne Review.

Language to be deleted is crossed out; language to be added is in bold.

I have also posed several Qs (in Blue type) based on comments and ideas the group may want to make a decision on.

Raul

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 2:08 PM, Claypool, Daniel <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Raul, as sections are added and deleted, we need to reflect the changes in the draft that is approved by the commission tomorrow so that they know what has changed as a result of the comments received.

Thanks,

Dan

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 2:03 PM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:

As I discussed with Dan last week, there should be a caveat on the no map statement to reflect the following "..., except under circumstances to provide alternatives for those areas of review directed by the commission, where applicable."

Thabks,
Jodie

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Villanueva, Raul" <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, 31 May 2011 09:34:17 -0700
To: DiGuilio, Michelle<[REDACTED]> Vincent Barabba<[REDACTED]> Jodie Filkins-Webber<[REDACTED]> Connie Galmbos Malloy<Connie.Galambos-Malloy@crc.ca.gov>; Michael Ward<[REDACTED]>
Cc: Daniel Claypool<[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller<[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review

Good morning Commissioners:

My comments below.

Also, based on the thread:

I will be leaving in the language about the InLine Reviewer **not** creating their own maps.

I will be adding the mission statement: "The in process review is a procedure to confirm that the criteria required by the Voters First Act and the directions provided by the Commission to the technical consultant are reflected in all maps."

Finally, is there a preference for one term over another: InLine Review, In Process Review, etc. ?

Thank you,

Raul

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 12:09 AM, DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello Dan, Krik and Raul:

I just sent an email distributed to the larger email group but wanted to follow-up with Connie's suggestion to touch base with someone tomorrow (Tues.) on the status of the in-line process reviewer. As you could see by my email, I don't think we should structure the IFB to include a requirement to do mapping - I think that can open a big can of worms. I think we should structure it more to like an academic peer review than to re-create our maps.

(1) Having said that, under section (V.A.) we should state that such software will be required if requested by the Commission but not as a part of the review process itself. **The provision for maptitude is to provide access to the data in the database(s) and evaluation capabilities.**

(2) Under (V.B.) an in-line reviewer should not only use the listed criteria for their report but we should also ask them to clearly include their reasons/justifications for their recommendations made in the report.

Currently it does not require them to provide their justification for their report recommendations. **Change made.**

(3) Also, I foresee some potential issues with (V.G.3.) about "Presenting to the Commission suggestions for improvements via on-screen of affected lines...". I think we should be clear about what we want here. I see it as Q2 showing the visualization of change as recommended by the in-line reviewer and not the reviewer doing the maps for us. Again, I think the way its currently written there could be a question as to what "presenting suggestions for improvement via on-screen" could mean to an applicant. The more we define how this will happen the less likely a conflict could arise. **Good point. I included the on-screen presentation of suggestions as narrative depictions (by themselves) may be insufficient to convey the suggested changes and their possible impact(s). Having Q2 bring up the original and then show the proposed changes would address this concern.**

(4) Lastly, do we need to have any language in the IFB about how the in-line reviewer with work/coordinate with Q2 in accessing the maps they have created? Currently, we have language in the IFB that the contractor will need to have technology requirements as well as access to the same data used by Q2 but it doesn't appear that we have made any requirements about how to coordinate with the data (maps) that already exist. But I guess this begs the question of whether or not we want them to "work together" or simply have data available to the contractor via some pre-determined method. **The original idea was that the InLine Reviewer would be provided the same data and have the same software as Q2. The map under consideration would be provided to the InLine Reviewer (via a maptitude file?) so that the review could be performed independent of Q2. The point brought up about how closely the Commission wants them to work together bears consideration.**

Thanks for the consideration of these issues. Is there someone I can or should talk to about this tomorrow in preparation for the Tech. Adv. Comm. meeting on Weds? Many, many thanks!

Michelle

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Galambos-Malloy, Connie** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, May 30, 2011 at 5:11 PM
Subject: Fwd: Draft of IFB for Inline Review
To: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]>

I would suggest working w/Dan and Kirk on an effective way to frame the in-line review mission statement
- I think the draft below is pretty decent!

Connie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Miller, Kirk** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, May 28, 2011 at 5:06 PM
Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review
To: "Galambos-Malloy, Connie" <[REDACTED]>

Connie,

I think we can have the best discussion and determination by framing the right questions ahead of time, of which this is certainly one.
Let me consider a framework for decision making and go over it with you prior to the meeting. Kirk

On Sat, May 28, 2011 at 4:58 PM, Galambos-Malloy, Connie

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Kirk - would you have any counsel to offer to the Commission regarding any
> impact on our risk of litigation due to having two competing sets of maps?
> Personally, I do support the concept of an IFB but want to make sure we as a
> Commission are on the same page of the implications moving forward. If this
> item moves forward on the agenda, which it appears it will, I would request
> you to weigh in on your review of the matter.
> Connie

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: Ward, Michael <[REDACTED]>
> Date: Fri, May 27, 2011 at 7:20 PM
> Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review
> To: "Galambos-Malloy, Connie" <[REDACTED]>
> Cc: [REDACTED] Kirk Miller <[REDACTED]> Jodie
> Filkins-Webber <[REDACTED]> Michelle DiGuilio
> [REDACTED] Vincent Barabba
> [REDACTED] Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]>

>

>

> I appreciated and concur with Kirk's proposed mission statement. Q2 has
> stated that they believe any in-line reviewer would have to be a mapper with
> mapping capability. I concur with that. So i think that is an important
> requirement to include. Also, I don't agree that a concern about competing
> maps is a necessary fear. We have had several, long days inviting people to
> draw, support and explain competing maps. If a in-line reviewer did find an
> issue worth commenting on, it would only seem appropriate for them to be
> able to visually display map options that would pull the commission further
> in line with the sum of the criteria/direction provided. I would not be in

> favor of leaving a "no mapping" clause in place for this IFB. I do believe
> this in-line process should be further defined during a business meeting and
> requirements for its use defined. We can't wait until we 'need it' to
> figure it out. Thanks

>

> On Fri, May 27, 2011 at 7:05 PM, Galambos-Malloy, Connie

> <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Dan your summary was excellent and captured my interpretation of where we
>> last left off with the in-line review discussion. I think that incorporating
>> a succinct mission statement would be helpful for establishing clarity
>> amongst Commissioners and the general public.

>> Connie

>>

>> On Fri, May 27, 2011 at 11:32 AM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> I like the idea.

>>>

>>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>>>

>>>

>>> From: [REDACTED]

>>> Date: Fri, 27 May 2011 15:19:46 +0000

>>> To: Jodie Filkins-Webber<[REDACTED]> Villanueva,

>>> Raul<[REDACTED]>

>>> ReplyTo: [REDACTED]

>>> Cc: Michael Ward<[REDACTED]> Michelle

>>> DiGuilio<[REDACTED]> Vincent

>>> Barabba<[REDACTED]> Connie

>>> Galambos-Malloy<[REDACTED]> Daniel

>>> Claypool<[REDACTED]>

>>> Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review

>>> That is a good comment. I think it would be helpful to the process to
>>> have agreement around a "mission statement" as it relates to this activity.

>>> Would something like this capture the essence of this work: "The in process

>>> review is a procedure to confirm that the criteria required by the Voters

>>> First Act and the directions provided by the Commission to the technical

>>> consultant are reflected in all maps." Adding some certainty about the

>>> outcome expected by the Commission for the in line review process will add

>>> the contracting process. Please offer your thoughts about this definition.

>>> Kirk

>>>

>>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>>>

>>>

>>> From: "Filkins-Webber, Jodie" <[REDACTED]>

>>> Date: Thu, 26 May 2011 22:06:27 -0700

>>> To: Villanueva, Raul<[REDACTED]>

>>> Cc: Michael Ward<[REDACTED]> Michelle

>>> DiGuilio<[REDACTED]> Vincent

>>> Barabba<[REDACTED]> Connie

>>> Galambos-Malloy<[REDACTED]> Kirk

>>> Miller<[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool<[REDACTED]>

>>> Subject: Re: Draft of IFB for Inline Review

>>> Hello Raul,

>>> I have a few questions regarding the document.

>>> 1. Can you explain the statement in Section V. E.: "The InLine Reviewer

>>> will not

>>> develop a map or set of maps." I am not certain why this would be in the
>>> bid because Sec. V. G. 3. states : "3. Presenting to the Commission
>>> suggestions for improvements via on-screen movement of the affected lines so
>>> the Commission may better evaluate the substance of the suggestions." Thus,
>>> if the reviewer is not to develop a "map" how can they provide suggested
>>> improvements? If the reviewer determines that there is an alternative map
>>> that is in compliance with the CRC directives, and more so than that
>>> provided by Q2, it is expected that they will develop a map or set of maps
>>> for comparison, reconsideration or adoption. As we know, review and/or
>>> redevelopment of one area could affect others and have "ripple" affects.
>>> Thus, I recommend that the last sentence of Sec. V. E. be removed.

>>> Thank you,

>>> Jodie

>>> On Thu, May 26, 2011 at 4:21 PM, Villanueva, Raul

>>> [REDACTED] wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Good Afternoon Comissioners:

>>>>

>>>> Here is the latest draft of the IFB for the In-Line Review.

>>>>

>>>> Of particular interest for you is Section V: Scope of Work and the
>>>> evaluation. Please indicate any comments, edits and/or changes to this
>>>> section.

>>>>

>>>> The State boiler plate cannot be changed. Also, the final dates for
>>>> posting, evaluation and award will be filled in once all edits and reviews
>>>> have been completed by you and by DGS legal.

>>>> Please call or email if you have any questions. A response by next

>>>> Tuesday is appreciated.

>>>>

>>>> Thank you.

>>>> --

>>>> Raul Villanueva

>>>> Business Manager

>>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>>> 901 P Street, Suite 154-A

>>>> Sacramento, CA 95814

>>>> [REDACTED]

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> --

>>> Jodie Filkins Webber

>>> Commissioner

>>> Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>> "Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

>>

>>

>>

>> --

>> Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner

>> California Citizens Redistricting Commission

>>

>> "Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"

>> www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov

>> (916) [REDACTED]

>

>

>
>
> --

> Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
> California Citizens Redistricting Commission
>
> "Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
> www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
> (916) [REDACTED]
>

--
Kirk E. Miller
Chief Counsel
Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA. 95814
[REDACTED] (o)
(916) [REDACTED]

--
Connie Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission

"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--
Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--
Raul Villanueva
Business Manager
Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814
[REDACTED]

--
Daniel M. Claypool

Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: [REDACTED]
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"

--
Raul Villanueva
Business Manager
Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814
[REDACTED]

--
Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--
Raul Villanueva
Business Manager
Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814
[REDACTED]

Barabba, Vincent <[REDACTED]> **Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 4:06 PM**
To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]> Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **Ontai, Lilbert** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, May 31, 2011 at 4:16 PM
Subject: Re: Commissioners needed to track line-drawing instructions
To: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Commissioners <[REDACTED]> Daniel Claypool <[REDACTED]> Kirk Miller
<[REDACTED]> "Villanueva, Raul" <[REDACTED]> Janeece Sargis
<[REDACTED]>

I'll do San Diego. Gil

On Tue, May 31, 2011 at 10:43 AM, DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hello fellow Commissioners:

In consultation with Chair Connie, Q2 and other CRC staff, we have recognized the need for more specific tracking of our line-drawing instructions to the mappers. Suggestions have included having a 24-hr turn-around on transcripts or to hire a dedicated individual to track the substantive details about our directions to the line drawers. This issue is currently on the Tech. Adv. Comm. agenda but will not be addressed formally until after our first day of line drawing (late Weds.).

