

express our belief that the Commission's interpretation of this requirement has shortchanged itself of the full time legally allowed under the Voters First Act to carry out its line-drawing duties.

We understand that because of the 14-day posting requirement, the Commission believes it must settle upon a final draft map by the end of July and then post the final draft map for a 14-day comment period. However, since no changes could be made to the final draft map, this effectively renders the final so-called public review period meaningless since comments submitted could not actually be considered by the Commission – and in turn makes the effective final map deadline sometime in late July (rather than the actual August 15 deadline set forth in the Voters First Act).

We believe that this interpretation deprives the Commission of much-needed time to draw and agree upon maps that comply with the Voters First Act's mapping criteria. That the Commission would benefit from more time beyond the end of July is unmistakable, and the time pressure facing the Commission is something several members have acknowledged themselves during the Commission's meetings.

This pressure is the result of several factors out of your control, including the difficulties inherent in the Commission's unique position of implementing a brand new process, and the removal by Proposition 20 of one month from the Commission's map-drawing timeline. Most fundamentally, this time pressure is the result of the Commission's immense challenge, and also profoundly important opportunity, of fairly balancing the interests of all Californians. While your work has truly embodied an appreciation for diverse demographics and geography, we believe that the task you face of drawing maps in only a few months that fairly take into account the complexity of California's population, economy and geography would be a herculean endeavor for any body of citizens.

Recognizing the time pressure you face and our shared goal of fair districts based on widespread public input, we believe that the Commission could best fulfill its responsibilities by adopting an alternative interpretation of the 14-day posting requirement that restores to the map-drawing process the originally intended deadline of August 15, and in so doing ensures the full time period from today until August 15 is available both for public comment that will be considered by the Commission, as well as the Commission's preparation of final maps. An alternative interpretation of the 14-day posting requirement, such as we what propose below, would provide the Commission with sufficient time to post a revised draft map near the end of July for a 14-day comment period and incorporate comments received into a final map by August 15. For the reasons stated below, we believe that such an interpretation more accurately reflects the intent of the Voters First Act than the interpretation of deadlines and procedure currently being followed by the Commission.

An alternative interpretation would also remedy what we believe to be inequities created by the cancellation of the second draft map that was originally scheduled to be released on July 14. By the

admission of some members of the Commission, the first draft map released on June 10 was rushed and did not represent the Commission putting its best foot forward. This coupled with the cancellation of the second draft map means that the public has not had the opportunity to review and provide comment on a bona fide map.

While we greatly appreciate the Commission's visualizations, including the Commission's recent enhancement of the visualizations, we emphasize that they were initially meant to have the limited purpose of allowing members of the public watching the Commission's live-stream to better follow the Commission's line-drawing discussions. The visualizations are not a substitute for a full map and do not allow the public sufficient time to analyze them before the Commission makes modifications. An alternative interpretation of the 14-day posting requirement would address the inequities caused by the cancellation of the second draft map by restoring the full amount of time legally permissible under the Voters First Act, thus allowing the Commission to actually consider and incorporate comments provided by the public on the revised map that will be posted at the end of July.

Issues Inherent in Commission's Interpretation of 14-Day Posting Requirement

The Voters First Act's 14-day posting requirement is set forth in section 8253(a)(7) of the Government Code, which states:

The commission shall establish and implement an open hearing process for public input and deliberation that shall be subject to public notice and promoted through an outreach program to solicit broad public participation in the redistricting public review process. The hearing process shall include hearings to receive public input before the commission draws any maps and hearings following the drawing and display of any commission maps. In addition, hearings shall be supplemented with other activities as appropriate to further increase opportunities for the public to observe and participate in the review process. The commission shall display the maps for public comment in a manner designed to achieve the widest public access reasonably possible. Public comment shall be taken for at least 14 days from the date of public display of any map.

As noted above, we understand the Commission's interpretation of this requirement is that it must settle upon a final draft map by the end of July and post the map for a 14-day public comment period – but without the ability to make substantive mapping changes in response to comments received during such period. In addition to truncating the final map deadline to late July, this interpretation contravenes the intent of the Voters First Act to provide the public with a meaningful opportunity to give comment on the Commission's maps.

