

Mapping Playbook

2020 CRC – FINAL DRAFT 3.2 (2021.10.18)

Note: the full Playbook consists of this document plus two attachments:

Attachment #1: “Consideration of Current District Boundaries” (see II.D.4.b)

Attachment #2: “Line Drawing Phases Plan” (see IV)

- I. **Data:** All mapping will be based on Statewide Database’s Official 2021 California Redistricting Database, consisting of:
 - A. Adjusted P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data with state incarcerated persons reallocated and federal incarcerated persons removed
 - B. Electoral datasets (Voter Reg. and Statement of Vote) on 2020 census blocks
 - C. Citizen Voting Age Population tabulations on 2020 census block geography

- II. **Ranked Statutory Criteria** (California Constitution, Article XXI, § 2):

The following six criteria (A-F) are listed in order of priority. Some include related but non-statutory considerations. Lower-priority criteria only apply to the extent that they do not conflict with higher-priority criteria.

 - A. **Equal Population:**
 1. Assembly, Senate, and BOE: as close to +/- 0% as possible but with deviation permitted by law (“reasonably equal population”)
 2. Congressional: as close to +/- 0% as possible (“population equality as nearly as is practicable”)

 - B. **VRA compliance:** Fulfill all Section 2 requirements

 - C. **Contiguity:** Observe absolutely, with appropriate consideration for islands and permanent water crossings; never use point contiguity

 - D. **Cities, Counties, a City and County, Local Neighborhoods and Local Communities of Interest** (note that the below sub-criteria of 1. Governmental Units and 2. Communities of Interest are not ranked within this criterion):
 1. Governmental Units: The statutory requirement is to respect the integrity of “any city, county, city and county, local neighborhood, [and] local community of interest” (note that “local neighborhood” is not limited to an officially designated neighborhood)
 2. Communities of Interest
 - a) The statutory requirement is to keep together, to the extent possible, each community of interest, which is a contiguous population that shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation

- b) By statute, defining communities of interest excludes any consideration of relationships with political parties, incumbents or political candidates
3. Apply these further non-statutory considerations to COI input:
- a) Where COI submissions conflict, generally give greater weight to those that:
 - (1) Aid in satisfying other statutory criteria, especially higher-ranked ones
 - (2) Are more relevant to the district type being considered (e.g., a COI focused on a national park might bear more weight for a congressional district than an Assembly one)
 - (3) Seem to represent a larger segment of a community
 - (4) More closely fit the statutory definition of a COI
 - (5) Are given by someone located in that COI
 - b) When an individual COI input submission is unclear or inconsistent with itself, generally give greater weight to the part of that individual submission that is more clear, specific, and central
 - c) Give due but carefully considered weight to COI input given via official resolutions by elected bodies
 - d) Give due but carefully considered weight to input by organizations; be aware of which interests a given organization does and does not represent, and be aware of how locally representative it actually is (or is not)
 - e) It is appropriate to consider COIs known to Commissioners through data or other documented evidence even if those communities have not submitted COI input
 - f) Sheer quantity of input on a given COI is difficult to weigh; COI submissions are aids to identify and define COIs; therefore, quantities (whether many or few) should be duly considered but are not decisive
 - g) In cases of multiple substantially identical COI input submissions that appear “scripted,” generally evaluate the COI on its own merits, noting the above considerations about quantity of input; do not discount such input merely for seeming “scripted”
 - h) Be open to ways a heterogeneous region may nevertheless “share common social and economic interests”
 - i) Consider racially framed COI input in the context of all other traditional redistricting criteria, so that race is never a sole or predominating factor (except as needed for VRA compliance)
 - j) Give appropriate care and consideration to the possibilities of covert motivations and sources of COI input; factually questionable input can be checked or ignored; use a critical lens to discern attempts to reverse engineer districts; always look for actual evidence

- k) If testimony alone is insufficient to fully define a given COI, it may be helpful to seek current and valid demographic, economic, historic, land-use, and other data (e.g., via reports written by local communities about their own issues); and make in-person visits
- 4. Areas that are not specified by statute but overlap with the statutory Government units and Communities of Interest include:
 - a) Unincorporated communities and Census Designated Places (which are typically larger than a neighborhood and sometimes as large as a small city)
 - b) Current state election districts, which will be considered per *Attachment #1, "Consideration of Current District Boundaries"*

E. **Compactness:** Not bypassing nearby areas of population for distant ones

F. **Nesting:** Two whole, complete, adjacent Assembly districts per Senate district; ten whole, complete, adjacent Senate districts per Board of Equalization district

G. **Exclusions:**

- 1. We will not consider the place of residence of any officeholder or candidate
- 2. We will not or draw any district with the intention of favoring or disfavoring any officeholder, candidate, or party

III. **General Mapping Sequence:**

- A. Areas with potential/probable VRA districts (Assembly, Senate, Congressional)
- B. Assembly plan
- C. Senate plan
- D. Board of Equalization plan
- E. Congressional plan

For each plan, the Commission will start with more densely populated areas, such as those in Los Angeles County, and move towards comparatively less populated areas.

IV. **Mapping Process:** As set out in *Attachment #2, "Line Drawing Phases Plan"*

V. **Some General Principles:**

- A. Document all decisions and their reasons, including incremental ones
- B. Consult the most current data available, remembering that the 2011 maps are a decade old
- C. "Share the Gain & Pain"--spread the costs and benefits of mapping decisions; e.g., if a city must be split in one plan, consider keeping it whole in another plan
- D. Be open to resolving similar issues in different places in different ways
- E. Remember: "The cleanest option is not always the best" - Justin Levitt
- F. Remember: we are neither in the incumbent protection business nor in the wrecking ball business