Therefore, the recommendation is that we Commissioners take responsibility for taking notes during the line drawing sessions of June 1 and 2 to be used as reference for the mappers, if needed. This would entail having at least 2 Commissioners taking notes on areas/regions in which they are familiar for the AD, SD and CD maps. (The idea for having at least 2 commissioners is to be able to cross reference all the information we will be discussing and to more accurately catch the nuances of our discussions.)

I would like to ask for volunteers for this responsibility as well as the areas in which you feel comfortable taking notes by **THIS EVENING (7:00/8:00-ish)**. Once I have all the Commissioner volunteers I will put together a list of designated Commissioners and the area(s) to be tracked as well as any additional volunteers needed to fill in regional gaps. Again, the hope is to have another method for tracking directions to line-drawers in the next round of draft maps. Many thanks for your help in this important task.

Michelle

--

Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Gil Ontai, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation -- Democracy at Work"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>
To: "Barabba, Vincent" <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 4:22 PM

Thanks Commissioner. Please send a note indicating when you are complete with each PRA

Regards,

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Lonni Leitch
Assistant Commission Liaison
Citizens Redistricting Commission
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] cell

"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

STURGES PRA #13 - Fwd: Clarifications on my mapping comments

DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]>
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Aug 18, 2011 at 11:15 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun, May 29, 2011 at 9:27 PM
Subject: Re: Clarifications on my mapping comments
To: "DiGuilio, Michelle" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> Connie Galambos-Malloy <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>

I don't think it's a significant legal issue since the video is the official record. However, it may be very inconvenient.

--}cyn

On Sun, May 29, 2011 at 8:31 PM, DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I agree that this is a significant issue, especially since it's a paper trail from one of our attorneys. I emailed Connie on this earlier in the hopes that she could address this issue as the incoming Chair. Again, I could be available tomorrow at any time for a conference call. Thanks!
Michelle

On Sun, May 29, 2011 at 8:06 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi, Karin--

Unfortunately, I stopped taking notes at some point, but my memory is quite good. We can resolve any discrepancies on a conference call.

--}cyn

On Sun, May 29, 2011 at 7:33 PM, Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]> wrote:

hi commissioner dai
i am happy to report that we did not get a ticket and that we had all of the equipment back in the office at 2am!

thank you for these notes and clarifications. we would REALLY APPRECIATE your notes from the past two days. my people have voiced concern with ms johnston's notes and our's are rather thin.

happy memorial day weekend to all of you

.
karin

On Sun, May 29, 2011 at 12:53 PM, Dai, Cynthia <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hey, Karin--

Hopefully you made it home without a ticket 😊!

I just wanted to clarify my comments yesterday:

- On the comment about keeping Parkfield in Monterey County with SLO County, I hadn't considered the fact that we would then have to consider retrogression for the SLO County district. If that is problematic, I would say don't worry about it for Assembly if we end up fixing it in the larger Senate coastal district. That is consistent with our "spread the pain" philosophy.
- Likewise on the 29 Palms area: I seem to recall that you were not able to include all of Coachella Valley in the district, so adding this area might make it worse. Since only a few people mentioned this area (who were from neighboring towns), I would say only encroach into San Bernardino county if you need the population. I don't recall hearing about Idyllwild, but it's up on a mountain and probably could go to Hemet rather than Coachella Valley.
- Per our visualization on p. 6 of our wrap-up for Regions 1,2, and 3, it looked like it might have been perfect if we added the southern part of the Salton Sea area for an Assembly district. Did that screw up the San Diego district? If so, it seems like we kept the Salton Sea whole in the larger districts, so it's OK.

I am copying the Chair and Technical Lead on these comments, and I'm sure that we'll discuss these options on the record at our upcoming line-drawing meetings. I also wanted to express my concern that some of Marian Johnston's notes for our past sessions did not seem completely accurate to me. I'm not sure what the lead time is on our session transcripts, but I'm sure any one of us would be happy to complete your notes if you are unsure in the upcoming days.

Thanks for working so hard over the holiday weekend,
--}cyn

--

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

--
Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"*Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!*"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

STURGES PRA #13 - Fwd: Directions to line drawers 6-1-11

[REDACTED]

DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]>
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Aug 18, 2011 at 11:17 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Karin Mac Donald** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2011 at 11:28 PM
Subject: Re: Directions to line drawers 6-1-11 ([REDACTED])
To: [REDACTED]

commissioner diguilio,
thank you SO MUCH for these notes. we are so grateful! !!!

.
karin

On Wed, Jun 1, 2011 at 5:28 PM, <[REDACTED]> wrote:



I've shared [Directions to line drawers 6-1-11](#)

Click to open:

[Directions to line drawers 6-1-11](#)

Google Docs makes it easy to create, store and share online documents, spreadsheets and presentations.



--
Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]



Leitch, Lonni <[REDACTED]>

STURGES PRA #13 - Fwd: line drawing direction please!

DiGuilio, Michelle <[REDACTED]>
To: Lonni Leitch <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Aug 18, 2011 at 11:17 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dai, Cynthia** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun, May 29, 2011 at 10:09 PM
Subject: Re: line drawing direction please!
To: jaime clark <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED], Karin Mac Donald <[REDACTED]>, Stan Forbes <[REDACTED]>

Jaime--

Since I may not be awake for the call, here is what I recall:

- Yes on splitting Placer and El Dorado if needed. Keep Lake Tahoe area intact (with Truckee). Auburn and north are more rural. Folsom and south are more suburban/urban.
- Use CAPAFR guidance on keeping South Sac and Elk Grove together
- On region 5, the preference was to keep with SB county with SLO county and split Ventura at the East County line. However, I think you will run into the same problem all the other mappers did if you have to start at the Monterey county line and don't cross over the mountains. I think you'll have to see what happens with Tamina's and Nicole's regions.

--}cyn

On Sun, May 29, 2011 at 5:00 PM, jaime clark <[REDACTED]> wrote:

hi commissioners!

i am writing to clarify the commission's directions on a few areas in regions 5, 6, and 9. i have some specific questions and some more fuzzy areas that i'd just like to be sure are all squared away in my head. mostly these are questions about what the direction is for each plan set concerning specific counties. please have a look and get back to me at your earliest convenience.

* re: sacramento, san joaquin, and stanislaus county: i know there was lots of general direction, and especially concerning sj county i have a good grasp of where splits can be if needed (big thanks to commissioner diguilio!). i just want to be clear that the general direction was that western placer and el dorado counties can be added to the greater sacramento metro area if needed?also, am i correct in remembering that the visualization that split the city of sacramento to add south sac to elk grove was the preferred option? are there any more specific directions that you can pass my way?

* concerning the tri-county area (region v): i think crc wanted to maintain the east/west ventura split for ADs, and to add the northern, less populous regions of santa barbara county to slo county. is this correct? also if i remember correctly, the commission directed that the east/west ventura split does not necessarily need to be maintained in SD and CD plans, but that everythng should be moved south into la county as needed. oh! and to keep parkfield (southern monterey county south of san ardo) with north slo county! ***this is all going to be greatly effected by the bay area through monterey county and what happens up there. slo is in a tough spot because of its proximity to the section 5 counties and due to its low population. keeping this in mind, i will follow these directions as much as possible and we'll see what happens.

if i can think of anything else i will email you again

thank you both so much for your guidance, i greatly appreciate it!
hope your days are going well and that you are resting.

thanks again!
jaime

--

Cynthia Dai, Commissioner
California [Citizens Redistricting Commission](#)
"Fair Representation--Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov



--

Michelle R. DiGuilio, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation - Democracy at Work!"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov





Leitch, Lonn <[REDACTED]>

Sturges5 PRA#13 Notes

Ontai, Lilbert <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2011 at 2:23 PM

To: Lonn Leitch <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Marian Johnston <[REDACTED]>

Lon, attached is file on all my notes taken June 1 & 2, inclusive of May 29 to June 4, as requested by Mr. Sturges. Please confirm you received it. Thanks

--

Gil Ontai, Commissioner
California Citizens Redistricting Commission
"Fair Representation -- Democracy at Work"
www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov
[REDACTED]

**Sacramento June 1 & 2.doc**

10K

Gil Ontai
Sacramento
June 1, 2010

1. Avoid use of race as principal factor for COI decision: 14th Amendment
COI: share soci/economic interests:
drill down to what makes a community of interest:
school, language, history, business, geography, churches,
Where Section 2 and 5 are concerned: more room to use race

2. Retrogression: minority groups are smaller than the benchmarks;
Merced/Stockton Section 5: Asian 11% Stockton down to 5%
If no reduction: then no regression; standard is met.
If small changes less than benchmark: then totality is required
where?
voting patterns?
act cohesively?
tend to vote similarly with other minority groups?
point of views from Asian community?
gov't officials familiar with this group?

Do you have obligation in the specific county vs. can one go over to another county? Risky: implies you can do whatever in Stockton?

API "finger" has API: 11% to 5% if finger is removed. "Ability to elect" does not apply to Section 5:
Section 5 require that minority has ability to participate. Don't know how small is small: totality is required.

Totality: compactness, etc., helps

Increasing one minority group at the expense of the other: risky
Totality: Especially if other areas increased

If loss of one and gain of another give no choices; then CRC needs to explicitly explain
What if both minority groups vote as a coalition: totality
Public support and comments will be necessary. Will give thought.
Commissioner's should make their own statements on minority groups, geography, etc.

3. AA LA

Read report for justification for existing lines: adjusted of equal pop. but kept lines:

No existing legal justification

Section 5 argument, but does Section 5 does not exist in LA

No previous polarization claims

Therefore: no requirement to form a minority-majority black group, so there fore must use compactness, contiguity, socio-economic factors: racially polarized study may help.

Clean slate approach: non-Section 2 approach? Follow strictly CA constitutional law?

Based on current history: no justification for AA minority-majority districts?

consistency throughout all district discussions

repa may be needed., focus on COI for now, then adjust if later if Section 2 emerges.

Importance of public testimony for AA district?

Important, but focus on COI issues, but not focus on racial group strength.

4. How many Section 2 in SD, Imperial, Chochella Area:

-Section 2 for Chula Vista, National City, Imperial: Section 2 Lation 50%?

-Section 2 hwy 8 to imperial; needs to make Section 8 deciaion : Latino 50%

-Cochella Valley- Imperial Valley: geographicly compact with Latino 50% or more. |
(potentially: lower riverside, chochelloa, salton sea area, imperial county)

Miller: Current draft maps: process?

Documentation of COI is important:

boundaries?

underlying basis?

Comments on visualizations made already?

none for now.

Public Comment: AA, Alice Hoffman, president made presentation to keep the current boundaries in the LA area.

Deguillio: Line Drawing Tracking Procedures:

1, name of visualizaiton?

2. comments on why choose or not choose visualtions?

3. capture nuances?

Line Drawing Map Session:

Karin, Jaimie, Tamina

Definition of Benchmark: 2000 boundaries using current 2010 census data

Merced: Section 5 Areas:

Kings: Section 5 Areas:

Monterey Section 5 areas:

Yuba: Section 5 areas:

Potential Section 2 District:

Assembly

Fresno County:

Senate VAP:

Merced-Kings: OK

Monterey:

Yuba:

Congressional Districts:

Merced Section 5:

Kings:

Monterey:

Yolo-Yuba:

Other Areas:

Assembly Districts:

North-Coastal:

Coastal District: Rixdelmendo ok

Rixmtcap

Napalake

Sacramento Area:

Rixuba

Rviwestsac

Rivissacelkgr

Econstrcosta

Pittsantioch

Rviestandesh

Greater Bay Area:

Ealameda

Wcontracosta

Hayward

Milperry

SanJose

Rviimont

Silconval

Ssanmateo

Nsanmateo

Rvifresno

Rvitulare

Rvibakers

Rvslosb

Rvsbwvent

Congressional Districts:

Northcoast page 22

RXIMTCAP page 22

RXIYUBA page 22

YoloSolonap page 23 (Pittsburgh and are split)

SACCity page 23

SACCounty

Sanjoaquin 21

Stanislaus County 21
Contra Costa pag 19
Oakland pg. 19
Alameda
San Jose (explore removing finger - Fremont)
San Joaquin page 21 & 25
Monterey, page 20
San Mateo page 25 (SF area: Dai and Ancheta will recommend)
Foothills page 21
Merced
Fresno, page 20
Tulare, page 20 (short 80,000) Nicole and Alex to work on
SLOSB, page 24
East Ventura, pg. 24

Senate Districts:
(see final maps)

Kolkey available next Tuesday, 6/7/11

Northern Commissioners to submit notes to Karin by 10pm tonight or earlier.