The Commission's interpretation renders meaningless the other requirements set forth in

section 8253(a)(7) such as the requirement to conduct an “outreach program to solicit broad public participation in the redistricting public review process” and to supplement hearings “with other activities as appropriate to further increase opportunities for the public to observe and participate in the review process.” Surely the Voters First Act cannot be read to impose these requirements merely to encourage the public to review maps and make comments that have no chance of influencing the outcome of the final map.

Faced with the incongruous consequences of such an interpretation, the Commission has a duty to interpret section 8253(a)(7) in a manner that harmonizes its requirements. We believe this to be especially true given the Commission’s position as the Voters First Act’s inaugural body. The time pressure faced by the Commission and the inequities caused by the cancellation of the July 14 draft map also speak to the need for a different interpretation.

Recommended Interpretation of 14-Day Posting Requirement

There are two interpretations of section 8253(a)(7) that the Commission can adopt in order to better harmonize the requirements of section 8253(a)(7). The first is to interpret the 14-day posting requirement to apply to the Commission’s draft map, but not to the Commission’s final map. Such an interpretation arguably goes against the plain meaning of section 8253(a)(7). However, we believe that where the plain meaning of a statute leads to the kind of illogical consequences that follow from the Commission’s interpretation, it is appropriate to interpret provisions of a statute that seemingly conflict with each other in a manner that harmonizes them.

The conflicting requirements of section 8253(a)(7) can be viewed as the result of a drafting error. We analogize section 8253(a)(7) to another provision of the Voters First Act that is set forth in article XXI, section 2(c)(3) of the California Constitution:

Each commission member shall be a voter who has been continuously registered in California with the same political party or unaffiliated with a political party and who has not changed political party affiliation for five or more years immediately preceding the date of his or her appointment. Each commission member shall have voted in two of the last three statewide general elections immediately preceding his or her application.

The last sentence of this provision makes sense only if it is interpreted to read as follows: “Each commission member shall have voted in *at least* two of the last three statewide general elections immediately preceding his or her application” (italicized words added). In the same manner, section 8253(a)(7) can be interpreted to read as follows (in relevant part):

... The hearing process shall include hearings to receive public input before the commission draws any *draft* maps and hearings following the drawing and display of any commission *draft* maps... The commission shall display the *draft* maps for public comment in a manner designed to achieve the widest public access reasonably possible. Public comment shall be taken for at least 14 days from the date of public display of any *draft* map.

(italicized words added).

A second, alternative interpretation is construe the 14-day posting requirement, as applied to the final map, to mean that concurrently with submitting a final approved map to the Secretary of State for certification, the Commission must post the final approved map for a 14-day comment and hearing period. Under this interpretation, the purpose of the 14-day comment period would be not to allow the public to make comments with the goal of influencing the final map, but rather to allow the public to review the final maps and make comments with the assurance that those comments would be reflected in the Commission's official records and be posted in a manner that ensures immediate and widespread public access, as required by the Voters First Act (Government Code section 8253(a)(2)).

Such an interpretation would be consistent with the Voters First Act's requirement that the Commission's final plan be subject to referendum in the same manner as statutes. Specifically, the Voters First Act added the following language to the California Constitution, contained in article XXI, section 2(i): "Each certified final map shall be subject to referendum in the same manner that a statute is subject to referendum pursuant to Section 9 of Article II. The date of certification of a final map to the Secretary of State shall be deemed the enactment date for purposes of Section 9 of Article II." Consistent with this new language, the comment period after map adoption would represent an opportunity for members of the public to inform the referendum process.

Conclusion

It is imperative that both the Commission and the public are able to use the full time legally allowed under the Voters First Act rather than rush to meet your current deadline that terminates the map drawing process earlier than anyone ever intended. We urge the Commission to adopt one of the two interpretations we have offered to you.

Either interpretation we have offered to you represents a more appropriate construction of the

14-day posting requirement than the Commission's interpretation, which leaves the public with a false expectation that pre-August 15 deadline comments would actually be taken into account by the Commission. Either interpretation would provide Californians with a meaningful opportunity to give input on the revised map that will be released at or near the end of July, while preserving for the Commission the greatest amount of time allowed by law for completing its work.

We share your goal of drawing fair districts for all Californians and offer these comments in the hope they will help you achieve that goal.