Southern California Mapping:

6/2/11

Committee Reports:

Communications: Wilcox to release 4 part press release
6/10 to make formal press release in the Capitol with media attendance
Training on 6/8 by Wilcox
Commissioners to be briefed on local district maps and official explanations
Website and publications: re-visit the listing of CBO into two categories to

remove bias

Legal: Post 8/15/11:

gag order for consultants
staff gag order?
commissioners shall use "canned" speech to avoid conflicts or litigation fodder
strong guidelines: no publications first two years?
vetted speeches by council
draft of policy by staff with review by Jodie

IFB for racially polarized voting analysis (pva)
draft by staff with review by Jodie

Finance: 3 year funds have been transferred into our account
Forbe and Barraba to review and finalized draft scope of work for the in-line consultant IFB
Will hire notetaker
New office: FULLY FUNCTIONAL
Google Doc for chairs and leads
-each lead create a google doc by Sunday, starting today's issues.
-advisory committee meetings: venue and time permitting.
-put dates

- cc entire commission
- instructions will be sent out

Security line item costs

Financial report made - Debra

Inappropriate public comments: commissioners shall access, but not public

Code of conduct, page 6, communications and chain of command: miss-communication and mis-understanding

-concerns/questions from other commissions regarding staff and consultants shall be directed to chair or vice-chair

-motion passed: no wrong doing occurred; ammended by Ward: "accept the investigation and the results of the allegation was disproven."

-Admin Committee to revise code of conduct to clearly identify procedure for personnel claims.

Line Drawing (Continued):

LA: VRA questions on 3 district area

San Diego

Region 1SD: District as drawn is still under consideration for legal opinion: will make preliminary opinion/report

As applied to Section2: compactness not sufficient; however, COI is supportable.

CA compactness definition:

COI: may form compactness

geographic and density form long chain along the south of the county.

Are we missing a section 2 by going to Imperial? Should be pursued?

Pomona Valley

Do additional CVAP and RPA: close to Section 2 conditions

Riverside - Cochella Valley

GENERAL MEETING JUNE 2, 2011

PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Draft map communication strategy --

different documents - narrative

-talking points

-shorter message

-press release

-press conference on June 10 ?

-potential for power point presentation - concern re legal issues

-legal request of Miller - re post-draft map vs. what to do / say b/w 8/1/-8/14 and post 8/15.

- Miller: so many facts

Website -

COB references - Connie agrees re consider taking off the website and MB agrees that early references to the advocacy sources

-Raya is lead for public info

Legal Advisory Committee:

Publication issues

-lots of interest what we have done

-possible clearance by counsel during litigation

-pre-litigation stage - MB - what you say can be a part of the litigation - extremely careful of statements by any commissioner .

-we should not have self-imposed gag order - clear by counsel - Angelo thinks that conflict to consider writing/publication re his participation on the commission-ethical issue.

-consistent policy for staff as well

-prepare a canned speech vetted by counsel - trained to give

-Peter possible strong policy against

-does not favor black and white rules re process

During litigation - cleared by counsel -

Post-litigation publication issue - will be address by Miller or Johnston

IFB - RPV - DGS has provided guidance re additional changes - but not released yet and will follow up with interagency agreement.

Finance and Administration -

Creating a google doc for each sub-committee lead to be caught up - transferring tasks to the next lead - share with all

-Policy manual - communications protocol - chain of command and how issue evolve and do some fine tuning -

Administrative inquiry - comm and status

-thorough and unbiased investigation into matter

-result of inquiry that satisfactory conclusion reached - miscommunication and misunderstanding .

-provided pertinent information and responsibility - and satisfactorily resolved and no impropriety for others involved.

-Forbes - what caused investigation to commence? - indiv comm reached out to counsel . -

-Implications to negative report? no answer provided by Miller

Miller - required follow up - based on information received

Dia - personnel issue - claims privacy matters - not confuse issue - to allege privacy

Ancheta - chair and vice chair have power to do that between meetings - no question of authority of chair and vice chair -

Michelle - dont need full comm - regardless of the allegation must be investigated - process has to play out - full comm not privy - should not have aired it publicly like I did

MB - when a report comes to her - that potential exposes liability to comm - worked in -- legally she had the responsibility to advise of the complaint - conferred with chair and vice chair and was told to contact Miller -- (but Angelo and Barabba looked at one another and do not concur with MB re telling her to contact Miller) - Should deal with such confidentially - as required

JR - troubled by what should have been a confidential matter - claims Ward must have acquiesced in disclosure of investigation - warranted attention of legal counsel - not legal advisory committee -- close drawer and let it go. Need immediate action - handled as best it could since she was present -

Yao - no one questioning intent or practice - concern is that full comm needs to be aware - using privacy as an excuse in our structure is not going to work.

Aguirre - confidential issue --

Forbes - motion - comm accept the results of the investigation and the allegations had no basis matter

Miller - not a personnel matter --

Ward -- assumptions about motives causes problems - etc. etc - claims no understanding

Public Comment -

50% compact districts for AA

-AA lawyer letter read -- Thornburg v. Gingles - sec. 2 - min must be able to demonstrate that whites vote to block -- numbers show that there is no compact 50% area - and white voters do not vote as a block - no legal basis to conclude that sec 2 district required --

Map drawing and visualizations for Reg. 1, 2, 3,4

Los Angeles -

Lancaster - pg 16 - goes over to Adelanto

Santa Clarita - p. 16 - includes chatsworth, porter ranch and portions of granada hills - bottom border is Roscoe Blvd. -- if need to include all of catasic then pull from the bottom west corner of district --

-Foothill district -- splits seven cities - need to consider including LaCanada FLintridge areas

-Burbank - Glendale - does not include Pasadena -- so may consider shifting to include, but then have issue with Beverly Hills and Sherman Oaks - so rework Los Feliz -

East San Gabriel -Covina - all cities split - look at CA Institutes dist 52 - to allow for greater integrity of city.

-West San Gabriel Valley - API Sec 2 area -- clean up bottom of district -

Whittier-Pico Rivera - CVAP - 61% - over-pop so may be able to put people into the W San Gabriel Valley

Downey - Norwalk - possible sec. 2 - for LAT --

Brown to comment - on Whittier-Pico, Downey-Norwalk, South Gate - Lakewood , Downtown - Boyle Heights -- -- Brown did recommend that we unpack - he has a copy and maybe he can weigh in .

Brown - the districts that are drawn now are not required to be drawn that way

under section 2 --

-drawn to reduce the overcompensation of minority group but not required to be drawn this way - and no reason it cant be drawn in this manner.

South LA - Compton /Carson area

- not a sec 2 area -

-if not required for AA - then the comm is free to formulate a district based on other criteria (not race) -

San Diego --

Pomona Valley/ONT - splits Rancho Cucamonga -- sec. 2 and RPV mwill need to be considered
-split county

Rialto/Fontana - may be a sec. 2 and may need RPV

Santa Ana District -- page 14

-Now 45.03% -- at first blush not sec. 2 -- may need further analysis of CVAP

AHM -

LAT not contiguous so taken from

-not a potential sec. 2 area --

original alternative did not meet the first gingles criteria --

Summary Notes: ANA/AHM

1. Artesia/Cerritos to included with La Palma and Cypress into OC district
2. Santa Ana - District - sec. 2 - Q2 to consider further analysis of CVAP for area
3. respect Fullerton/Placentia / Yorba Linda/Brea
4. Put Anaheim with anaheim hills for populationr reasons
4. increase population of WEST by taking from the small south/west area of Santa Ana.

Westminster - WEST

- Combining Buena Park with AHM and include AHM hills for additional pop

-Include Artesia /Cerritos with La Palma to Garden Grove

-When doing above and need more population include Los Alamitos and Rossmoor

-Orange - if need more pop based on the CVAP pop -- ok to go to Costa Mesa

-

COASTALOC & SOC

-Shifting down -- extra pop move toward the coastal with I5 as the demarcation and push on the western side and then eastern up to tustin into TUST district

DBRHCH -- KEEP IT THE WAY IT IS.

-take out Brea and Fullerton and AHM Hills

- But issue is where we get the additional population if take out Yorba Linda and AHM Hills -boxed in with PMO/ONT and Chino and Whittier/Pico
- Dia - does it make since for Diamond Bar to Migrate west at all and if not then musst go south and then cant do the Fullerton/Placentia / Yorba Linda .

-maybe consider splitting AHM to include more with ANA --
-consider going into Whittier ?

Leave the Artesia/cerritos in and then leave everything else alone --

SUMMARY -- Move Artesia/cerritos 14 -15 -- Consider moving Whittier in and La Habra Heights --See Dia's suggestion --

Mono- SBR - LEAVE ALONE

- p. 11-12
-Hesperia Split
-but keep as is for now

SBCUCA - p. 10 -- LEAVE ALONE

Rancho Cucamonga split three times -consider lessening splits -- if remove then look toward Mentone and keep 29 palms in SBR county

1. remove Rancho Cucamonga - move to the West for foothill district
 2. include 29 palms, Mentone, Oak Glen at the county line to maintain those cities in SBR county
 3. go south to Menifee and pick up population to French Valley and Temecula
- CANNOT DO IT --

METROMV - ok

RIVJUR - ok

MURTEM - ok

SBR - CD

- Pg 23 -
- put in the unincorp area of fontana - take out redlands and then increase other distr with calimesa

ONT - CA p. 23

-swap out upland and chino hills - and san antoinio height - consider making chino hills whole

RVMV -p. 23

- pick up population southeast into corona

COACH

- OK

PRS - p. 24

-splits temecula - make up population by adding more when consider adding corona pop at the north.

WESTGG - p. 27

- put ANA with this district

SACOAST –

-keep coastal

-take santa ana out put with WEST GG

SOC - P.27

-include the other cities of south OC to county line - NEED TO SEE HOW MANY DISTRICTS SOUTH OC AN OC GET WITH POPULATION.

-

IN LINE PROCESS REVIEW:

Definition:

After the last business meeting it seemed to me that there is no united vision amongst the commission for what this inline process review should practically look like.

After many discussions it seemed that there was a common thread of wanting an impartial referee who can be called in to help broker solutions to mapping spotted issues at the commissions request

It seems to me, however that this in line review can serve as an invaluable resource in validating this citizens commission, as an institution, as well as being our best weapon at defending our maps and achieving public buy in.

I also think an inline review used maximally offers us an opportunity to take transparency to a WHOLE new level!

We are setting precedence across the nation as a governmental entity, and we have the means via this peer review OPPORTUNITY, to further distinguish ourselves as the model of what transparency in government can be.

In the Air Force we had a common phrase “who’s checking the checker”. I know we are all proud of our process and the work we’re doing. Why NOT highlight this effort by volunteering to have a 3rd party neutral inspect, advise and report that the very processes we have so deliberately employed meet and / or exceed the expectations of what the public at large, commission staff and we Commissioners desired.

So application of this would consist of bringing this peer reviewer on board between the 1st and 2nd drafty map release dates.