Sincerely,

Eugene Lee

Voting Rights Project Director

Ltr to CRC re 14-day posting requirement July 15 2011.pdf

Subject: Assembly Redistricting Plan Based on Regional Community Land Use Patterns

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 2011 11:12:23 -0700 (GMT-07:00)

To: [REDACTED]

CC: Don Saylor <[REDACTED]> Susan Lovenburg <[REDACTED]>

Attached is a plan for the **Assembly Districts in northern California** that is rooted in the **major regional community-land use patterns**.

With a very minimum of exceptions this plan manages to keep cities whole as well as many of the smaller counties.

Because California geography is large and not compact some districts will be large and not compact. Yet people living in those areas mostly share a common perspective and share many common interests.

With modern information and communication technology physical distances are not the obstacle they once were.

This plan will provide better representation for both the more rural regions of the north state and the urban areas.

This plan is also more likely to simplify meeting requirements of the Voting Rights Act.

From earlier testimony, it is likely that many from Yolo and Marin counties will be displeased at being included with their more urbanized neighboring areas. No plan can meet everyone ideal preferences.

That said, the plan does keep both of those counties whole.

And, finally, it is fair to say that of all "rural" counties in the north these two are far and away best situated by education and geography to cope with any increased challenges that arise because of their inclusion with the adjacent cities.

Please review the attached files and think about this possible option.

Thank you.

Richard Seyman
Davis, CA

20110715_RSeyman_AD_NorthernCalifornia.pdf

Siskiyou-Sierra Region

Siskiyou-North Sierra District

Trinity County	13,786
Shasta County	177,223
Modoc County	9,686
Sierra County	3,240
Siskiyou County	44,900
Lassen County	34,895
Plumas County	20,007
Butte County	38,000
only Magalia & Paradise area	
Nevada County	78,764
w/o Truckee	
Placer County northwest	42,000
	462,501

Tahoe-South Sierra District

Nevada County east	20,000
Placer County southeast	82,000
El Dorado County	162,758
w/o 20,000 of El Dorado Hills	
Amador County	38,091
Alpine County	1,175
Calaveras County	45,578
Tuolumne County	55,365
Mariposa County	18,251
Mono County	14,202
Inyo County	18,546
Madera County east	7,000
	462,966

Sacramento Valley Region

Tehama County	63,463
Butte County	182,000
w/o Paradise, Magalia	
Colusa County	21,419
Glenn County	28,122
Sutter County	94,737
Yuba County	72,155
	461,896

Sacramento Metro Region

Placer-Citrus Heights-Folsom District

Lincoln city	32,819
Rocklin city	56,974
Roseville city	118,788
El Dorado Hills	22,430
Folsom city	72,203
Granite Bay	19,388
Orangevale	33,960
Citrus Heights city	83,301
near Citrus Heights	10,000
Fair Oaks part	10,912
	460,775

East Sac Rancho Cordova District

Rancho Cordova city	64,776
gold river	7,812
Fair Oaks part	20,912
Arden Arcade	92,186
Carmichael	61,762
Foothill Farms	31,121
Antelope	45,770
North Highlands	42,694
Sac City District 3	18,645
Rosemont	22,681
La Rivera	10,801
Galt	23,640
East & South County	18,000
	460,800

South Sac-Elk Grove District

Sac City District 4 south	22,000
Sac City District 7 southeast leg	30,000
Sac City District 6 w/o Elmhurst/Tahoe Park	31,539
Sac City District 5 w/o Curtis Park	41,159
Sac City District 8	61,458
Fruitridge Florin area	115,000
Elk Grove	153,015
Sac Co Census Tract 90.04	7,154
461,325	

Sac Core- North Sac-Yolo District

Yolo County	200,849
Sac City District 1	106,729
Sac City District 2	52,975
Sac City District 3	39,645
Sac City District 4 north	23,703
Sac City District 7 Pocket are	22,585
Curtis Park	5355
Elmhurst /Tahoe Park area	10,340
462,181	

North Coast Region

North Coast-Napa District

Del Norte County	28,610
Humboldt County	134,623
Mendocino County	87,841
Lake County	64,665
Cloverdale (Sonoma)	10,000
Napa County	136,484
462,223	

Sonoma District

Sonoma County	463,878
w/o west Petaluma & Cloverdale areas	

Marin-San Francisco District

West Petaluma	10,000
Marin County	252,409
San Francisco District 2	73,182
San Francisco District 1	73,182
San Francisco District 5	53,182
461,955	