This person would be responsible to review and report to the commission their assessment of our major map drawing processes such as:

- review commission process for instructing line drawers
-
- evaluate sufficiency of the direction provided to our technical and vra consultants. Is it clear or contradictory or inconsistent?
-
- Evaluate how instruction/guidance and direction is communicated amongst commission and various map making staff.
-
- Evaluate how vra and technical consultants process and apply commission direction/guidance/instruction
-

- Validate VRA and technical consultant work product for sufficiency w/ commission instruction.
-
- Lastly, be that 3rd party neutral, deliberation support consultant to be called in to make recommendations on commission spotted issues.

This inline review concept also save the commission and thus the state \$\$ and justifies post-august commission activity as the work product of an active, in or during – process review will allow for a thorough and cost efficient Post-mordem of this historic commission and its procedures. It serves to lay the foundation for this commission to improve itself, lobby for necessary changes for next decade and justify release of funds for post map commission activity.

For all of these reasons, I hope the commission will carefully consider adopting a concept of in-line review that contains the elements I have outlined, one that maximizes this commissions opportunity for success.

CA area	District Name	Details about the District	** Technical Notes**	** Legal notes **
page 12	SILICONVAL	split in cupertino (pop. based 44,000 in blue SILICONVAL and 5000 in willow (SSANMATEO)	split in cupertino (pop. based 44,000 in blue SILICONVAL and 5000 in willow (SSANMATEO)	is there some way to pick up the Cupertino pop (5,000) somewhere - maybe the southern San Jose district
page 12	SSANMATEO	northern cities in this district were kept whole; exception of Half Moon Bay	clean up Half Moon Bay and Cupertino splits Cal Institute and Cal Conservation League have other ways to split SF that might filter into San Mateo in a better way; looking into city of SF planning data on neighborhoods;	
page 11	NSANMATEO	includes a small section of southern SF	for SF: Angelo and Cynthia could look at SF equivalency files to determine the boundary options for SF to give to Q2	
page 11	2 SF areas			
page 9	FOOTHILLS	Central Placer & El Dorado and Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Madera	can you put 14,000 of cameron park back into FOOTHILLS district and do something with the 43,000 in madera city (?) area - south/west part of RVIFRESNO district - that could be included in the valley district	
page 14	RVIFRESNO	Nor. Kern - east of 99, Tulare Co, small northern Kern County communities		
page 14	RVITULARE			
page 14	RVIBAKERS	remainder of kern co, west of i-5, remainder of bakersfield and ridgecrest included	look into the MONO/INYO/HIGH DESERT district that has impacts on the eastern part of this district (per Karin's direction)	
page 15	RVSLOS	splits the city of Lompoc and southern boundary in north of goleta	can you keep Lompoc whole by shifting Santa Ynez and Buellton south?; can you split the correctional facility instead of a city?	
page 15	RVSWVENT	Problem area for the splits that might be required	NEED feedback from VTA cities as to where the split should happen: either through Onard with Fort Huachuca and El Rio into E. Via Co. or Santa Paula/Fillmore/Piru into E. Via. Co.	
CONGRESS				
page 22	NORTHCOST	North Coast Counties, including Marin and split at Sonoma Co. Placer/El Dorado split is for Tahoe; Grass Valley and Nevada city together;		
page 22	RXIMTCAP			
page 23	RXYIBA	already discussed it in Sec. 5		
page 23	SOLANO SACRAMENTO	Solano and a bit of southern Yolo Co a touch of Napa, and into Sac. Co. with Walnut Grove, Isleton and Pittsburg, in Contra Costa	problem of Pittsburg (50,000+) in this district and out of Contra Costa - no real place to make up the population difference; take from Oakly	
page 21	SAN JOAQUIN	has lodi, stockton, down until mantecca (not sure about lathrop) plus eastern contra costa (no gail)	Not much to do except to take from Discovery Bay, Oakly, etc. some pop on western boundary may change.	
page 21	STANSILAU	all Stan. Co. and parts of So. SJ CO including Tracy, (modesto not split for CD like before)		
page 25	CONTRA COASTA	San Ramon valley north through lamirinda north and west over through hercules and to top of oakland area	el cerrito in contra costa so maybe they can get richmond in (maria)	
page 19	OAKLAND	balance of oakland	clean up castro valley end of the district (connie)	
page 19	ALAMEDA	Fremont finger - split on the western edge of the city of fremont on the other side of rowak	** ISSUE of Alameda being an east-west district (which allows for oakland to be kept whole and counties to be more intact) - CAN SOLICIT input from these areas here; Issue of keeping Newark and Fremont and union City together? (Connie's question); should we look at rotating the district from tri-county up north and then push south from hercules/bridge area and work down through oakland (but would be split - pain issue) and split Alameda County around Fremont)	
page 25	SAN JOSE	(good from Angelo)		
page 20	MONTEREY	(good to go)		
page 25	SANMATEO	(good from Vinez)		
page 25	SAN FRANCISCO	northern San Mateo and a bit into south SF	Cynthia and Angelo will continue to work on these areas with mappers	
page 21	FOOTHILLS	mostly good - details need to be worked out		
page 20	FRESNO	the usual foothill counties		
page 20	TULARE	rest of Fresno along 99 (outside of Merced sec. 5) and the cities of Visalia and Hanalei		
page 20	KINGS (sec. 5)			
page 24	SLOS	SLO, SB and Ojai	put Ojai with SB or take a part of western VTA city to be SB	
page 24	EASTVENT	over populated by ~110,000	take off Simi Valley (based on population) with Santa Clarita	
SENATE				
page 18	NORTHCOST	part of Solano Co and not Marin		
page 18	YUBA - sec. 5	Butte is included with colusa / glenn buddies on this one (with a large percentage of the pop)		
		REMEMBER: that nesting is a place to start but then mappers can clean up the lines and the pain of nesting		
		NESTING ADS: Solano and Marin AD together, Cent. sac. & El Dorado; West Sac & SACELKOR; Stockton and stansilau; foothill with eastern foothills;		
		Nesting ADSs: richmond & oakland; pitburg/contra costa and east alameda; west alameda/hayward & milpitas and berryessa; 2 SFs together; san mateo county together; ??coast 2 districts and 2 inland districts together - issues of sec 5??;		

Map Drawing Notes Re: 6/2/2011

ANAFULL & DBRHCH

1. Artesia/Cerritos to included with La Palma and Cypress into OC district
- 2.. Respect Fullerton/Brea/Placentia / Yorba Linda by removing/swaping from DBRHCH - rotate the population counterclockwise picking up Whittier with COI of La Habra Heights and La Habra and possibly La Mirada-- allowing Artesia/Cerritos to rotate into OC -keeping Anaheim whole with Buena Park
3. Put Anaheim with Anaheim hills for population reasons
4. Increase population of WEST by taking from the small south/west "circle" area of Santa Ana.

WEST-

1. Remove Buena Park and combine with Anaheim and include Anaheim Hills for additional pop
2. Include Artesia /Cerritos with La Palma to Garden Grove
3. When doing above and need more population include Los Alamitos and Rossmoor

SANTAANA -

1. Santa Ana - District - sec. 2 - Q2 to consider further analysis of CVAP for area
2. Orange - if need more pop based on the CVAP population -- ok to go south to northern Costa Mesa

COASTALOC & SOC

1. With removal of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor from COASTALOC, consider adding west side of Dana Point nearest coast to add population- Shifting south along coast with I5 as the demarcation and push on the western side and then eastern up to Tustin into TUST district - upon shift do not cross 55 Freeway to the west and so do not add Santa Ana in TUST - ok to consider additional population of portions of Anaheim Hills with

TUST - look at 241 corridor/toll road.

METROMV - ok

RIVJUR - ok

MURTEM - ok

SBR - CD

1. Put in the unincorp area of Fontana into district take out Redlands and then increase district with Calimesa, Mentone area.

ONT - CD

1. Swap out Chino Hills for Upland and San Antonio Heights

RVMV -CD

1. Pick up population southeast into corona

COACH-CD - OK

PRS -CD

1. When subtracting population of Corona to go into RVMV, add population at Temecula to keep Temecula in RIV county

WESTGG - CD

1. Remove Santa Ana from SACOAST and put into this district

SACOAST -CD

1. Keep coastal - take out santa ana out put with WEST GG - increase population by increasing district south-coastal from Newport Beach south along coast to Dana Point - along 5 Freeway

SOC - CD

1. Consider whether area has sufficient population for 2 CD with Central OC moving into Orange and Anaheim Hills.

2. Keep all South OC cities in OC CD district - do not cross to San Diego

ALL OTHER DISTRICTS NOT REFERENCED HEREIN WERE DEEMED SUFFICIENT WITH NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES.

Map Drawing Notes Re: 6/2/2011

ANAFULL & DBRHCH

1. Artesia/Cerritos to included with La Palma and Cypress into OC district
- 2.. Respect Fullerton/Brea/Placentia / Yorba Linda by removing/swaping from DBRHCH - rotate the population counterclockwise picking up Whittier with COI of La Habra Heights and La Habra and possibly La Mirada-- allowing Artesia/Cerritos to rotate into OC -keeping Anaheim whole with Buena Park
3. Put Anaheim with Anaheim hills for population reasons
4. Increase population of WEST by taking from the small south/west "circle" area of Santa Ana.

WEST-

1. Remove Buena Park and combine with Anaheim and include Anaheim Hills for additional pop
2. Include Artesia /Cerritos with La Palma to Garden Grove
3. When doing above and need more population include Los Alamitos and Rossmoor

SANTAANA -

1. Santa Ana - District - sec. 2 - Q2 to consider further analysis of CVAP for area
2. Orange - if need more pop based on the CVAP population -- ok to go south to northern Costa Mesa

COASTALOC & SOC

1. With removal of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor from COASTALOC, consider adding west side of Dana Point nearest coast to add population- Shifting south along coast with I5 as the demarcation and push on the western side and then eastern up to Tustin into TUST district - upon shift do not cross 55 Freeway to the west and so do not add Santa Ana in TUST - ok to consider additional population of portions of Anaheim Hills with

TUST - look at 241 corridor/toll road.

METROMV - ok

RIVJUR - ok

MURTEM - ok

SBR - CD

1. Put in the unincorp area of Fontana into district take out Redlands and then increase district with Calimesa, Mentone area.

ONT - CD

1. Swap out Chino Hills for Upland and San Antonio Heights

RVMV -CD

1. Pick up population southeast into corona

COACH-CD - OK

PRS -CD

1. When subtracting population of Corona to go into RVMV, add population at Temecula to keep Temecula in RIV county

WESTGG - CD

1. Remove Santa Ana from SACOAST and put into this district

SACOAST -CD

1. Keep coastal - take out santa ana out put with WEST GG - increase population by increasing district south-coastal from Newport Beach south along coast to Dana Point - along 5 Freeway

SOC - CD

1. Consider whether area has sufficient population for 2 CD with Central OC moving into Orange and Anaheim Hills.

2. Keep all South OC cities in OC CD district - do not cross to San Diego

ALL OTHER DISTRICTS NOT REFERENCED HEREIN WERE DEEMED SUFFICIENT WITH NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES.

St

Commissioner Raya, response to Sturges PRA

June 1 Sacramento Business Meeting

George Brown:

RACE

(1) use of race evaluating COI

Avoid as principal factor becs SC interp of 14th Am: can't use race to classify

Go below level of ethnicity as description: culture, traditions, schools, churches, language, employment

When conclude area is not a sec 2 area, need good record to support our decision, i.e. race isn't the only factor used

(2) sec 5 retrogression issue: evaluation of min groups that are smaller percentage in covered jurisdiction and benchmark district, and in new district there is difference (Merced/Stockton area, Asians, remove Stockton finger)

Burden of proof we are not diminishing political power

Georgia v Ashcroft: if no reduction in min voting strength, no retrogression, sec 5 standard is met

Easy case is when % in proposed district is greater than benchmark

Re small changes, need TOC analysis, look at voting history, where is group located? Does group act politically cohesively, vote similarly? Or are they distinct groups that don't?

Do they vote similarly w/other min groups in same jurisdiction?

*need further info frm groups and maybe local officials

Q: MDG: is there obligation to focus solely on min group voting strength in covered county? Or have to consider entire benchmark district that crosses through the county?

Is there % pop lower than what's needed "ability to elect", do you not have to worry?

That's term of art, 50%+; we don't know how small is too small.

Investigate TOC to see what level of effectiveness for Asians previously

VB: if we remove finger and meet all other criteria, ds that meet TOC test?

PY: if can show total minorities have significant gain, or one group has big gain, does that meet TOC?

A: TOC analysis can consider this, but, boosting one group that already has advantage, but cut other, that doesn't meet retrogression

CD:

Imagine how we will defend maps to DOJ?

JR: is evidence of coalition voting part of analysis?

A: 2 Qs 1) where is Asian community geographically? Are they cohesive? If yes, leads one way

2) are Latinos/Asians politically cohesive? If yes, reducing by 5% might be concern. If no, easier

Conclude it is not retrogressive under TOC

CGM: what other evid? A: commissioners can apply own knowl; need public outreach and input

St

AARC

Proposal: leave existing boundaries pretty much as they are, adjust for population

Does not see legal argument to support that

No evidence of racially polarized voting in AfAm community, may be some coalition voting
Have elected preferred candidates w/as little as 30% of VAP

Commission constrained by criteria in CA constitution

Only required to draw sec 2 district if meet Jingles

If no RPV, no requirement

If AARC correct, we need to draw lines on city boundaries, neighborhoods and COI

Do further analysis, incl RPV and further input frm interested persons

Sugg for Draft 1: don't consider poss sec 2 for now, apply constitutional criteria

Q: MB: if we start w/maintaining existing districts, are we at risk becs we're not supposed to consider?
"non-sec 2 approach"

A: wld be inconsistent w/what we've done, to start w/existing districts and modify from there

Part of Q is do existing districts meet constitutional criteria?

Sugg: be consistent in evaluating these districts

Q: AA: at some pt we have to determine whether there is risk of section 2 case? Presume there is no RPV
or TOC. Presuming we're not initially at risk?

A: CRC has to comply w/sec 2; in preparing maps, have to evaluate whether circumstances require
drawing maj/min district. In other areas, early assessment shows Jingles precondition met and need
further investigation. In LA, agree based on evid we have to date, not clear maj/min D required for
AfAm community particularly becs record is from AARC which argues it is not required. Dsnt relieve CRC
frm considering whether it is in fact required.

3 approaches: (1) yes, sec 2 (2) no sec 2 (3) rely solely on COI ALL subject to later adjustment

A: there isn't legal basis for considering % of CVAP to draw district

St

SAN DIEGO/COACHELLA/IMPERIAL

CRC needs to consider whether sec 2 area combining Chula Vista, appears compact

Border district raises valley east thru riverside co, around portions of salton sea, looks >75% total pop Latino but raises compactness question

Q:MB: shld we look at other ADs we've visualized, longer, sparse population, are we being consistent?

A: dnt know

KM: what, other than general description of process, shld accompany draft maps?

A: no opin, CRC will want some articulation to enhance public response

As part of overall process, shld document COIs identified, incl where we believe boundaries are, and underlying bases for district

Q: MDG: any comments on visualizations/preferences we did in Northridge?

A: no chance to look at updated visualizations recvd last night; will review; no comments on what we're working on today.

St

MAPPING INSTRUCTIONS

Section 5 Areas

Page 12 Merced AD:

LVAP 48.49, BVAP 3.24, AVAP 6.85

District has changed a little. Turlock has been added w/o diluting LVAP, fully intact

Only split is Modesto (99/132)

Entire Merced + western Stanislaus Co

Bmarks: LVAP 47.03, BVAP 6.21, AVAP 11.49

(reflects modifications from "preferred version" from prev mtg)

MDG: any way to have Modesto whole? i.e. 99 corridor option

A: need Stan Co area for LVAP

CD: compared bmark from CAPFR plan to this? A: no, but will ask HQ to do it

AA: any Modesto concentrations that would increase B and A #s?

A: spread out; no census tracts above 10% in northern Modesto

GA: what is dispersion of Asian comm around Modesto split?

MDG: this is area George was talking about.

VB: this looks like good TOC, can't make it better w/o violating other constitutional criteria

GO: "Asian" = API

CD: others came up w/same; follow counsel's sugg to get more info on B and API; ID what API communities are.

CGM: no specific instructions to mappers but need further research for post-draft maps

Page 17 Merced SD: (Green)

Addresses Merced and eastern Monterey benchmark issues, similar to bmark district lines

Fresno is only city split

County of Merced intact, splits Modesto, doesn't include Turlock (unlike AD), western Stanislaus, west flat Madera

San Benito Co intact, 101 corridor Monterey Co

Bmark: LVAP 53.48, BVAP 3.14, AVAP 5.64

LVAP 57.43, BVAP 3.27, AVAP 5.6

MDG: look into other split for Modesto, whether to include Salida (incl for pop)

Qs: to reduce green "finger"? A: wide split city of Fresno in 3 dists

GO: where is Hmong? A: can only show API, no breakdown Hmong; API in Fresno, highest % west of 99

SF: re fingers, could move @ 3500 people from end of finger into green to shorten finger

KMD: will take as sugg for next visualization

Summary: look at options to decrease finger and look at higher deviation in blue to get more compact, 99/41 area

Page 20 Merced CD

Flatlands of Madera, COI southern area of Fresno city

SF: can you eliminate finger, and go more along the 5? A: balancing between this and Kings sec 5 area; possibly cut off southern Fresno city and extend into Fresno Co elsewhere

Page 14: Kings County AD

All Kings Co intact, grabs along 99 corridor: Delano, McF, Wasco, Shafter

Kern Curl is wrapping around same as SD and CD

Southeast Bakersfield COI

LVAP 63.64, BVAP 7.33, AVAP 3.85

St

Bmarks

Page 20 Kings Co CD

Kings Co intact

Look at poss sec 2, LCVAP 49.25

MB: qstn reliability of CVAP

Page 13 Monterey County AD

Bmarks LVAP 19.86, BVAP 2.32, AVAP 7.76 (western Monterey Co)

LVAP 22.92, BVAP 2.28, AVAP 7.71

Includes all SC Co except Pajaro Valley and Interlaken

Eastern Monterey Co: incl Watsonville, Freedom, Interlaken, Gilroy, San Martin, Morgan Hill

LVAP 60.53 BVAP 2.3 AVAP 12.9 Bmarks: LVAP 60.93, BVAP 2.19, AVAP 10.91

Ends at Monterey Co line, dsnt go into SLO

PY: how close do we have to get? Analysis may not be doable befr 6/10. Propose for draft map, w/in .10% adeq until we can address slight differences.

VB: don't focus on particular deviation now. SF: let small diff go at this point

CD: if actual pop of min grp has changed becs of pop shift, and look at registration, may not be able to get higher unless go far afield to get pop. AA: in TOC analysis, big pop shift may justify

Page 16 Monterey SD

Northern area to Monterey border, no Santa Clara Co

Western side of Monterey, entire SLO and entire Santa Barbara Co, no part of Ventura Co(Los Padres NF)

MDG: access to Santa Clara Valley? Problematic to separate from rest of Ventura Co. A: not enough pop to stop at SLO

GA: COI Oxnard Plain/Hueneme, Santa Clara Valley (agric/Farm): work this in (pop 50K)

A: if direction to move Monterey Co line so, include Ojai? Split city of Ventura? To include 126 in eastern Ventura Co?

VB: nervous about splitting Monterey Bay in half. Did we have SD going north?

A: for AD and CD, yes; can try going north for SD

Direction: go north

VB: what wld happen if include all of Santa Cruz Co?

Page 20 Monterey Co CD

Includes part of southern Santa Cruz

Prev direction to include Scotts Valley

Santa Cruz city split 3x

Bmarks: LVAP 44.16, B2.5, A6.51

St

Page 6 Yuba County AD

Yolo Co split: ds not include Woodland, Davis, West Sacto; includes Esparto city and unincorp areas

Bmark: LVAP 11.72, BVAP 2.16, AVAP 3.37

Here: LVAP 17.72, BVAP 1.46, AVAP 5.5

(note MDG sent benchmarks by email)

CGM: how did you arrive at this re BVAP? A: similar to district created by direction in Noridge.

Color-coded areas, look for tracts to pick up to help w/bmark

Tracts sparse and below 10%

MDG re Butte:

Page 18 Yuba County SD: 2 northern ADS nested

Page 23 Yuba Co CD

Blue:

City of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati, Sonoma are split

Napa city, St Helena are split

Northern Yolo Co slightly difft split than SD and AD

(direction for foothill districts drives this)

SF: wld delete Sonoma/ esp Santa Rosa and add Woodland

Pop diffs??

CD: Butte Co left out of this central ag dist?

A: cld move napa, yolo w/co's surrounding Sacto (Solano, cc, san Joaquin)

SF: keep where it is so they're not lost in sacramento

MDG: not many choices w/o impacting other areas becs of Butte pop

Direction: include more of Yolo Co, take Sonoma, esp Santa Rosa out

Page 13 Fresno County AD

Moved to CVAP becs of Strickland case, shld look at 50%+ for CVAP districts

MDG: any other splits? A: none other than south part of Fresno along 99

GO: any reason why BVAP lower than CVAP? A: function of CVAP data (ie citizenship)

St

MAPPING OTHER

ADs

Mendocino Coastal: Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Sonoma

**Mountain Cap: Sisk, Modoc, Lassen, Plumas, Butte, Sierra, Nevada, Lake Tahoe area incl tracts so of lake
in El Dorado county
splits: placer & el dorado co's, no cities**

**NapaLake: intact counties, east of 101 Sonoma Co (Windsor, santa rosa, glen allen)
Sonoma Co split (2 splits, 3 districts)**

**Marin: intact co, southern Sonoma Co, southeastern tracts of Solano Co
Splits to meet population standards
MB: what was direction? A: don't go into San Fran; wine growing areas together
MDG: testimony? A: none on Solano County
SF: can we keep Fairfield whole? Napa wine north of Napa city
MDG: compare American Canyon to what was taken out of Fairfield?
CD: (public comment on 3 areas)
GO: when we split a city, where will we draw the lines around COIs?
KMD: public will tell comm when drafts are out
MB: useful to look at topography here?
Vallejo connected to East Bay corridor
Keeping Marin whole dsnt necess follow COIs
SF: catch ferry in Vallejo to SF; keep Travis w/Fairfield**

SacMetro/Placer:

**Includes Auburn split, Folsom, Orangevale, Citrus Heights split, Rio Linda split
Exchange cld be made Auburn into Foothills District
CD: is folsom dam area intact? A: yes**

El Dorado:

**Wilton included
3% deviation can be amended, going into rest of shingle springs**

WestSac: out to Davis

**SF: bring UCD into district; strong connections to sac; mondavi center
CD: extend to Dixon? SF: cld be but it's in Solano county
Direction: pick up pop**

Elk Grove:

SF: large Homng comm south Sac; if need pop pick up along Sacto River, down to Isleton

PittAntioch:

**Direct: bring Vallejo down w/Martinez
Galt/Lodi ID w/Stockton rather than so Sac
Make room for them w/Stockton**

St

Move Manteca down
Take Discovery Island & Bethel into Pitt/Ant

Stanislaus Co east:

+so and western SJ Co

Manteca 50K, if put in here wld exceed deviation standards

Move Tracy west? ie bedroom community for alameda?

MB: discuss COIs in this area.