San Francisco Core District

San Francisco District 5	20,000
District 3	73,182
District 4	73,182
District 6, 7 ,8 & 9	292,728
District 10 north end	3,000
462,092	

San Francisco-San Mateo District

San Francisco District 10	70,182
San Francisco District 11	73,182
San Mateo north	320,000
463,364	

North Bay Area Region

Solano District

Solano County	413,344
American Canyon city	19,454
Martinez city (most of)	30,824
463,622	

Northeast Contra Costa District

Antioch city	102,372
Brentwood city	51,481
Clayton city	10,897
Concord city	122,067
Oakley city	35,432
Pittsburg city	63,264
Walnut Creek city	64,173
Discovery Bay	13,352
463,038	

West Contra Costa- Alameda District

Bayview-Montalvin

Pinole city	18,390
Richmond city	103,701
San Pablo city	29,139
El Cerrito city	23,549
Hercules city	24,060
Crockett	3,094
Martinez (part)	6,000
El Sobrante	12,669
East Richmond Heights	3,280
Kensington	5,077
Rodeo	8,679
North Richmond	3,717
Rollingwood	2,969
Tara Hills	5,126
Albany city	18,539
Berkeley city	112,580
Emeryville city	10,080
Piedmont city	10,667
Oakland city north end	56,000

462320

5004 East Contra Costa- Alameda District

Castro Valley	61,388
Lafayette city	23,893
Moraga town	16,016
Orinda city	17,643
Pleasant Hill city	33,152
San Ramon city	72,148
Danville town	42,039
Livermore city	80,968
Dublin city	46,036
Pleasanton city	70,285
	463,568

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

From: **Richard Blackston** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 9, 2011 at 9:21 PM
Subject: My input to the Commission
To: [REDACTED]

July 9, 2011

Good Morning Ladies and Gentlemen of the State Reapportionment Commission,

Like you I am interested in having a state legislature that will work to meet the many and varied needs of this great State of California and the best way of insuring that this will occur is for the districts to be designed with no political involvement or considerations.

I have been working on my suggestions for the State Assembly, State Senate and Congress and I think I have come up with a workable design. I am still in the process of drawing the maps but I have designed the districts with the numbers of which I am including with this report. I have also included the district maps for the Congressional, Senate and Assembly Districts of which I am in the process of working on. I am still working on all the maps but I think you will understand what I am leading to.

When drawing these maps I am using the following check list:

- Federal and State Voter Rights Laws.
- Keeping Counties and Cities as whole as possible and dividing them when necessary.
- Keeping the districts as contiguous as possible.
- Keeping industrial and economical communities interest together as much as possible.
- Work to keep the district's transportation system as united as possible.
- Considering geographical features such as mountain ranges, the Delta and other waterway systems.
- Keeping ethic and racial influences intact as much as possible.

So with that I am giving you my draft of the California Reappointment Plan for the Congressional, Assembly and Senate Districts. I will provide you with a copy of the maps as I finish them. I am using the Berkeley Law Center in Sacramento to design my maps and from what I have been told they are on the same Computer Servers that the Commission uses.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Richard Blackston

[REDACTED]

Lodi, California 95240

[REDACTED]

—7_9.jpg



—senate_7_6.jpg



—congressional_7_6.jpg



7_9.jpg

—senate_7_6.jpg

senate_7_6.jpg

—congressional_7_6.jpg

congressional_7_6.jpg

—California Congressional Districts 6.28.2011.docx

California Congressional Districts 6.28.2011.docx



California Congressional Districts

Designer, Richard Blackston

July 8, 2011

(702,905 citizens per district)

District One:

• Del Norte	28610	
• Humboldt	134623	
• Trinity	13786	
• Mendocino	87841	
• Lake	64665	
• Sonoma	373380	702905

District Two:

• Siskiyou	44900	
• Modoc	9686	
• Shasta	177223	
• Lassen	34895	
• Tehama	63463	
• Plumas	20007	
• Sierra	3240	
• Glenn	28122	
• Butte	220000	
• Colusa	21419	
• Yuba	72155	
• Sutter	7795	702905

District Three:

• Sonoma	110498	
• Marin	252409	
• Napa	136484	
• Yolo	200849	
• Solano	2665	702905

District Four:

• Sutter	86942	
• Sacramento	615963	702905

District Five:

• Sacramento	702905	702905
--------------	--------	--------

District Six:

• Nevada	98764	
• Placer	348432	
• Sacramento	98420	
• El Dorado	157289	702905

District Seven:

- Sacramento 1500
- Solano 410679
- Contra Costa 290726 702905

District Eight:

- Contra Costa 17599
- San Joaquin 685306 702905

District Nine:

- El Dorado 23769
- Amador 38091
- Alpine 1175
- Mono 14202
- Calaveras 45578
- Tuolumne 55365
- Stanislaus 67341
- Mariposa 18251
- Madera 150865
- Fresno 269722
- Inyo 18546 702905

District Ten:

- Stanislaus 447112
- Merced 255793 702905

District Eleven:

- Fresno 549923
- Kings 152982 702905

District Twelve:

- Fresno 110805
- Tulare 442179
- Kern 149921 702905

District Thirteen:

- Kern 689710
- San Bernardino 13195 702905

District Fourteen:

- Contra Costa 702905 702905

District Fifteen:

- Contra Costa 37795
- Alameda 665110 702905

District Sixteen:

- Alameda 702905 702905

District Seventeen:

- Alameda 142256
- Santa Clara 560649 702905

District Eighteen:

- San Francisco 702905 702905

District Nineteen:

- San Francisco 102330
- San Mateo 600575 702905

District Twenty:

- San Mateo 117876
- Santa Clara 322647
- Santa Cruz 262382 702905

District Twenty One:

- Santa Clara 702905 702905

District Twenty Two:

- Santa Clara 195441
- San Benito 55269
- Monterey 415057
- San Luis Obispo 37138 702905

District Twenty Three:

- San Luis Obispo 232499
- Santa Barbara 423895
- Ventura 46511 702905

District Twenty Four:

- Ventura 702905 702905

District Twenty Five:

- Ventura 73902
- Los Angeles 629003 702905

Districts Twenty Six thru Thirty Eight:

- Los Angeles (13 districts) 9137765 9137765

District Thirty Nine:

- Los Angeles 51837
- Orange 651068 702905

Districts Forty thru Forty Two:

- Orange (3 districts) 2108715 2108715

District Forty Three:

- Orange 250449
- Riverside 452456 702905

Districts Forty Four thru Forty Seven:

- San Diego (4 districts) 2811620 2811620

District Forty Eight:

- San Diego 283693
- Imperial 174528
- Riverside 244684 702905

Districts Forty Nine thru Fifty:

- Riverside (2 districts) 1405810 1405810

District Fifty One:

- Riverside 86691
- San Bernardino 616214 702905

District Fifty Two thru Fifty Three:

- San Bernardino (2 districts) 1405810 1405810

California Congressional Districts with Divided Counties

Sonoma:

- 1 373380
- 3 110498 483878

Sutter:

- 2 7795
- 4 86942 94737

Sacramento:

- 4 615963
- 5 702905
- 6 98420
- 7 1500 1418788

Solano:

- 3 2665
- 7 410679 413344

El Dorado:

- 6 157289
- 9 23769 181058

Contra Costa:

- 7 290726
- 8 17599
- 14 702905
- 15 37795 1049025

Stanislaus:

- 9 67341
- 10 447112 514453

Fresno:

- 9 269722
- 11 549923
- 12 110805 930450

Kern:

- 12 149921
- 13 689710 839631

Alameda:

- 15 665110
- 16 702905
- 17 142256 1510271

San Francisco:

- 18 702905
- 19 102330 805235

Santa Clara:

- 17 560649
- 20 322647
- 21 702905
- 22 195441 1781642

San Mateo:

- 19 600575
- 20 117876 718451

San Luis Obispo:

- 22 37138
- 23 232499 269637

Ventura:

- 23 46511
- 24 702905
- 25 73902 823318

Los Angeles:

- 25 629003
- 26-38 9137765
- 39 51837 9818605

Orange:

- 39 651068
- 40-42 2108715
- 43 250449 3010232

Riverside:

- 43 452456
- 48 244684
- 49-50 1405810
- 51 86691 2189641

San Bernardino:

- 13 13195
- 51 616214
- 52-53 1405810 2035219

San Diego:

- 44-47 2811620
- 48 283693 3095313

California State Assembly

Designer, Richard Blackston

July 8, 2011

(465,674 citizens per district)