MDG: up against Merced Co; Lathrop, Tracy have become commuter cities, but Tracy has agric still; econ downturn means they're changing back

French Camp south is area

County wld prefer to keep Tracy, not have Manteca; don't go over Altamont

Direct: incorp Manteca? Prob not. Way to get Lodi and Galt w/Stockton, change western side

Lodi closer to Stockton than Galt but Galt so connected to Lodi. Solicit info?

SF: does it make sense to move Tracy, Manteca w/Stockton?

KMD: confirmed testimony Galt cld go w/Lodi and Stockton

Alameda:

Splits Walnut Creek (64K pop)

Per COI, Lamorinda, Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton

MDG: don't go over Altamont

VB: agree

CD: explain Walnut Creek split: A: majority of city is in this district; split based on pop

West Contra Costa:

CC Co split; Oakland split, includes Emeryville, Piedmont, Richmond up to Carquinez bridge

Port Costa, county line

Take Oakland Hills as dividing line, south end of district is regional park

Oakland:

Will work on bringing piedmont in

CGM: Emeryville is shopping center for Oakland residents; Oak dsnt have much commercial

Can you combine Emery w/southern Oakland distrct?

Direct: include Emeryville 7K? Piedmont 11K? may change based on COI testimony

CGM: prioritize Emeryville over Piedmont becs of transp corridor, connection to port

KMD: can also play w/Berkeley city line

CGM: corridor into so & west Berk is historically AfAm community to preserve

Hayward San Leandro:

Splits: top of San Leandro, bottom of Fremont: based on keeping Newark/berryessa COI together

Questions: is san leandro evenly populated so any split wld be same?

CGM: look at transp issues shared

Milpberry:

Milpitas to Berryessa COI

Takes rest of Fremont, Newark, parts of SJ to Berryessa

AA: what boundaries for Berryessa? A: street boundaries from COI testimony

St

San Jose:

Western Monterey/Santa Clara:

Silicon Valley:

Cupertino split: population based; 5K out of this district
AA: try to keep it together if poss, bumping up against sec 5 area

South San Mateo:

County border between Santa Cruz and San Mateo
Per COI testimony
Half Moon Bay split – they'll try to clean up

North San Mateo

AA says there's wiggle room moving south from San Fran
Start w/SF, try to find commonalities going south, cld go further south that way
Need to hear reaction becs we've heard little from SF itself, not enough to work with
CD: like that CAPFR kept Daly City & Colma together
MW: do we have Calif Institute's equivalency files yet?
CGM: tasks AA and CD w/reviewing all submissions re SF; come back w/2 options

Foothills:

Remainder of Placer Co west of Lake Tahoe, Central El Dorado Co, intact Tuolumne, Mariposa,
Madera, Alpine, Amador
MDG: split off El Dorado Hills and Cameron park as part of greater Sac Area

Eastern Fresno Co:

Rest of Fresno and foothills
MB: little conflict, did we hear "foothills" in this area? We did hear about keeping 99 corridor together.
Same econ interests, keep integrity of corridor
Constraints: sec 5 county + poss sec 2 area
CD: testimony to keep Madera county whole

Tulare Co:

Intact county + northern areas of Kern Co east of 99

Kern Co:

Remainder of Bakersfield into mtns, to Ridgecrest
MB: what is rationale? A: looks like this for population; Kings Co sec 5 curl goes thru Kern Co
SLO cldnt go east; written testimony for Ridgecrest to be included w/kern Co.
MDG: once you dealt w/sec 5 and respect geog boundaries, this is what you're left with.
PY: will be qstn about splitting county. A: this is the most splits, in this county.

St

MB: testimony: don't put us w/LA Co but didn't mean don't put us w/Antelope areas w/in Kern
MDG: do you go into rest of high desert? KMD: they are going thru testimony carefully; ask Alex,
Becs there was huge ripple effect moving thru these

SLO:

Intact county

Lompoc split for population; total pop 41K; correctional facility area & No area of city are split

MDG: any way to keep Lompoc whole? A: will look into it

A: COI testimony keep w/orcutt and santa Ynez

PY: why not split correctional facility itself? CGM: consider economic ties of area to facility

KMD: facility spread over 4 census blocks, 3500 people

West Ventura:

Splits Oxnard, Port Hueneme included w/eastern Ventura

Impacted by SLO not moving east

MDG:

GA: if look at demographics & economic areas, to split Oxnard go west of Victoria to freeway;

Maybe go closer to Ventura Blvd area, give you more of west side. Ventura Rd is econ split,
west side more upscale new development vs east side famrworkers. But SC Valley, Montalvo,
El Rio areas are farmworkers; cross into Colonias Chicas Barrios, low econ area

MDG: what are 2 options? Port Hueneme w/Oxnard, Santa Clara Valley w/eastern Ventura?

GA: it's a tussle.

SF: make sense to pull most southern tip up and pull "bulge" down to pull in agric community?

VB: likely they will be nested in SD? A:

GA: come down Oxnard blvd to ... KMD asks to consult w/GA offline

St

CDs

Coastal: (green, pg 22)

AA: why not keep Sonoma intact and split Marin? Did we give options?

Jamie: this is hybrid between 2 regions and COI testimony advocates for this district

If all of Sonoma included & Marin split off, wld have to cross GG Bridge for land contiguity

MB: it's a long district. Are we ok w/compactness?

CGM: comfortable in light of so much COI testimony; public will give us feedback on draft too

VB: prob not much choice considering where pop is

Mountain Cap: (yellow, pg 22)

Nevada Co splits south of Alta Sierra

Includes Truckee and south of it per COI testimony, and Lake Tahoe

SF: is Grass Valley in same district as Nevada City? A: yes

PY: is it imp't to keep counties together? CD: not for Lake Tahoe, need same rep

CGM: COI testimony keep tahoe basin together

Yuba/Sutter/Glenn/Lake/Napa/eastern Sonoma/no Yolo: (pg 23 Blue)

Solano/Yolo: pg 23 Lavender

Pittsburgh and Antioch are split, crosses county into Contra Costa

Pitt pop 57K: MDG: take it out and add more contiguous areas? Eg Brentwood, Oakley?

A: can try it

Sac City:

Ok

Sacto Co:

Remainder of county

El Dorado Hills not in this

San Joaquin Co

Excluding Manteca, Tracy, Escalon

MDG: take a little frm western part, ie Discovery Bay?

Stanislaus Co

Manteca, Ripon, Tracy

Modesto whole for CD

Contra Costa:

Lamarinda, san ramon to county line, Richmond up to bridge

CGM: did you explore other options to splitting Richmond? A: yes, but too much pop

Will look at pulling pop from east

Alameda/Oakland:

Albany, Berkeley, Piedmont, Emeryville, Oakland, little bit of Castro Valley

CGM: can you clean up Castro Valley? A: if move El Cerrito, might be able to do that, will try

Alameda/San Lorenzo etc:

St

Balance of Alameda County:
Fremont split; Newark is wholly encapsulated in fremont

San Jose:

Following 680/880
MB: concerned that elsewhere we've tried to keep counties whole
What wld it take to keep Fremont, Newark and Union city together?
MB: split Alameda Co as "bay" and "inland". Q2 will explore
Notes Fremont is 200K pop

San Mateo Co:

Follows county lines
Gilroy, Morgan Hill and San Martin together per COI testimony

Monterey/San Benito/most of Santa Cruz Co
Sec 5

Santa Cruz Co balance

Incl Scotts Valley and Boulder Creek in Silicon valley area
VB oks it

No San Mateo Co

Into San Francisco
Sunset intact
AA: Ingleside is lower income, go north into Sunset more to have similarities w/Daly City
CGM: task AA and CD to follow up; per AA good starting point to link SF w/San Mateo Co
0% deviation

Foothills:

Western regions of placer and el dorado, all alpine, Calaveras, Tuolumne, mariposa, Amador,
Eastern flatlands of madera co, eastern areas of Fresno Co.
0% deviation
Along 99 incudes Visalia and Tulare
Only city split is Fresno (total pop 427K)
Sec 5 county picks up southern part of city

Tulare:

Rest of Kern Co
Rest of Tulare Co, little piece of Fresno Co south
Needs 84K people

SLO/SB:

Incl northern Ventura Co/Ojai
0% deviation
The Avenue is bordered on west side by hwy 33
MDG: sugg take some off northern part of Ventura city (western side) and put it w/Santa Barbara
CGM: ok for first draft? GA: will work offline w/Q2

Ventura:

118K overpopulated, Jamie left it /wNicole

St

SF: take Simi Valley out 111K; testimony to put it w/Santa Clarita

SDs: overlay of ADs, no complete plan, can nest after adjust ADs

North Coast:

Excludes southern part of Sonoma Co

Yuba:

All east, incl northern Yolo Co, Lake Tahoe area

Sec 5 districts can't be nested

Foothills w/East Fresno

West Sac w/Sac

Hayward + MilpBerry

Alameda + Richmond

East Alameda + PittAntioch ?

**** Sec 5 drives Santa Cruz and Monterey apart in middle of bay**

NOTE: we don't have to nest; can start w/it and adjust from there

Nesting is convenient for registrars eg and easy for voters

We're directing nesting but make adjustments as necessary

Nesting harder in sec 5 areas

Jamie can take closer look at them & see how pop shakes out

End of today Q2

-

Commissioner Raya response to Sturgis PRA

Mapping Sacramento – June 2, 2011

Jeanne Raya

ADs

Antelope Valley pg 16

Description: Includes Antelope and Victor Valleys

New iteration

Following COI testimony

previous direction to keep valleys together

LA Co and San Bern Co are split

Includes 19% Castaic (census place), 9% Hesperia

Issues: Q2 thinks Castaic can be moved w/Santa Clarita per testimony

Comments: JFW: appears consistent re high desert COI

Direction: none

Santa Clarita pg 16

Description: cities: Castaic, Santa Cl, Granada Hills, Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, Northridge

Comments:

where wld you adjust boundary to bring in Castaic? A: south corner but Castaic added pop is very small (3K+)

Population choice to cut off agua dulce and acton

Direction: none

San Gabriel Mtn Foothills pg 16

Description: Pasa, Alta, Monrovia, Sierra Madres, Azusa, Glendora

Last direction cld be split if VRA concerns to south

Comments: Burbank split off tho significant testimony to contrary

Q2: tried to keep G/B/P together but might involve some splitting of Pasadena

Q: are they together anywhere else?

Q2: together in one, not in other

Q: shld Griffith park be w/G/B/P?

Comments:

what else can you do to keep G/B/P intact so we can make a choice

Q2Q: where shld Sherman oaks go?

Also sec 2 concerns (SFVEast) west of G/B/P

To south is poss NE LA sec 2 district

Wld affect configuration of district down to port of LA

Directions: try to preserve G/B/P per COI testimony

Q2: consider effect on foothill district and Covina District 55% LCVAP
If remove Pasadena, have to pick up pop – where? look at cities below 210 fwy

Q2: split 7 cities
what is rationale?
relied on COI testimony re use and relation to land

Comment: issue was connection to mtns, not cities

Direction: move forward w/foothills district, but see about reuniting cities
Add Altadena, remove Sherman Oaks?
PY: too far all the way to east county line, not ideal
There are sufficient cities on east side that touch foothills for another district
Use max flexibility for foothill district, maybe 2 (E/W)
Don't split Altadena, Pasadena
Try to maintain poss sec 2 to south
JFW: La Canada Flintridge, La Crescenta are IN foothills

EAST SGV/COVINA pg 20

Description: south & adjacent to foothills

Baldwin Park, West Covina, Duarte, Citrus, Covina, Monrovia (some parts)
Splits: Arc, Azu, Duarte, El Monte, Glen, Indus, Mayflower Village, Monr, West Covina
Becs of foothills direction and potential VRA district to west (API)
LCVAP55.11%, BCVAP 6.1%, ACVAP 11.9%

Comment: look at CIJobs District 52 as sample, look at Hacienda Heights
Bringing in Avocado Heights & Hacienda heights brings it down

Direction: preserve more whole cities, look at 52 version south, might allow for more integrity of
Foothill cities

WSGV pg 20

San Gabriel, Alh, So Pasa (part), Temple City, Monterey Park, So San Gab, Rosemead, N. El Monte,

Issues: potential sec. 2

Comments:

Direction: clean up South el monte

Whittier/Pico Rivera pg 20

Potential sec 2

Montebello, Pico, La Mirada, Hac Heights, Rose Hills, El Monte, Whittier
El Monte, Industry, Montebello, Pico Rivera, So El Monte city splits

Q: Can you balance w/WSGV w/o impacting Latino CVAP?

Nicole: has too many people, can trade 4K across border.

Comment: Industry has few residents but we split it

Direction: Work on losing population.

Downey/Norwalk pg 20 and South Gate/Lakewood + Whittier + Boyle Heights

Potential sec 2

Includes: Florence Grand, walnut park, bell gardens, Norwalk, parts of downy, Santa Fe springs, Cerritos, Artesia

LVAP 62, BVAP 5.89, ACVAP 15

MB: can it be cut and spliced? Why not? combination is 49-50% CVAP

MDG: instead of splitting e/w, can you split n/s?

Q2Q: shld we split Bell "duck bill"? VB: easier to explain funny shaped city than city split

JFW: concerned w/both districts; (+Whittier Pico): need VRA counsel to look at it.

High concentration we're creating in 3 districts

CD: look at effect on Downtown/Boyle Heights too

AP: duck bill is mfg zone, econ important

MDG: have attorneys looked at this? Ana: discussed latino concentrations, attempt to unpack based on CRC direction and counsel. Concern: not compact district

MB: looking at density for Whittier; Whitt/La Mirada corner: if some area is packed, cld you pick up south east corner?

PY: concern about Cerritos and Artesia in this district. Ana: we weren't crossing county lines. PY: you crossed in other places; not good choice for these cities. CGM: give them freedom to look across county borders. JFW: we said it was ok at this point; wld be consistent w/COI

Direction: flag for GB to look at this cluster

Qs to GB: how do we look at packing in abutting districts? Is it as much of a concern when all districts around are "packed". Shld we proceed along COI lines rather than sec 2 since pop is so concentrated> might lead to integrity and compactness w/o considering sec. 2

GB: there was attempt to draw cities and neighborhoods whole, not overconcentrate single Min in any particular district. If successful, w/a little more analysis, likelihood of successful litigation is low. Re these areas: wld not refer to them as sec 2 areas to extent lines drawers have been successful creating districts that follow other criteria in Ca constitution. In LA Co, 3 areas require further study, including RPV analysis/develop date: west SGV, san fern East, AfAm south and southwest LA. Getting to point where reasonably comfortable not high risk of successful sec 2 litigation, subject to verifying they followed city and neighborhood boundaries.

PYQ: by unpacking this area, LA is so compact, we have lumped in cities to east that have nothing in common, have sacrificed COI testimony. This may be necessary but is it defensible when questioned re COI criteria?

GB: some will come down to commissioners exercising their judgment. Mappers have successfully followed other criteria. These districts aren't required to be drawn this way under sec 2 – we can consider other alternatives, can't assess litigation risk until do further analysis if we want.

Gb: area complies becs cities/neighborhoods are whole. We're free to do this or something else. Ok to draw to reduce overconcentration of single minority group. Also ok to consider other criteria.

MDG: at what point do we balance preventing packing with COI testimony so we can do both? Are we free to do whatever we want?

GB: to extent we can draw using nonVRA criteria and then assess # of districts w/sufficient maj/min so we have minimized litigation risk, we can defend districts on constitutional criteria other than race. There is a range of maj/min L districts to draw w/lower litigation risk. Doesn't mean that's only way to draw it. We're free to have mappers come up w/alternatives; assess then how risky we feel those are.

Suggestions/comments:

Downey/Norwalk dist: add la Palma

Walnut Park, Bell Gardens go up w/Pico Rivera

can we get tighter on some COI configurations?

if take out Cerritos, Artesia, what do we put back in?

Move Cerritos, Artesia to Orange Co?

too much pop in W/Pico so moving Cerritos & Artesia will alleviate, then move rest around.

DIRECTION: move Cerritos & Artesia to Orange Co, see how you move other around

Compton/Carson pg 19

Willowbrook, Compton, Carson, LA neighborhoods: Watts, Rancho Dominguez (whole except LA)

Lynwood wasnt included, to keep it above 50% cvap

If included, wld be in northeast corner

AP: strong case sec 2 not required; appears no evid of RPV. To what extent can boundaries be modified to reach lower percentages? Q2: can do it, might need to split in Inglewood Westmont area to maintain communities around the edges. AP: request what is a rsnable % below 50%?

GB: to extent this district is consistent w/other criteria, we can leave it as is. We can also consider whether to modify a district

MDG: we shld still honor coastal intact, and not crossing county line, as we modify

PY: in applying unpacking, do we have to start off w/sec 2 district? If we don't have one, how does unpacking apply? GB: we're not saying these must be unpacked to comply w/sec 2; ok to consider over-concentration when applying other criteria. GB: dsnt believe there's risk of *successful* packing claim.

Ana: can we look west and east? Also Long Beach area? Looking at districts with lower concentrations if can't go e, w, or so. COI testimony against both ports in same district.

CD: add Lynwood to Compton/Carson – what wld AP take out? A: "Westmont, look for other neighborhoods". This wld increase BCVAP though in Compton/Carson.

JFW: areas are intertwined, maybe we really aren't splitting COIs, cld nest Senate too.

Lynwood to Inglewood,

Carson to port,

Cerritos/Artesia out – to OC;

May be merging Southgate/Lakewood with Downey/Norwalk

GA suggs CAPFR ADs 58 and 60 as model. MDG: caution keeping coastal intact.

Culver City/Crenshaw pg 18 green

Includes LA neighborhoods

GB guidance: if drawn using nonVRA criteria, it's ok as is.

JFW: haven't recvd testimony on this area. If respecting neighbs, have you captured all Uni Park? And Exposition Park? What is northern border? (West Washington Blvd – north of 10)

Q2: used neighborhood council boundaries

Further direction: none

San Diego

GB: one question: choice between AD entirely in city of SD vs. border district. What happens to latino pop in city of SD in border district. Are they included in entirety?

Is there compact concentration if consider part of Coachella w/ part of Imperial? Waiting to consider issues of compactness.

JFW: do you have recommendation we're safe issuing drafts while under consideration?

GB: yes, note to ourselves and public we're waiting for further analysis.

MB: want to understand compactness concern. Is it the length, crossing counties, large size of ImpV?

GB: wrt sec 2 compactness, consider border district on its face, the pop pattern east along 8 to whole IV dsnt meet definition – they'll look at it. If CRC has sufficient COI testimony, we can make choice based on that. Other area, portion of Coachella/Riv/aroundSalton Sea, he has seen maps of Latino pop that look concentrated, may be compact.

GB: compactness in Ca constit is subject to meeting other criteria

We can link contiguous COIs that meet criteria, can include, eg along the border. w/in our discretion.

MDG: dsnt think compactness is such an issue becs it reflects pop.

AA: are we ignoring sec 2 district in SD to create border district?

GB: Q to mappers what happened to SD community? Were they split? Or are they whole?

A: they are split to form border district. Part of Chula Vista & IB are included in border district.

GB: we need RPV analysis

JFW: border district is over pop 8K. may be poss to have both. Have sec 2 in southwest corner of San Diego and have border district consistent w/COI testimony.

Ana: a lot of the pop for border district comes from southwest SD.

SF: move north in SD city to take in part of sec 2 district.

CD: look at Coachella whole w/Imperial Co whole

Crosses one county line. Had conflicting testimony (vs not together)

Ana: prev visualization: split Coachella Valley to keep IV whole

JFW: what testimony to join Desert Hot Springs, Brawley & El Centro?

Alternative direction?: JFW: how much pop to east/north in SD Co?

MB: refer to MALDEF map, picks up Poway, etc, east Natl City for wholly SanDiego AD. #74

Pomona Valley pg 10

LCVAP49.16, BCVP10.17, ACVAP 6.87

Splits Rancho and crosses county line due to COI testimony

Previously had unincorp Fontana but pushed CVAP too high

GB: compact geog, 49%, do RPV analysis, consider cld be *required* sec 2 district

JFW: shld we also highlight for adjacent Fontana? GB: yes

GB: do not need to consider COI testimony as much if determine it's reqrd sec 2. If determine it's not reqrd, have to be concerned about county split.

Direction: none other than GB

North Orange County pg 14

Santa Ana 45%LCVAP and Anaheim 28%LCVAP

We instructed to keep Anaheim and Santa Ana in separate districts

GB: Ana clearly not sec. 2 Santa Ana may be worth more analysis of LCVAP by Q2, make sure not >50% 45-49% take a look. It's not burdensome if we're only looking at a few.

VB: we have reduced CVAP by our instruction. Can we defend that?

GB: first alternative (cities together) didn't meet first Jingles precondition. wld be a challenge that it wld cut thru the city of Orange.

SF: suggests moving lines to strengthen Asian pop west and raise Santa Ana CVAP

Santa Ana VAP is 69%

Direction: Anaheim/Fullerton COI re bonds betw Fullerton w/Placentia, Brea, Yorba Linda

Alex: done this way to balance population. Will move Artesia/Cerritos/LaPalma,

Reconsider Anaheim/Buena Park, respect COI Full/Plac/Ana Hills/Yorba Linda

Westminster pg 14 olive green "WEST"

Splits: garden grove, santa ana, fountain valley (small portn, cld be worked out)

Kept small part of santa ana to respect little Saigon boundaries

JFW: ripple effect down of moving la palma,artesia, cerritos etc: take out Buena park to Anaheim district

Going down the coast, what is effect?

Add Rossmoor, los alamos

PY: best combine Buena Park w/Fullerton

Ana: which definition to use for little Saigon? A: use COI

JFW: ds COI include Hunt Beach? Yes, so we wld split HB to add it to little Saigon

Direction: JFW has it

Tustin pg 14, 15

Coastal

So OC Coastal

Direction: shift pop of SOC, portion to coastal and portion north to Tustin, use I-5 as demarcation

DB, Chino Hills, Rowland, La Habra, Walnut pg 14

Direction: include Full, Placentia, La Habra, Yorba Linda together

Maybe Ana Hills to Ana for pop reasons

Ana: one way this might work for AD is look at Santa Ana central – “ok”

PY: keep Industry whole? Ana: need to split to keep Walnut in district

Direction: CD: we’re hemmed in: WSGV, Pomona Valley COI, DiamondBar et al COI

Does it make sense for DB to migrate west?

If not, can’t do the Fullerton/Placentia combo

MB: careful using “sec 2” when it’s not a sec 2 issue

Could use modified version of prev iteration, move Santa Ana up. But that splits Anaheim

****Consistency applying criteria**

SB/Inyo/Mono

Ok

SBCUCA

Splits: 67% RC, 79% SB City

Direction to look into not splitting RC 3x

Driven by need to put part of Riverside co somewhere

JFW: respect SanBern Co line, take Rancho out, take east pop out of purple district

Get addit pop running down, stay on east side of 15

If RanchoC is out of district need to figure out what to do w/100K on that side

Direction: look at going west in foothill district

RIVJUR

City of Riverside split

MURTEM

AA: Add layer: reservation population

Actually shows all pop

Take Rancho out, then.....

GA: is there interest in dipping into east Coachella?

SF: effort to save Rancho is twisting everything

Direction: put Rancho back

NCOASTSD pg 8

Ok

RANCHOBMM pg 8

Rancho Bern, Mira Mesa, Scripps Ranch, TerraSanta, Miramar, Carmel Valley, San Pasqual, Fairbanks
Ranch is split
Go down stop at alpine

CRNOSD

Ok

CVNC

Area GB IDs as poss sec 2

LMSANT

Ok per GOntai

Westside/Santa Monica

Only LA is split

SF: include VA hospital? No, it's 11K people

AA: use VA hosp as center: Brentwood more like Westwood than West Hollywood

MDG: justification to tie SM to Malibu? Nicole: wld shift pop in SF valley

Direction: keep SM in westside

Burbank/Glendale

If push Sherman oaks in have to move pop out

Creates issue w/SFV East

Leave districts as they are, including Burb/Glendale, unite B/G/P in SD

Think of purple as another SF Valley area

East SFV pg 17 green

Comment: captures COI very well

West SFV pg 17 yellow

Ok

Hancock Park pg 18 purple

Based on downtown COI

Some neighborhoods are split around edges, Nicole will take a closer look

Council boundaries may not be firm

Southern boundary is Washington

East LA pg 17 green

Includes LA neighborhoods

Includes Griffith park COI

OK

NOTE: counter clockwise shift moving La Habra or La Habra Heights with DB? Moves things west, may correct South Gate?

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

San Bernardino pg

Direction was to include Mono & Inyo w/SB

ok

City of San Bernardino

85% Fontana, 25% Redlands (rest in SB District)

Unincorp Fontana not included

ONT

(out of the room – no notes)

RVMV

Need 6500 people – from southwest? Corona

COACH

From eastern border Riv Co, Coachella Valley whole

PRS pg 25 which I don't have

Splits Temecula, rest w/San Diego

Can look to add more of it

Was trying for 0% deviation

LYHL pg 27

Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Brea, La Habra together w/Orange, and split Anaheim

WESTGG pg 27

41% Anaheim, 2% HB

SACOAST

83% Santa Ana, 97% HB

Suggestions: move south to reduce SOC

put Santa Ana w/west GG

coastal from San Clemente North?

coastal separated from inland cities?

COASTALSD pg 22

If lose orange co, go south along coast to add pop

Then add poway to area that gives up

CHNC

Chula vista east of 805, terrace, spring valley, el cajon

IMPSD

West Chula Vista, whole natl city, into logan heights barrio district, Sherman heights, city heights, Oak park, shell town,

Shave 8K in metro area, at top of finger

NESD pg 22

Recvd direction to poway

Splits Temecula at north

LONG BEACH

includes port of LB

no splits

WHITTIER

South gate is split

Need 14K people

HAWTHORNE/COMPTON

Ok

PALOS VERDES EAST BEACH

WEST LA

SANTA MONICA MTN TO MALIBU

SAN GABRIEL VALLEY/DIAMOND BAR

43.49 ACVAP

Need COI support to go this far east

Econ, social, education commonalities

EAST LA COUNTY

50.77% LCVAP, 14.85% ACVAP

EAST LA

58.29% LCVAP

FOOTHILL DISTRICT

Make Arcadia split to make district contiguous?

Econ different in area north of 210

EAST SFV

49.6% LCVAP

GB advice: look more closely at this district

WEST SFV/EASTERN VENTURA CO pg 30, 31

Ok

ANTELOPE VALLEY pg 30

Santa Clarita valley whole

Commissioner Raya response to Sturges PRA

June 2 Business Meeting

Public Information

Narrative:

- Criteria direct from Prop 11
- Shade sec 5 districts
- Show existing districts
- Explain effort to honor geog boundaries, COIs
- "rough draft", further detail input will make changes

Discussion:

See handwritten notes

Legal

1. Chief Counsel Report
2. Coordination of work betw GD and Q2:
3. Commission governance matters:

Litigation and post-litigation period

Q2 subject to gag order

What limitations on commissioners?

Media engagement, public speaking, blogs, editorials

Publications: special limitations for 10 yrs as "public officials"

Discussion: **VB**: reqr clearance for comment

MB: in "litig possible" phase, better not to comment > backfires

Ex: nonprofit touted case attys were characterizing as not so big

AA: invitation to keynote election law conference

Impt to temper what we say, but no gag order, clear w/counsel

Well-defined scope for publications

MDG: is staff and GD subject to gag?

SF: need prepared speech vetted by counsel at the ready

PY: set strong guidelines, eg no publication for 2 yrs; we may not have counsel for commission later. Public record during process speaks for itself

CD: dsnt favor black/white; favors canned speech vetted by counsel; impt to talk

About process, focus on mission/goals/criteria

DC: have not addressed staff, vendors, GD

KM: wrt state litigation, must be brought w/in 60 days; fed litigation will get prompt plaintiff; we'll know early and can revisit this w/more knowledge.

VB: who will be avail to review when we don't have staff or counsel?

CGM: direct staff to work on this and bring suggestions back

JFW will review

4. Status of IFB for RPV analysis

KM: preparing another iteration for DGS now

JFW: can consider academics from other public schools, even outside CA; GD has provided work description and names, JFW and AA will review (inter-agency contract)

(note: SG area is one identified by GB for possible analysis; he will ID areas to review w/analyst)

5. Tracking previous motions

Handout

Finance/Admin

1. ED Report

2011-2012 budget \$400K, \$1.5M litigation support

DOF: 3 yr funding, released

Venues

RPV IFB (VB and SF)

Security plan

Assistants for Christina, for em volume

Augment Q2 budget to allow for note taker

Declined offer for software \$

Rest of agenda completed

Gil Ontai
Sacramento
June 1, 2010

1. Avoid use of race as principal factor for COI decision: 14th Amendment
COI: share soci/economic interests:
drill down to what makes a community of interest:
school, language, history, business, geography, churches,
Where Section 2 and 5 are concerned: more room to use race

2. Retrogression: minority groups are smaller than the benchmarks;
Merced/Stockton Section 5: Asian 11% Stockton down to 5%
If no reduction: then no regression; standard is met.
If small changes less than benchmark: then totality is required
where?
voting patterns?
act cohesively?
tend to vote similarly with other minority groups?
point of views from Asian community?
gov't officials familiar with this group?

Do you have obligation in the specific county vs. can one go over to another county? Risky: implies you can do whatever in Stockton?

API "finger" has API: 11% to 5% if finger is removed. "Ability to elect" does not apply to Section 5:
Section 5 require that minority has ability to participate. Don't know how small is small: totality is required.

Totality: compactness, etc., helps

Increasing one minority group at the expense of the other: risky
Totality: Especially if other areas increased

If loss of one and gain of another give no choices; then CRC needs to explicitly explain
What if both minority groups vote as a coalition: totality
Public support and comments will be necessary. Will give thought.
Commissioner's should make their own statements on minority groups, geography, etc.

3. AA LA

Read report for justification for existing lines: adjusted of equal pop. but kept lines:

No existing legal justification

Section 5 argument, but does Section 5 does not exist in LA

No previous polarization claims

Therefore: no requirement to form a minority-majority black group, so there fore must use compactness, contiguity, socio-economic factors: racially polarized study may help.

Clean slate approach: non-Section 2 approach? Follow strictly CA constitutional law?

Based on current history: no justification for AA minority-majority districts?
consistency throughout all district discussions
rpa may be needed., focus on COI for now, then adjust if later if Section 2 emerges.

Importance of public testimony for AA district?

Important, but focus on COI issues, but not focus on racial group strength.

4. How many Section 2 in SD, Imperial, Chochella Area:

-Section 2 for Chula Vista, National City, Imperial: Section 2 Lation 50%?

-Section 2 hwy 8 to imperial; needs to make Section 8 deciaion : Latino 50%

-Cochella Valley- Imperial Valley: geographicly compact with Latino 50% or more. |
(potentially: lower riverside, chochelloa, salton sea area, imperial county)

Miller: Current draft maps: process?

Documentation of COI is important:

boundaries?

underlying basis?

Comments on visualizations made already?

none for now.

Public Comment: AA, Alice Hoffman, president made presentation to keep the current boundaries in the LA area.

Deguillio: Line Drawing Tracking Procedures:

1, name of visualizaiton?

2. comments on why choose or not choose visualtions?

3. capture nuances?

Line Drawing Map Session:

Karin, Jaimie, Tamina

Definition of Benchmark: 2000 boundaries using current 2010 census data

Merced: Section 5 Areas:

Kings: Section 5 Areas:

Monterey Section 5 areas:

Yuba: Section 5 areas:

Potential Section 2 District:

Assembly

Fresno County:

Senate VAP:

Merced-Kings: OK

Monterey:

Yuba:

Congressional Districts:

Merced Section 5:

Kings:

Monterey:

Yolo-Yuba:

Other Areas:

Assembly Districts:

North-Coastal:

Coastal District: Rixdelmendo ok

Rixmtcap

Napalake

Sacramento Area:

Rixuba

Rviwestsac

Rivissacelkgr

Econstrcosta

Pittsantioch

Rviestandesh

Greater Bay Area:

Ealameda

Wcontracosta

Hayward

Milperry

SanJose

Rviimont

Silconval

Ssanmateo

Nsanmateo

Rvifresno

Rvitulare

Rvibakers

Rvslosb

Rvsbwvent

Congressional Districts:

Northcoast page 22

RXIMTCAP page 22

RXIYUBA page 22

YoloSolonap page 23 (Pittsburgh and are split)

SACCity page 23

SACCounty

Sanjoaquin 21

Stanislaus County 21
Contra Costa pag 19
Oakland pg. 19
Alameda
San Jose (explore removing finger - Fremont)
San Joaquin page 21 & 25
Monterey, page 20
San Mateo page 25 (SF area: Dai and Ancheta will recommend)
Foothills page 21
Merced
Fresno, page 20
Tulare, page 20 (short 80,000) Nicole and Alex to work on
SLOSB, page 24
East Ventura, pg. 24

Senate Districts:
(see final maps)

Kolkey available next Tuesday, 6/7/11

Northern Commissioners to submit notes to Karin by 10pm tonight or earlier.

Southern California Mapping:

6/2/11

Committee Reports:

Communications: Wilcox to release 4 part press release
6/10 to make formal press release in the Capitol with media attendance
Training on 6/8 by Wilcox
Commissioners to be briefed on local district maps and official explanations
Website and publications: re-visit the listing of CBO into two categories to

remove bias

Legal: Post 8/15/11:

gag order for consultants
staff gag order?
commissioners shall use "canned" speech to avoid conflicts or litigation fodder
strong guidelines: no publications first two years?
vetted speeches by council
draft of policy by staff with review by Jodie

IFB for racially polarized voting analysis (pva)
draft by staff with review by Jodie

Finance: 3 year funds have been transferred into our account
Forbe and Barraba to review and finalized draft scope of work for the in-line consultant IFB
Will hire notetaker
New office: FULLY FUNCTIONAL
Google Doc for chairs and leads
-each lead create a google doc by Sunday, starting today's issues.
-advisory committee meetings: venue and time permitting.
-put dates

- cc entire commission
- instructions will be sent out

Security line item costs

Financial report made - Debra

Inappropriate public comments: commissioners shall access, but not public

Code of conduct, page 6, communications and chain of command: miss-communication and mis-understanding

-concerns/questions from other commissions regarding staff and consultants shall be directed to chair or vice-chair

-motion passed: no wrong doing occurred; ammended by Ward: "accept the investigation and the results of the allegation was disproven."

-Admin Committee to revise code of conduct to clearly identify procedure for personnel claims.

Line Drawing (Continued):

LA: VRA questions on 3 district area

San Diego

Region 1SD: District as drawn is still under consideration for legal opinion: will make preliminary opinion/report

As applied to Section2: compactness not sufficient; however, COI is supportable.

CA compactness definition:

COI: may form compactness

geographic and density form long chain along the south of the county.

Are we missing a seciton 2 by gonong to Imperial? Should be pursued?

Pomona Valley

Do additional CVAP and RPA: close to Section 2 conditions

Riverside - Cochella Valley