District One:

• Del Norte	28610	
• Humboldt	134623	
• Trinity	13786	
• Mendocino	87841	
• Lake	64665	
• Sonoma	18203	
• Napa	117946	465674

District Two:

• Sonoma	465675	465675
----------	--------	--------

District Three:

• Siskiyou	44900	
• Modoc	9686	
• Shasta	177223	
• Lassen	34895	
• Tehama	63463	
• Plumas	20007	
• Sierra	3240	
• Butte	112260	465674

District Four:

• Yuba	72155	
• Nevada	98764	
• Butte	107740	
• Glenn	28122	
• Colusa	21419	
• Sutter	94737	
• Yolo	42738	465675

District Five:

• Yolo	158111	
• Napa	18538	
• Solano	289025	465674

District Six:

• Solano	124319	
• Contra Costa	341356	465675

District Seven:

• Sacramento	465674	465674
--------------	--------	--------

District Eight:

- Sacramento 465675 465675

District Nine:

- Placer 348432
- El Dorado 117242 465674

District Ten:

- El Dorado 63816
- Amador 38091
- Alpine 1175
- Mono 14202
- Calaveras 45578
- Tuolumne 55365
- Mariposa 18251
- Madera 150865
- Fresno 59785
- Inyo 18546 465674

District Eleven:

- Sacramento 465675 465675

District Twelve:

- Sacramento 21764
- Contra Costa 443910 465674

District Thirteen:

- San Joaquin 465675 465675

District Fourteen:

- Stanislaus 465675 465675

District Fifteen:

- San Joaquin 171103
- Stanislaus 38778
- Merced 255793 465674

District Sixteen:

- Marin 252409
- San Francisco 213266 465675

District Seventeen:

- San Francisco 465674 465674

District Eighteen:

- San Francisco 126295
- San Mateo 339380 465675

District Nineteen:

- San Mateo 379071
- Santa Cruz 86603 465674

District Twenty:

- Contra Costa 263759
- Alameda 201915 465674

District Twenty One:

- Alameda 465675 465675

District Twenty Two:

- Alameda 465674 465674

District Twenty Three:

- Alameda 377007
- Santa Clara 88668 465675

District Twenty Four:

- Santa Clara 465674 465674

District Twenty Five:

- Santa Clara 456675 456675

District Twenty Six:

- Santa Clara 465674 465674

District Twenty Seven:

- Santa Clara 289895
- Santa Cruz 175779 465674

District Twenty Eight:

- San Joaquin 48528
- Stanislaus 10000
- Santa Clara 6056
- San Benito 55269
- Fresno 345821 465674

District Twenty Nine:

- Fresno 465675 465675

District Thirty:

- Fresno 59169
- Kings 152982
- Tulare 253524 465675

District Thirty One:

- Tulare 188655
- Kern 277020 465674

District Thirty Two:

- Kern 465675 465675

District Thirty Three:

- Kern 96936
- San Bernardino 368739 465675

District Thirty Four:

- Monterey 415057
- San Luis Obispo 50618 465675

District Thirty Five:

- San Luis Obispo 219019
- Santa Barbara 246655 465674

District Thirty Six:

- Santa Barbara 177240
- Ventura 288434 465674

District Thirty Seven:

- Ventura 465675 465675

District Thirty Eight:

- Ventura 69209
- Los Angeles 396465 465674

Districts Thirty Nine thru Fifty Eight:

- Los Angeles (20 districts) 9313500 9313500

District Fifty Nine:

- Los Angeles 108640
- Orange 357035 465675

Districts Sixty thru Sixty Four:

- Orange (5 districts) 2328375 2328375

District Sixty Five:

- Orange 324822
- Riverside 140853 465675

District Sixty Six thru Seventy One:

- San Diego (6 districts) 2794050 2794050

District Seventy Two:

- San Diego 291147
- Imperial 174528 465675

District Seventy Three:

- San Diego 10116
- Riverside 455559 465675

Districts Seventy Four thru Seventy Six:

- Riverside (3 districts) 1397025 1397025

District Seventy Seven:

- Riverside 196204
- San Bernardino 269471 465675

Districts Seventy Eight and Eighty:

- San Bernardino (3 districts) 1397025 1397025

California State Assembly Districts with Divided Counties

Sonoma:

- 1 18203
- 2 465675 483878

Butte:

- 3 112260
- 4 107740 220000

Yolo:

- 4 42738
- 5 158111 200849

Napa:

- 1 117946
- 5 18538 136484

Solano:

- 5 289025
- 6 124319 413344

Sacramento:

- 7 465674
- 8 465675
- 11 465675
- 12 21764 1418788

Contra Costa:

- 6 341356
- 12 443910
- 20 263759 1049025

El Dorado:

- 9 117242
- 10 63816 181058

Fresno:

- 10 59785
- 28 345821
- 29 465675
- 30 59169 930450

Tulare:

- 30 253524
- 31 188655 442179

Kern:

- 31 277020
- 32 465675
- 33 96936 839631

San Joaquin:

- 13 465675
- 15 171103
- 28 48528 685306

Stanislaus:

- 14 465675
- 15 38778
- 28 10000 514453

San Francisco:

- 16 213266
- 17 465674
- 18 126295 805235

San Mateo:

- 18 339380
- 19 379071 718451

Santa Cruz:

- 19 86603
- 27 175779 262382

Alameda:

- 20 201915
- 21 465675
- 22 465674
- 23 377007 1510271

Santa Clara:

- 23 88668
- 24 465674
- 25 465675
- 26 465674
- 27 289895
- 28 6056 1781642

San Luis Obispo:

- 34 50618
- 35 219019 269637

Santa Barbara:

- 35 246655
- 36 177240 423895

Ventura:

- 36 288434
- 37 465675
- 38 69209 823318

Los Angeles:

- 38 396465
- 39-58 9313500
- 59 108640 9818605

Orange:

- 59 357035
- 60-64 2328375
- 65 324822 3010232

Riverside:

- 65 140853
- 73 455559
- 74-76 1397025
- 77 196204 2189641

San Diego:

- 66-71 2794050
- 72 291147
- 74 10116 3095313

San Bernardino:

- 33 368739
 - 77 269471
 - 78-80 1397025
- 2035235

California State Senate
Designer, Richard Blackston
June 28, 2011
(931,349 citizens per district)

District One:

• Del Norte	28610	
• Humboldt	134623	
• Trinity	13786	
• Mendocino	87841	
• Lake	64665	
• Sonoma	483878	
• Napa	117946	931349

District Two:

• Siskiyou	44900	
• Modoc	9686	
• Shasta	177223	
• Lassen	34895	
• Tehama	63463	
• Plumas	20007	
• Sierra	3240	
• Yuba	72155	
• Nevada	98764	
• Butte	220000	
• Glenn	28122	
• Colusa	21419	
• Sutter	94737	
• Yolo	42738	931349

District Three:

• Yolo	158111	
• Napa	18538	
• Solano	413344	
• Contra Costa	341356	931349

District Four:

• Sacramento	931349	931349
--------------	--------	--------

District Five:

• Placer	348432	
• El Dorado	181058	
• Amador	38091	
• Alpine	1175	
• Mono	14202	
• Calaveras	45578	
• Tuolumne	55365	
• Mariposa	18251	
• Madera	150865	
• Fresno	78332	931349

District Six:

• Sacramento	487439	
• Contra Costa	443910	931349

District Seven:

• San Joaquin	685306	
• Stanislaus	246043	931349

District Eight:

• Stanislaus	268410	
• Merced	255793	
• Fresno	407146	931349

District Nine:

• Fresno	259647	
• Kings	152982	
• Tulare	442179	
• Inyo	18546	
• Kern	57995	931349

District Ten:

• Kern	781636	
• San Bernardino	149713	931349

District Eleven:

• Marin	252409	
• San Francisco	678940	931349

District Twelve:

• San Francisco	126295	
• San Mateo	718451	
• Santa Cruz	86603	931349

District Thirteen:

- Contra Costa 263759
- Alameda 667590 931349

District Fourteen:

- Alameda 842681
- Santa Clara 88668 931349

District Fifteen:

- Santa Clara 761625
- Santa Cruz 169724 931349

District Sixteen:

- Santa Clara 931349 931349

District Seventeen:

- San Benito 55269
- Monterey 415057
- Santa Cruz 6061
- Fresno 185325
- San Luis Obispo 269637 931349

District Eighteen:

- Santa Barbara 423895
- Ventura 507454 931349

District Nineteen:

- Ventura 315864
- Los Angeles 615485 931349

Districts Twenty thru Twenty Eight:

- Los Angeles (9 districts) 8382141 8382141

District Twenty Nine:

- Los Angeles 820979
- Orange 110370 931349

Districts Thirty thru Thirty Two:

- Orange (3 districts) 2794047 2794047

District Thirty Three:

- Orange 105815
- Riverside 825534 931349

Districts Thirty Four thru Thirty Six:

- San Diego (3 districts) 2794047 2794047

District Thirty Seven:

• San Diego	301266	
• Imperial	174528	
• Riverside	455555	931349

District Thirty Eight:

• Riverside	908552	
• San Bernardino	22797	931349

Districts Thirty Nine and Forty:

• San Bernardino (2 districts)	1862698	1862698
--------------------------------	---------	---------

California State Senate with Divided Counties

Napa:

• 1	117946	
• 3	18538	136484

Yolo:

• 2	42738	
• 3	158111	200849

Contra Costa:

• 3	341356	
• 6	443910	
• 13	263759	1049025

San Francisco:

• 11	678940	
• 12	126295	805235

Santa Cruz:

• 12	86597	
• 14	169724	
• 16	6061	262382

Santa Clara:

• 14	88668	
• 15	761625	
• 16	931349	1781642

Sacramento:

• 4	931349	
• 6	487439	1418788

Stanislaus:

- 7 246043
- 8 268410 514453

Fresno:

- 5 78332
- 8 407146
- 9 259647
- 17 185325 930450

Alameda:

- 12 667590
- 13 842681 1510271

Ventura:

- 17 507454
- 18 315864 823318

Los Angeles:

- 19 615485
- 20-28 8382141
- 29 820979 9818605

Orange:

- 29 110370
- 30-32 2794047
- 33 105815 3010232

Riverside:

- 33 825534
- 37 455555
- 38 908552 2189641

San Diego:

- 34-36 2794047
- 37 301266 3095313

San Bernardino:

- 10 149713
- 38 22797
- 39-40 1862698 2035210

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Richard J Seyman <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 2011 17:32:43 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Richard J Seyman <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Northern Calif Plan

Message Body:

Attached is a plan for our Assembly Districts that is rooted in the major regional community-land use patterns of the north state. Because California geography is large and not compact some districts will not be compact. Yet people living in those areas largely share a common perspective and many common interests. With modern information and communication technology physical distances are not the obstacle they once were. This plan will provide better representation for both the more rural regions and the urban regions of the north state and is likely to also more likely to simplify meeting requirements of the Voting Rights Act.

From earlier testimony, it is likely that many from Yolo and Marin counties will be displeased at being included with their more urbanized neighboring areas. No plan can meet everyone's ideal preferences. But of all "rural" counties in the north, these two are far and away best situated by education and geography to cope with any increased challenges that arise because of their inclusion with the adjacent cities.

Please review the attached files and think about this possible option.
Thank you. Richard Seyman, Davis CA

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: David Williams <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 2011 19:15:11 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: David Williams <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Good Government

Message Body:

The quality of our governments will greatly improve if we have many competitive+/-% districts! If not we will all suffer more of the same for 10 years again.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: David Williams <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 2011 19:31:12 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: David Williams <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Good Government

Message Body:

The quality of our state and federal governments will greatly improve if the CRC creates many competitive $\pm 2\%$ districts! If not we will all suffer more of the same for 10 more years again. This is the hope of the great majority of Americans.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

Subject: Public Comment: General Comment

From: Rebecca Jordan Glum <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, 16 Jul 2011 06:04:04 +0000

To: [REDACTED]

From: Rebecca Jordan Glum <[REDACTED]>

Subject: LEASE CHANGE THE LATEST CONGRESSIONAL MAP BOUNDARY WHICH DIVIDES THE COMMUNITY OF VALLEY VILLAGE CALIFORNIA.

Message Body:

Please help! If you lived in our neighborhood you would see that this boundary splits up our small little community!

I live in Valley Village, located in Los Angeles, California. I am very concerned that the new map proposed earlier this week will divide Valley Village into two parts. Please redraw the line so that it follows the 170 Freeway and keeps the 25,000 stakeholders in Valley Village in one congressional district.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission