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## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR SADHWANI: Good morning, California, and good morning, Dodger Nation.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Woo, woo, woo, woo.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Welcome to the California Citizens

Redistricting Commission, in our third day of reviewing visualizations from across the state.

We continue with our agenda, on agenda item number

2, and will continue on with that today. We will begin by taking the roll.

Is Ravi available to do that for us today? MR. MANOFF: Just a moment.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Good morning, Chair. I'll be taking roll.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. Very good. Thanks so much,

Alvaro.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: All right.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go Blue. Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's logging on.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay. He's here but logging
on.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad. COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa. COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.
DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Presente.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Sadhwani.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Here.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: You have a quorum, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you very much. Our schedule
for today; we will be continuing with the Mapper Kennedy, who is here. Hi, good morning, Kennedy. And pick up where we left off last night in our review of Assembly visualizations and ideas for the Central Valley and Northern California. We'll then move to that region for Senate visualizations, followed by Congressional visualizations. Finally, we'll move on to Mapper Tamina. And do a review of the Bay Area and the coastal areas.

We have a lot to cover today. If by some chance we don't finish everything, we will issue a continuation order, and complete this meeting on Monday afternoon, if need be. I understand that we have a hard stop at 6:30, due to staffing requirements, and so we will -- we'll see how far we get today. I'm very hopeful that that we'll complete our work, but should we need to, we will continue Monday afternoon.

And so with that, I'm going to hand it over to Karin and Kennedy, to continue our review of the Assembly districts. I believe that there are still some additional comments and considerations to be made for that area.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Good morning, everybody. Thank you for having us. We went over the Assembly plans for the Northern California and Central -- Inland Central California areas yesterday. And we received some
feedback and direction already, but we were not done with the feedback and direction. So perhaps we could finish that and then move on to Senate. Thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds great. Commissioner Fernandez, did you want to jump in with a question?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I wanted to provide my feedback since I was -- I had to leave early yesterday. CHAIR SADHWANI: Excellent. Perfect. Let's just go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Are we good? CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thank you so much. And before I start, I do want to mention that I do -- I don't like being rushed. I feel that others have -- may have complained in the past about Southern California being rushed. But now we've gone through LA and all of Southern California, and we have fifty-two counties left to do. And I just want the same respect that I've given all the other counties and visualizations, for the other fifty-two counties of California that are still left to be discussed. And with that, I am going to start. So I unfortunately had to leave a little early yesterday, so I was unable to hear the feedback from my colleagues
yesterday. So I apologize ahead of time to the Commissioners, probably more so, Toledo and Turner, if I repeat any of the comments that you may have given. I will listen to those tomorrow, once that information is posted.

And with that -- and I did want to just say, I was reminded of why we're here. On my trip to the airport last night, $I$ had an Uber driver who is an immigrant here for six years, and I talked to him the whole way, and I was just reminded: Yes, we're here for them. We're here for every Californian. And every time I meet someone new, I am reminded of how much I love this state.

So with that; all right, Kennedy and Karin, are you ready?

MS. MAC DONALD: We are.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And so I will start with B. And at this point, I cannot say B is better than A. But what I will do is give feedback on the two different visualizations. And I do want to thank you both for these visualizations.

And so with that, I'm hoping that I've labeled them correctly. I'm going to start with B, because I believe that's what you started with during our trip. Okay. I'm just looking through my pages right now. So this one is Assembly District $B-1$, page 3, and it is titled, ABD

Delta, during the pandemic to strengthen. I did that. This one is Assembly District B one, page 3, and it is titled ADB-Delta. Okay. Thank you. And so this one, I kind of want to say the Yolo part and like from -- let me see where I'm at -- I'm moving my mouse, like, that's really going to help me right now.

But yes, I'm moving the -- like Freeport, Hood, Courtland, all the way to Discovery Bay, moving that out and making it more of to Yolo County, like to Williams and Napa. Yeah, that would be my recommendation for visualization. Thank you so much.

And then the next one, you don't have to bring it up if you don't want, but it was the $A D B-1$, page 4, and it is titled, ADB-WP-EDH, El Dorado Hills, and that one I liked. So I just want to say that I like that visualization. Of course, I may change my mind later.

And I did want to do -- I wanted to let the public know that $I$ did read the comments that were sent through our live input, our feedback. And I heard you, Del Norte and Shasta, thank you for writing in. And then also I want to encourage those -- I did get a chuckle that their response was, "No, no, no." That's great, but I would really love to know why you don't like those visualizations; and the reasons for that. So thank you.

Okay. So thank you for that one. And then I
liked -- also liked ADB-1, page 5, and that one is South Sac, and that one combined like Fruitridge Pocket in the Sacramento area, all the way down to Elk Grove.

And on this one, I do have a little note that the CVAPs for the Latino, Black, and Asian are high. So I would really like to look at that as a possible VRA coalition district.

And ADB-1, page 7, this one is ADB-NS-ACC, I like that one as well. It's like one -- I thought it's as important to say which ones we like, versus which ones that we may need to work on. And I think that might have been it for the B. I'm just going back real quickly.

Oh. ADB-1, page 2: That one is Tracy; and somebody might have already provided feedback on that one. This one, again, is also high in CVAP for Latino, Black, and Asian, so I would also like to look at that as a possible coalition for VRA.

Okay. And then I'm going to move over to A, visualization A. And just so that I don't forget, on some of these visualizations, I'm not going to go through each one. We love some of the coastal counties with some of the inland counties. And I would -- my preference is to keep the coastal counties together. So from Del Norte all the way down, as far as you can go to make districts. And that was in reference to ADA, page 1. And there're
some other ones too. And I think we had them too. But I just thought, it's a universal type of comment.

And then $A D A$, page 2, that one is $A D A-M-W F$, and that's Merced, West Fresno. And that one, that district had a high Latino, 47.55, so I'd like to look at that as a possible VRA coalition district. The ADA, page 3, is Central North. That one, I just wanted to let you know that I did like that one. I liked that combination of counties that are combined.

On AD-4 -- I mean, I'm sorry, ADA page 4, it's the Sierra-Calaveras, I'm going to take -- I'm going to repeat what Commissioner Sinay said: There's something I don't like about that, but I've got to figure out what that is, so maybe with the next visualization. It's grabbing some communities which I'm not sure how much commonality they have, so I'm hoping that the public can chime in on that.

And ADA, page 5: That one is West Placer, and that one I liked. That's just a comment for that, that was your -- oh. Oh, I'm sorry. No. I wanted to add Folsom and Orange Hills to that one; if I could see a visualization for that, it would be great, because it's kind of just cut off at Granite Bay, and Roseville, and I'd like to bring in Folsom, Orangevale.

I'm not sure what that will do -- well, obviously,
that's going to do something to your numbers. If need be, I would back out Rio Linda to that one, and maybe Alberta as well, and Antelope, just for the numbers, yes, yeah perfect. I would consider dropping those out and then bringing in Folsom, yeah. Thank you.

And then, okay. Oh, that's very good. So the next one is ADA-6, and that is the Nor Sac County. So this is where I would like to take Orangevale and Folsom out of that one, and then add Citrus Heights to this one -oops, am I ahead of you -- there we go. Add Citrus Heights to that one, and then possibly add Rosemont, Vineyard and Wilton to that one -- or to a visualization -- not necessarily to that one, but to a visualization.

The West Sac -- Sacramento, that's ADA-7, I go back and forth on that one, but I'm okay with that for now. I understand why West Sacramento would want to be combined with Sacramento. But I also understand why Yolo County would want to have West Sacramento. So we'll leave that as it is right now.

And then the next one is ADA, page 8, and that is the South Sac and North San Joaquin. Yes. And that one, again, I would like to -- from like Clarksburg to Rio Vista, like that whole piece of it, I would like to chunk that out and put it more towards the Yolo County, like up
to Williams. Williams is above Woodland, so kind of up that area. I'm sure you can see my hands moving, right, because I'm copying your --

And then again, this one is a high Latino, Black, and Asian. So $I$ would actually like to look to see if there's a VRA coalition, recognizing that we are moving some of the population away. So we'll see how that looks like -- what that looks like.

And then the last one was ADA, page 9, and that's the Stockton area. And that one, I would just like to look at a possible coalition for -- the VRA it is high in Latino, Asian, and Black as well.

And that is, I believe, all I have for my comments. So thank you so much, to Kennedy and Karin, for those visualizations.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Were there any additional comments on the Assembly districts? All right.

Well, I did just want to note, Commissioner

Fernandez, I understand and share your frustration. You know, which is really why $I$ wanted to make sure that we had plenty of time this morning to come back to the Assembly district, as well as finish this area before moving on. And that is our plan. And what we will do for today.

Sorry about that. I didn't realize, I didn't have
my camera on.

And if need be, as I mentioned this morning, we will issue a continuation of this meeting, and finish. Particularly, that might include public comment. So I want to certainly note that for the public, as well as, potentially, the reading of the notes, if we don't get to that, that takes quite a -- a lot of time, but also a really important piece to ensure it's on the record.

So with that, Karin and Kennedy, I think we can move on to the Senate districts in this area.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much. So we're moving on to the Central Northern California State Senate A visualization set. And I understand that Mr. Becker is here. And Kennedy will walk us through the visualization on page 5. Again, this is Senate A. So that's visualization on -- the visualization on page 5. And the existing Assembly district lines are on, and so is the CVAP.

MS. WILSON: So here we have the Fresno-West Kern, this follows the outline of the Western Kern district that was drawn in the Assembly districts. And this goes along, taking all of Kings County, and then the parts of Western Fresno that we had before. This keeps together Reedley, and Sanger, and Fowler, and those communities here in all of Western Fresno.

And I will now hand that over to Mr. Becker, unless you -- oh, Karin is going to read that.

MS. MAC DONALD: Let me read the CVAP of this visualization really quickly. So the deviation is negative 1.43 percent. Latino CVAP is 56.72 percent. Black CVAP is 5.94 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.93 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.06 percent. And White CVAP is 29.57 percent.

MR. BECKER: And I'll just note here, as you can see, Gingles 1 is satisfied. This is over a majority Latino. We are seeing evidence in the Assembly districts of Gingles 2 being met with Latino, racially polarized voting. And it looks like we're still collecting data on Gingles 3 here. But it looks like Gingles 3 is likely met in this area as well. But we're still collecting some more election data from that area.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay. We're going to move on to -just one second. Kennedy is changing the district labels. And we're now moving on to visualizations for district sized visualizations that did not have any -that did not receive any special VRA consideration. And that we're starting on page 9, please, of Central Northern California State Senate A Plan, page 9.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So now we have Kern, Los Angeles County, and San Bernardino County. I can see you are not
being quite fond of this, considering it takes Lancaster, which was to show you what we needed to get population up. There is a different version of this that doesn't include this at all, and just goes down into San Bernardino Valley. But we have the Victor Valley here kept entirely whole together, Lucerne Valley as well. And we have this part of Bakersfield that is not included with this Western Kern, as well as Tehachapi and these desert cities here, but not going up into Ridgecrest. And so taking Lancaster out, this percentage, numbers-wise drops dramatically. But just showing you what we had to do with the VRA consideration to get it to that. But there is a different visualization that's coming in $S D-B$ as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The percent deviation on this visualization is 1.15 percent. Latino CVAP is 34.01 percent. Black CVAP is 10.78 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.83 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.13 percent. And White CVAP is 49.37 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to page 7 of the Senate visualizations, and this includes this northern part of Kern County. So I kept the Lake Isabella community together, along with Ridgecrest and Inyo-Kern too. And then we have Inyo, the entirety of Inyo, the entirety of Mono, the entirety of Tulare kept
together.

Then again, it's cut off on the Fresno and Madera lines there. And then we include Mariposa, Tuolumne, up to parts of El Dorado, which we needed population for this area. So El Dorado gives a big majority of population, and still you can see it's under, and then up to Alpine as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: As Kennedy said, this visualization is underpopulated by 5.10 percent. Latino CVAP is 28.54 percent. Black CVAP is 1.41 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.48 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.12 percent. And White CVAP is 63.84 percent.

Moving on to page 6.

MS. WILSON: Now, we'll be moving to page 6, and this includes -- I'll zoom in closer so you can see; so a majority of the Fresno area, and then the entirety of Clovis, and so this southern part belongs to that VRA sized Assembly district that we were working, along with this entire part of Madera, keeping the city side of it whole with Chowchilla, Fairmead, Atwater, being together as well, and then the entirety of Merced.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation for this visualization is 5.59 percent. Latino CVAP is 39.77 percent. Black CVAP is 5.88 percent. Asian CVAP is 10.04 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.11 percent. And

White CVAP is 42.48 percent.
MS. WILSON: Now, we will be continuing on to Senate visualization $A$, page 8. And we will be continuing to move north into the San Joaquin and Stanislaus area. So here we have San Joaquin, except for this -- the Oakdale, the Knights Ferry, is cut out and put with the Eastern California area. And then we move up into Stockton, keeping Stockton with Manteca. And we do not include Mountain House and Tracy in this visualization. And Lodi and the northern cities here are not a part of that.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation for this visualization is 7.93 percent. Latino CVAP is 34.81 percent. Black CVAP is 7.04 percent. Asian CVAP is 11.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.03 percent. And White CVAP is 44.36 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to a visualization page -- on page 4 of the Senate. And we will continue to move north. And we have here, the South Sacramento, the North San Joaquin area, along with this Delta area so -- and this visualization, you can see going into Contra Costa -- I'll zoom in a little closer -- that this includes all the way out passed Pittsburg, trying to grab that population from the Bay, and keeping these Delta areas together.

And then it follows the tail of Sacramento. It does
not cover the River Delta Unified School District, it starts at the Sacramento County line, and then the Lodi, Dogtown, Lockeford, these cities going up north with Sacramento, up into the line of that Fruitridge Pocket area, and keeping these areas of Elk Grove and Pocket together.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation for this
visualization is 4.46 percent. Latino CVAP is 23.08 percent. Black CVAP is 13.78 percent. Asian CVAP is 19.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.91 percent. And White CVAP is 40.41 percent.

CHAIR SADHWANI: It looks like we have a question from Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. What page was that again? Because I had my page 4 printed up, but maybe I labeled them wrong. I don't remember that one. CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. I actually haven't been able to find any of these.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Okay. I was -CHAIR SADHWANI: I don't know, yeah. Karin, could you read out that page again? I haven't been able to find any of these. MS. WILSON: The one we just did was page 3. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. I thought you said it was --

MS. WILSON: Oh. I'm sorry, page 4.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: On the Senate District A, page 4?

MS. WILSON: Senate District A, page 4. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't --

MS. WILSON: Central, North California.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do not have that one.

Okay. I'll have to probably have you call that one up again, as $I$ don't have that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It does depend on when you downloaded it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Did they change?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: There are revisions to the visualizations.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I looked this morning.

There're some new ones.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no. Okay.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. We're going to need to work on this process moving forward, because this is really challenging for us to try and keep up with. But in any case, let's continue.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Now, we will be moving to visualization, the page -- on Senate A, page 3, and so we will continue moving north into -- to North Sacramento.

It's titled, SDA-NSAC, Senate District A, North Sacramento. And so this here includes -- it excludes West Sacramento, it's not included. And we have this northern part of Sacramento up to Natomas with all of those Northern Sacramento county cities as well, up to Elverta, Antelope, and Folsom. These are all together with this North Sacramento area. And down into, goes here around Land Park, includes East Sacramento, this Del Paso Heights area as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation on this visualization
is 1.02 percent. Latino CVAP is 16.04 percent. Black CVAP is 9.62 percent. Asian CVAP is 10.24 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.27 percent. And White CVAP is 61.33 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now we will be moving onto page 2 of Senate A visualizations. And so I'm going to zoom out so we can see those counties. We have Butte down to Solano. So I'm going to turn the cities' layer off so we can see those counties a bit better. But this cuts off the Venetian-Vallejo, and keeps Butte with Sutter and Yuba. Keep Sutter and Yuba together, Yolo, and Solano, as well as Colusa, and Glenn.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation on this visualization is negative 3.57 percent. Latino CVAP is 19.64 percent. Black CVAP is 5.97 percent. Asian CVAP is 10.23 percent.

Indigenous CVAP is 1.77 percent. And White CVAP is 60.85 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now we will be moving on to the last page, which is page 1. And this has Northern California without the coastal cities. And so Siskiyou, Modoc, down to -- with Tehama, Plumas, down to El Dorado, and that El Dorado area, those chunk of cities were taken out and put down here, but includes the entirety of Placer, the entirety of Sierra and Nevada, and El Dorado is the only county split here with the cities.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation on this visualization is negative 6.36 percent. Latino CVAP is 9.81 percent. Black CVAP is 1.47 percent. Asian CVAP is 4.25 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.42 percent. And White CVAP is 81.35 percent. And this concludes set A.

And Commissioners, I apologize if there was -- if something happened with these downloads or handouts. I downloaded them last night, and the page numbers seemed to correspond to what is on the web.

We're now going to move to the Northern California. So it's the Central Northern California visualization, set B, for Senate. And if you wish, I can find exactly what the name is on the website. For that, please, just let us know what you need from us.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I think on the

```
website it is now labeled as Central/Northern CA State
Senate Visualizations B, slides 1 through 9 of 9.
    MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah.
    CHAIR SADHWANI: Unless Commissioners have any
specific questions, I think we can proceed.
    MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Thank you for that. I think
that was my attempt to make it a little bit clearer from
the other day, just to let everybody know how many slides
are in each visualization set.
    So for Senate for this area, there were two
different plans. A, we just went through. This is B,
there are nine slides in this particular set, and we are
going to start with -- just one second. We are going to
start with page 6, please.
    MS. WILSON: This visualization is -- this one was
drawn the same as A, so this has the exact same
boundaries as the A one was drawn. So we can have Mr.
Becker, when we go on to Congress, but unless he would
like to say something else, and add more to this, and I
can turn on the old boundaries as well.
    MR. BECKER: Yeah. I'll just add very briefly, one
thing I wanted to add that I didn't say before, we are
still, as I mentioned yesterday, collecting the Senate
specific elections, which are endogenous and highly
relevant here. And I'm told we should have pretty good
```

data on that to report next week.

MS. WILSON: So now moving on, we will be going to page 9 of those Senate B visualizations. And I'm going to change my labels; so one moment while I do that.

Okay. Okay. So moving on to page 9, we have Kern and San Bernardino County. And I'm going to turn that city layer back on so we can see what we have here. But this excludes all of Los Angeles County, and it includes the parts of Bakersfield that is not included in here.

So that northern and eastern; the parts of Shafter, Oildale, Tehachapi, these desert cities here; and then, it includes the entirety of the Victorville, Apple Valley area. It goes down to including Lake Arrowhead, Big Bear City, Morongo Valley, Twentynine Palms, and all of San Bernardino County, except for these cities that are inland here.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 4.06 percent. Latino CVAP is 31.30 percent. Black CVAP is 8.05 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.47 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.33 percent. And White CVAP is 54.84 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to page 8. And I'll zoom out so we can see those better. And this is going to be the visualization of Eastern California again, which is fairly similar to the one $I$ showed previously. So it includes the -- I'll zoom in closer so


White CVAP is 42.48 percent.

MS. WILSON: And here we have moving on to page 5, we have the San Joaquin and Stanislaus, which again, this one is identical to the last one as well. And just a reminder, this part of Stanislaus was cut out here, based on direction, not knowing entirely where to put it. But so put it out this way so that we could keep Stockton whole, and keep Manteca and Lathrop together as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here 7.93 percent. Latino CVAP is 34.81 percent. Black CVAP is 7.04 percent. Asian CVAP is 11.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.03 percent. And White CVAP is 44.36 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will continue moving north to Sacramento -- oh, to page 4. And this will have Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Contra Costa. And the difference that we have here, is this one just goes out to Pittsburg. It doesn't go any further into Contra Costa, and still does not include any Solano or Yolo together, keeps Lodi, Dogtown, and Lockeford going north into Sacramento as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation for this visualization is 2.63 percent. Latino CVAP is 22.58 percent. Black CVAP is 13.70 percent. Asian CVAP is 19.09 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.91 percent. And White CVAP is 41.05 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, I'll be moving on to page 3 of Senate B visualizations into North Sacramento. And a big difference here from the last one was the exclusion of Rancho Marietta due to these as well. So this one is now down with San Joaquin and Contra Costa, when before it was up with these ones here as well, so has Sacramento and these Northern Sacramento counties. And these ones are this the Northern Sacramento Cities here; including Folsom, Citrus Heights, Antelope, Elverta, down to ArdenArcade, keeping Arden-Arcade and Carmichael together, down to Rosemont and Rancho Cordova.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is 0.42 percent. Latino CVAP is 16.10 percent. Black CVAP is 9.64 percent. Asian CVAP is 10.29 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.27 percent. And White CVAP is 61.18 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now we'll be moving to page 2, and I'm going to zoom out so we can see this Greater Sacramento. I'm going to turn the cities' layers off so we can see this. This keeps the entirety of Yolo together, with West Sacramento with Yolo, Sutter and Yuba are not with Butte, but they are still together, the entirety of Placer, and then those parts of El Dorado, the El Dorado Hills, are cut out, but Placerville is still a part of this visualization here.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation for this
visualization is negative 8.05 percent. Latino CVAP is 15.66 percent. Black CVAP is 2.38 percent. Asian CVAP is 8.95 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.53 percent. And White CVAP is 70.51 percent.

MS. WILSON: And then now we'll be moving on to our last visualization, page 1, which includes these Northern California counties with the coastal ones; so down to Mendocino, Colusa, Butte, Plumas, Glenn, Tehama, Lassen, Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, and Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 0.24 percent. Latino CVAP is 10.91 percent. Black CVAP is 1.43 percent. Asian CVAP is 2.66 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 4.05 percent. And White CVAP is 80.12 percent.

MS. WILSON: And my apologies. Also forgot to mention we have Sierra Nevada kept together in this as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: That concludes set B of the Senate visualizations. And if you'd like, Kennedy can walk you through the major differences between Senate Plan A and Senate Plan B?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that would be really great.

MS. WILSON: So a majority of these differences start in the north, and including these coastal counties
and not makes a big ripple effect going down, but these down here are pretty much the same except for what we did with Kern. So here, this one included Lancaster, and so I didn't have to include the cities that were below.

I'm going to turn the cities layer on so that we can see it. And then I'm going to zoom in closer.

This is a comparison of $A$ and $B$, so SDA-A is in the red line and $B$ is in the black line. And here we have -one moment, let me turn those on and move a little closer so we can see -- that the A included Lancaster, which had to include some of this LA County, and then here we don't include any of it in the $B$, and just go along this line of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Big Bear, Morongo Valley, and taking this part of San Bernardino. And that helped us get to a closer deviation.

And then, moving through the Central Valley, things were staying the same, but then moving up north, in the $A$ visualization, we included Solano with Yolo together, and in B we do not have Solano at all. Moving into this South Sacramento, North San Joaquin, there's one that moves slightly passed Pittsburg into Clyde area, and then we also have one that just includes Pittsburg.

And then that rippled off to me including Rancho Marietta in one version of the South Sacramento County, and one that did not have it in it as well.

And then moving into El Dorado, we moved out as far as Placer in the first visualization, and then cut that off by the Cameron Park, El Dorado Cities in the second one. And then moving north, we had visualization A that -- I'll turn these lines off so we can see -- that does not include -- does not include Lake. But then as we -- oh, this one does not as well.

But as we move -- as we move north, we can see that there is a line keeping these, kind of, closer together. But Butte gets separated, and Colusa gets separated from Sutter and Yuba. But Sutter and Yuba stay together, but Butte is excluded. And Sierra and Nevada stay with the north. And those are some of the major differences of these two plans; as well as the coast, of course.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much, Kennedy. And that was really helpful just to kind of walk through the differences between these two visualizations.

I definitely see a lot of Commissioners prepared to provide direction. Let's start with Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.
To the line drawers, I'd like to start by saying I can't even imagine trying to provide information in a way that fourteen different people would appreciate it, and understand. So thank you for everything that you're doing.

It occurs to me, a couple of things. What will be beneficial, maybe not so much so for today, but for some of the other iterations going forward, I learned that with the online visualizations, if I can for -- when there's an A and B, if I can bring them both up for page, it's easy in the north, 1 is 1, 1-A, $1-B$, and $I$ can click back and forth and kind of see the differences on my screen, which is very helpful.

By the time you get down into some of the other parts, it's not a 1 for 1 , it's page 5 on $B$, and page 8 on A, which makes it a little bit harder, because I'm trying to keep up and understand. And so I just want to suggest that if there's ever a possibility for likenesses to be on the same page, and then we can kind of click back and forth here to kind of help with that; wanted to state that.

The second part is, is trying to -- the ripple effect, I am concerned that in the center part the options are the same, in the same. I do want to see something different, and let it ripple into the other areas and see what we have to do to fix it. Because I didn't particularly like the visualization for San Joaquin, we do have testimony that's wanting to see what that looks like whole. And of course, trying to accommodate the ends in both; $I$ understand why it's drawn
the way it is. I'd like to see for Senate district, what can we do to keep San Joaquin whole as opposed to split, and then see what that causes in some of the other areas.

In page 9, let's see, let me go to B, in the B visualizations, page 9, and then $I$ think it was also then it fell to 9 in A, again, the comparison. Yeah. So that little part down there was Los Angeles, I think you said on the map, on visualization $A$, that's taken out of $B$ ? What was the difference in the SDAK-LA? And then on the B it was SDB-Kern. Is it Los Angeles that's missing between the two visualizations?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.
MS. WILSON: And it goes farther down into San Bernardino County. So here in visualization A, we had Lancaster that was a part of it. And here into the Victor Valley, Apple Valley area, Lucerne Valley, put with that, and we didn't have this Lake Arrowhead, Big Bear, down to Morongo, and Twentynine Palms in the first one. And so then we excluded that, and just went down further into San Bernardino County, and took it down this way, into Morongo Valley. But we didn't go into San Bernardino, Redlands area, and just went this way to Morongo, Twentynine Palms, out to the east and the entirety of that up here.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Okay. Thank you. I just wanted -- I just kept going back and forth to see what that is. I don't have any comment. I'll leave that to Kennedy, with Morongo Valley, and all.

Let me match up some more of these maps, those two were observations, and then I'll come back in a bit. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Taylor.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good morning. Thank you, Chair. Not necessarily a critique of any one map in particular, or any preference toward A or B. I think in review, I would like to see the communities of Lancaster and Palmdale stay intact in the same district. I think those communities share a lot of similarities, a lot of community of interest.

Shoot. Some people don't even say them without -they say them together, it is synonymous with Palmdale, Lancaster. I think those are desert communities, or at least their living is closer to the desert communities, so they share more in common with the Rosemonts, the Adelantos, the Hesperias.

So I think those belong in the same district. And I know that's a big question for us right now as we fight, you know, the Acton, Castaic, Simi Valley, and where those fall in. But $I$ believe that Palmdale, Lancaster
community, and we've heard community input about it, too, should stay intact in a single district. Thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. And I very much agree with that comment.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yes. Building on that, because that that was my big piece. Lancaster and Palmdale, in my mind, absolutely have to stay together. I am torn between option A and option B here. My concern for -- in this particular area, so that the one that we just highlighted from Commissioner Turner, my concern for both visualizations, even if in, I believe this is option A, even if we include Palmdale in this visualization, my concern is that we are cracking some of the Black and Latino population, particularly in Kern. And so I just -- maybe that's just an observation.

So the direction is, when we're drawing any of these lines, that Lancaster and Palmdale have to stay together.

And then maybe I'd look to Commissioner Kennedy if he has any ideas, or even Commissioner Turner, about how we work -- how we work this particular area.

And then another global direction going back, I noticed again, Shafter was split with some of it, sort of little pieces. And so building off of a comment that Commissioner Fornaciari gave yesterday, I think we can't
split these small towns, especially in these big picture globalizations. I would like to see the small towns kept together; so a global direction for all visualizations. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. And thank you for the clarity of what the direction actually was. So that was, that was really great.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. And I do agree with Lancaster, Palmdale staying together. That was my comment for down there. And I want to reemphasize that not splitting the small towns, they have built relationships, and they work together because they are small, to try to have some sort of force.

So thank you for that, Commissioner Vazquez.
And I have comments moving further north. But should we stay -- do we move up, or how would you like to do it, Chair?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah, I mean, if seems like even --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Because yeah, I don't want to -- yeah, I don't want to take away from what we're building here.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. Either way, I mean, it seems like we're -- you know, there's a lot of interest in kind
of looking at this area, so it makes sense to frontload all of the comments about, you know, the southern, because we're coming to such a humongous portion of the state, so we have specific pieces here, and then we can move northward.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. That'll be great. Can I just -- Kennedy, can just can we can you just bring up SDA page 7? That was one that I didn't have. I have no idea why I didn't have it in my package. I just want to take a look at that one. I know that's a little further up, but $I$ just wanted to take a quick look before I make comments on that, and then $I$ will wait until we move further north.

MS. WILSON: So I can detail it for you. This has the Lake Isabella area, the Ridgecrest area, together with all of Tulare, Inyo, Mono, cut that part of Fresno and Madera, Mariposa, it also has Oakdale to Knights Ferry from Stanislaus, and then up into El Dorado Hills to Placerville, I believe.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think on that one, I think that was my concern in terms of looping El Dorado with that, $I$ would prefer not to keep -- not to have the Placerville. Like what part of the Placerville, can you zoom in on that?

MS. WILSON: Okay. I will zoom in for that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry about that.

MS. WILSON: No. That's what I'm here for.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So here, this part of Placerville. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thanks.

MS. WILSON: And Diamond Springs. And then in the version B, Placerville and Diamond Springs are taken out. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And I would just recommend taking out the Cameron Park piece as well. I realize that it's a ripple effect but that's -- so that's my comment on that piece of it. Thank you. I will -I'll comment later.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Fernandez, can I ask, I don't know this area very well.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Can you tell me a little bit about Placerville, Cameron Park, Diamond Springs that make you feel that way?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's more populated. So it isn't one of the smaller towns in the area, or up in the mountains, per se, it's actually being connected to, if you see it's Sacramento just kind of leads into Fair Oaks, Folsom, and it just kind of -- it's starting -there's a lot of construction up there, so it's more of a -- not so rural anymore. It's more urban, and more
connected to Sacramento.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Got it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: More population, there's a lot more people commuting to and from Sacramento to Placerville, and Cameron Park. I mean, it's a drag, but they still do it, bless their hearts.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much for that. I appreciate it.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. No direction, but two thoughts. One about the far north, and the big question about keeping the coast altogether, or keeping all the northern counties together, from coast inland. And I was thinking about the playbook and the thought of applying different solutions to the same place at different times. And just wanted to pull that one out of the garage, as we think in the future about the north, and maybe, you know, maybe the Assembly keeps the whole coast together, and the senate doesn't, or you know, or vice versa. But $I$ just wanted to float that thought out as a possibility.

Second observation is about deviation. And so just noting that this seems to have somewhat higher deviations, I know we're far, far, far from trying to get those numbers where they need to be, but just wondering
if there's any context at all that might -- behind that somewhat higher deviations through the set that might help us think about, or just plant a seed for how to think about those moving forward? Or if not, that's fine too.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. So using these bigger areas, one here, this is one of the larger deviations, and I don't want to split city -- I'm trying not to split cities and split counties. So this needs -- this area needs to be populated by somewhere, and where that is, I'm not entirely sure. So I'm, you know, teetering between just trying to separate some cities but not cutting any in half. And so that is a major reason for that. And not wanting to put Kern with these cities as well.

But there's -- someone has to give to this area. So that is one thing that a -- a reason for something like this having a big area. And then in this one, 7.93 in Stanislaus, I mean, keeping Stockton whole, that's a big population, and not necessarily knowing where to put Manteca and Lathrop as well.

And so you know, I know taking Tracy and Mountain House out, and I know Tamina will give -- she's going to dip into San Joaquin as well in some of her visualizations. So kind of trying to handle those tradeoffs and not knowing what populations can populate
over here. And that is kind of the reason for these, if that was helpful to you at all. And if you need me to elaborate anymore, let me know.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you. It looks like Commissioner Andersen is chomping at the bit to get in here, and has some ideas for you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do, actually, because that large area that's, you know, at minus 8 right now, that's the area that we worked extensively with. First of all, kind of, because we are starting in the south there, Ridgecrest specifically said: Well, yes, we're high desert, all our funding, all our roads, everything is done from Kern County. They do not want to be with San Bernardino, or you know, even Inyo.

So I would actually modify that. You know, when you put Kern, even if we were to put Kern -- the rest of Kern with Tulare, or something, to ground the population for this negative 8, I would actually like to start at the top, if we can go up, and where we have the Senate district, $I$ think it's at $B$, or is it $A$, the one that does not have the coastal. I think that is A, right?

MS. WILSON: Yes. That is A.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I can see that --

MS. WILSON: That does not have the coastal. This
is in red. I'll turn it back to black.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Could we just see, I think, is that page -- that's just on the first page A-1. MS. WILSON: Oh. Up to the north? COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, up to the north. MS. WILSON: Okay. That is A-1. COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. If we could, in that visualization -- okay, if we could add -- okay, first of all, take out Sierra, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, add Butte, Glenn, Colusa, right, add those, and I think that's going to help your population up north. And then, and I don't know -- yeah, and then, so add Sierra, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado to the -- or you know, essentially the eastern, what you're calling, to the Foothills, and Mono, Inyo, add that.

And then in -- actually now if you go to the center of it, put Yolo with Solano -- exactly, and that will add enough -- unfortunately, I know we're trying to do a Delta area, but Contra Costa, that area going up to Sacramento is never going to work. They just don't have -- I mean, they don't even get the same newspapers. I mean, they're just, it's too different. We really try to do a Delta area; we could still possibly play with that, getting a little bit of the tail of sacramento into Solano for population. But $I$ just don't know if we're
going to get there.

And then as Commissioner Turner said, trying to keep San Joaquin together, that would take a chunk out of that little portion in there, which you had with Calaveras and Tuolumne which, they don't really have -- they don't really have it together.

And then that could add more population from Stanislaus, and you have kind of cut -- it's still the valley, but you decided to kind of draw that, I'd like to put, and you have the Merced, Fresno, that line is so low, I'd like to move that a little bit further up into the hills.

And I know you've had population there, but I'm thinking you can grab part of Fresno possibly into that, because the one thing that we keep on hearing from Mono, Inyo, up north, their representatives always live in that area, and they might as well be, you know, in D.C., because they cannot get there in the winter. And actually even in the summer it's pretty hard.

So in terms of population, $I$ think if we add those upper, northern counties in with this, it could give us enough population, and then we can kind of rework, as Commissioner Turner was kind of suggesting, through the Central Valley, we kind of artificially narrowed it, and made them kind of cut a little, quite frankly, a little
oddly. And I'm hoping that we can kind of sort of rework, starting at the top down, where we kind of start at the bottom and went up, and it kind of -- it gave us a lot of things, but completely against all our communities of interest. So that's -- hopefully that that might help.

MS. WILSON: Do you mind revisiting, just really quickly, what parts of Fresno you were speaking about being with this Merced?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, right now Fresno is cut into like three -- it's in three different districts, Fresno County.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. So we have this one here. COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. MS. WILSON: It cuts off that smaller part, and then this here, and then the city part.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. And I'm wondering, rather than putting this, and Merced is cut into two and --

MS. WILSON: Oh. Merced is not --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
Madera --

MS. WILSON: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- is cut into two. If we could take -- and Merced with Madera is already, you
know, more than five percent over, so it has too much population in it already. So I would actually take parts of Madera and this part of Fresno, and put it with this -- well, you can't see where I'm -- put it with the eastern portion of Fresno, possibly, and grabbing Tulare, maybe something like that.

Or trying to play a little bit around with that -it's almost like we need to expand -- I know we're concerned with our, you know, potentially I believe, as Commissioner Vazquez said, it looks like we're kind of sort of packing a little bit maybe, you know, or even cracking.

If we could kind of rearrange where our -- where we're looking at our VRA possible district with this -I'd like us to kind of revisit this area, looking at other possibilities, because it's sort of too broken up. It's just a little too broken up, without being a bit more -- do I need to be a little more specific?

CHAIR SADHWANI: My sense is, and the line drawers can respond to that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.
CHAIR SADHWANI: But my sense is, the analysis is -as we've heard, is not done yet for from the VRA perspective, and so we'll be getting more of that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Did the line drawers need any more specificity on any of those comments?

MS. MAC DONALD: No. We're fine. Thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much. Commissioner Fernandez. Sorry about that. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And this is more a comment, not for the line drawers, but just in general. I think for me, personally, like having, various visualizations, A and B, I would prefer to just have one visualization, and work with that. And it makes it very challenging because we're not doing the live line drawing to really know how to move -- how moving the lanes impacts.

And so we kind of -- we give direction, and then we kind of have to wait until the visualization -- the new visualization is done, and I realize that there's still VRA analysis going on. But firstly, in moving forward I would prefer to just have one visualization, and then provide feedback just on one, instead of trying to compare the two to see which one I like, you know, which one you like better than the other.

And I do want to echo Commissioner Yee, with the deviation, and I'm hoping as we move forward, or continuing forward, those deviations won't be as high as they are for some of the areas. But again, I realize how
challenging it is for our line drawers, and I appreciate all the work you're doing.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that. Commissioner Fernandez. I know when you had your hand raised before, that you did have more stuff for the northern parts. Did you want to -- while the floor is yours, did you want to take that on now, or do you want to come back?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, it appeared that we were kind of moving from south, and I didn't want to lose that momentum.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm very happy to wait.

CHAIR SADHWANI: You bet. Okay. Sounds good. Just wanted to make sure you have a chance to get in there.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Another piece of global direction, I actually think for large cities, when we have to, especially for creating visualizations in this big picture, I do actually think splitting cities in half rather than leaving little bits of big cities to fend for themselves in another district, it feels like a more equitable place to start. So in these, again, global visualizations, I'd like the mappers to keep small cities and towns together.

But for big cities, for visualization purposes,
splitting them in half feels like the right way to begin. And then we, in live line drawing, can use community of interest input to figure out where exactly that line looks. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks. I will start with -- I guess I'll just -- I want to start with what Commissioner Vazquez says. I was going to make a similar comment to ask that as the line drawers are looking at -- just in any visualization, being conscious -- I know that they're picking up the census bloc level, but being conscious of where smaller towns and cities are also being split, and to keep them whole. Because I do recall Commissioner Fernandez saying that the impacts to a really small town could be so much more adverse than it would be to a large city.

And that takes me to building upon what Commissioner Andersen was saying. She was commenting that Fresno was split into three -- at least three different districts. I do want to note that the communities of interest testimony that we heard from individuals that are -- or community members that are from Fresno did also state that there is a preference for some of those splits to
occur, because of what they felt were differences in terms of interests.

And just, I'll say, you know, other different kinds of factors, whether it's transportation, or shopping, or you know, other community issues that they may face. And so that gets into what $I$ wanted to really talk about, which is that Eastern Sierra District, I feel like we heard very clearly from a number of callers, that keeping a district that really honor that eastern Sierra region in one district is important and that it's better to go north-south than to grab from, in their case, going west to grab more population.

I know that we heard communities of interest testimony around, particularly, Tulare, Fresno, and Madera about creating splits in those counties; because it seemed like people on both sides, actually, saw that there was a difference between being on the valley floor versus being in the mountains.

And so with that said, I know that on visualization A and B, and I appreciate what the line drawers were doing, what they try to do. I am a little concerned about the -- you know, the population deviation as Commissioner Yee mentioned.

I will say that looking at visualization B, which is SDB-ECA, I know that it includes -- and I heard what

Commissioner Andersen said about that little piece down in the Kern area that includes, I believe, Ridgecrest. So if you could move down, and it includes Lake Isabella Ridgecrest, I know that they would prefer to stay within Kern.

I think this is where we start getting to, you know, people are going to have to make some sacrifices, and you know, to get population. I do wonder, again, going east, and I wonder if there's -- in terms of my instructions, I would like to see something that could go further south into San Bernardino County.

I know that wasn't really a thrill for them to have that. Perhaps two visualizations, one that would exclude that portion of Kern, and go further south into San Bernardino, perhaps -- you know, maybe as far as Fort Irwin, and maybe going into Baker, I know that that does get a little odd, because now we're talking about mountainous areas and deserts.

But without knowing like -- you know, like was said, the live line drawing to see what the impacts to the populations would be. Would we be able to gain enough? Or in other words, my instructions to the line drawers would be: go as far south as you can, to pick up enough population, to be within the population deviation that you need to be for this visualization.

I know that in terms of visualization A, it did include parts of El Dorado County. I did hear what Commissioner Fernandez was saying, and I -- based on her description of that particular area, the Placerville area, I think that's why I'm supportive of not including that.

I am just concerned about going too far north, and whether or not that makes sense. It might, I don't know if it just -- I know that there was a desire to perhaps keep El Dorado and Placer together but -- and again, could you do a second visualization that would include the entirety of that El Dorado County.

I think we -- I can't remember if we saw something, but the entirety of El Dorado. Now, I know it would split Lake Tahoe in this particular case, but they at least have somewhat of a -- I think that that portion of El Dorado that would be east of Placerville would at least have, potentially, some commonalities, especially with Alpine being in this mi, would like to see if that would bring it down.

I know it would have also implications for the other sections of the farther north. And when we get to it, I guess I would like to just also add on to the entirety of the far north versus splitting it up into the coastal and inland areas. So I'll stop here on this one.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Commissioner Akutagawa. I just want to offer a reminder to Commissioners, to please try and be as concise as possible. We do have a lot to cover today.

We're up against a mandatory break at 11:00 a.m., and ideally -- we definitely are going to finish the conversation around these maps. But I just want everyone to please use their discretion. If another colleague has already mentioned something, we don't necessarily need to repeat it again, so we can keep moving and be really concise.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair Sadhwani. I'm looking at the Siskiyou, the SDA map, that has Siskiyou, Modoc, et cetera, and one of the concerns that I have is just keeping the Karuk Tribe together, the Karuk Tribe up in Siskiyou. They're located in Siskiyou, but they also have land in -- reservation land, their tribe is split into many little areas, and so they're in Del Norte, and Siskiyou, and parts of Humboldt, and touching almost into Trinity as well.

So if there's any -- I don't know if you can pull up the tribal lands on the screen, so we can kind of see where the Karuk Tribe is, and it's a bunch of little dots, so I don't know if it'll come up. I don't know if

```
it'll come up so well, because it's -- the reservation is
kind of in many little places.
MS. WILSON: Here it is in -- I'm going to turn the cities off so we can see a little bit better. But these brown kind of areas, this one I believe, is the Hoopa. I'm not sure how to pronounce it, that goes into Humboldt and Del Norte.
```

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So there's the Hoopa, which is in Humboldt and Del Norte, but then there's the Karuk, and the Karuk Tribe has been asking to be put in with Siskiyou County. They submitted testimony -- they're both in Del Norte, along the highway there, and then also in Humboldt County and Siskiyou. So I guess my direct and very clear ask, is just that we try to keep the Karuk Tribe together, as well as the Hoopa Tribe.

Try to keep the Hoopa Reservation together, and then the Karuk Tribe, and it appears the two tribes want to be in different areas so if that's possible. That would be the direction, if it's possible. If not, just keeping the two tribes together and whole. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want -- we keep saying big -- large cities and small cities, and I just -instead of speaking in generalizations, I didn't know if
the line drawers is -- yeah, if you all have a definition for large cities and small cities, or if we should be discussing what is a large city, and what's a small city.

Because there's a lot of us in this room, and each of us would probably come up with a different number. And so I looked in the playbook, and we don't have it in the playbook. So I just wanted to see if we wanted, to get a little more clarity on that, because I think that issue is going to come up more and more as we're getting -- going into the -- you know, into the smaller details.

MS. MAC DONALD: Well, if you'd like me to answer that. I think there are definitely different definitions of small city, medium city, large city, and it may also be a little contextual, honestly. So it may not be a one-size-fits-all even if you go beyond fourteen Commissioners. So we'll just take your detail, and we can -- you know, just remember, we're going to be at live line drawing very soon.

And again, we're here to just get to the general architecture of these maps not, you know, ten different little visualizations of things. And we're going to be able to do a lot of these things together, and then figure out if we do need to split, what is a good place to split. And we hear you loud and clear on these small,
little cities, is not our preference either. There are usually reasons for why that's happening, and we can all explore those together.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that. Did you have more, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. I didn't know if anybody else had some thoughts on that. I just wanted -- I get that it's contextual. But $I$ just wanted to make sure that we opened it up so that we could all -- this is the area where we -- you know, I'm into let -- is there, not maybe a shared understanding, and maybe the shared understanding is that it is contextual.

A small city in Los Angeles may be 300,000 , but a small city in the far north, you know, 300,000 is a big city. So I do get that. But I just want to know from my colleagues as well, as when you're saying small city, big city, do you have -- what you have in mind or what you're thinking as well?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, I hope you don't mind, but at this time, I'm just going to go into I'll make some comments and just --

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that's great.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that okay?
CHAIR SADHWANI: I appreciate you letting me know.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm being patient, but I --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Go for it. Let's go for it. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And in terms, I will respond to Commissioner Sinay. You're asking this small town girl of 1,000. So obviously a big city is 5,000 to me. So it's all relative. And for me, anything under 10,000 should be kept together. But again, that's from a small town perspective.

So with that $I$ will -- let's see, Kennedy, Butte, Solano, is SDA, I'm hoping it's page 2, because I think my numbering was off from what I printed versus what you -- oh, yes, that's it. What did I do here? I have this line all the way through, and I -- oh. I wanted to potentially have Solano in there with the Yolo. I really do want to try to keep Yolo and Solano together. They do have quite a bit in common, which would then cause to split out probably Butte, and maybe Sutter in Yuba.

So if you could somehow play with that. That would be one of the visualizations I'd like to see, and maybe, yeah, adding Yuba, Sutter, and Colusa possibly.

And then my next one is SDA-4, I believe. It is the North Sacramento one. And actually, if you could -- can you somehow pull that one and the one right next -- the one right above it; yeah, those two, perfect.

Again, you can't see my mouse moving, Kennedy. So on that, so I'm going to talk about both of them, right, yeah, the North Sacramento one right below it, San Joaquin, I would like to see a visualization of that North Sac, the top one. If we can kind of draw a line right underneath North Highlands and Folsom and make -you know, from there down to, like, Elk Grove, Wilton. That's what $I$ was thinking.

Yeah. Something like that. I know that's going to be a ripple effect, but I know you're magic, and it's really good, so I'm sure you'll all come up with something wonderful. And maybe with the northern one, I would want to -- you know, if we move up a little bit, we have like Roseville, Rocklin, Auburn. Yeah, like those areas, Granite Bay, Lincoln, those are kind of more associated with that. I'll say it, the bigger cities.

And then my next one, SDA, page 5, and that is moving more towards the -- oops. My page numbering might be off, if you move up, move up a little. It is called, SSAC-North San Joaquin on A. Yeah. There we go, yeah.

So on this one, we'd like to split off -- no, this one is just -- you know what, you're going to -- I'm going to change the other one. I think this one will automatically be impacted by the one I just talked about. But again, $I$ would like to split off that whole, what $I$
call the Delta, which is from Hood all the way down to Rio Vista, split that out, and put it into like the Yolo County one. And I would not include the Pittsburg, Bethel Island, Antioch.

As Commissioner Andersen mentioned, it's really difficult to try to tie the entire Delta together because they are such different communities. As you move from Rio Vista all the way to Sacramento, those communities are really small. And when $I$ say small, it's 1,000 -the towns are maybe 1,000, maybe 2,000, Rio Vista is bigger, probably.

And the only reason Rio Vista is bigger, it has a huge -- and I shouldn't say the only reason, -- they have a huge retirement community. So probably brings it up to about 10,000; and half of that is the retirement community. But once you get into like the Pittsburg, I mean, those are well-developed cities, of I don't even know what population is, but it's very different. So I completely agree with Commissioner Andersen, just to split piece of it off.

Okay. That was it for A. And then, and B, actually B --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Fernandez, I just wanted to let you know we are up against the break. We've got three minutes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So maybe get started. I don't know if you can finish in three minutes, or if you want to pause here, as you're switching between $A$ and $B$.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You know, that's a
challenge; I'm going to take that challenge, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Very good. I love it. I love it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay. So I'm just going to echo what some have already said for $S D B-1$, page 1, and that's your whole -- that's keeping all of the northern counties together? I would like to see the coastal, but $I$ also hear you, Commissioner Toledo, in terms of breaking up some of those communities. And I was trying to figure out how we could somehow do it, but then it's not connected.

So that's going to be a challenge for you. So I will just say, good luck, Kennedy. I have faith in you again. And maybe if we split out in the -- B-1, if we split out the coastal, as we could add Sutter and Yuba to it, possibly Placer and Eldorado, I did hear that -- I keep hearing that Placer, El Dorado, and Nevada, would like to stay together.

Okay, so that's it for that one. And B-2, page 2; that was an interesting one that $I$ don't love, $I$ don't
know how to change it. But it was really taking communities that are very different in their -- in everything, that $I$ think once we move other districts, it's going to break it up, which is what I'm hoping. So that's my hope to break that up. I just had a big no on that one.

And then the next one is page 3, and we already talked about that one. Kennedy, on $A$, so if we could just apply the same, which was splitting from Arcade down. Oops. We've got one minute, Kennedy. Here we go.

Yeah, just splitting that from Arden-Arcade, that would be, kind of like your line. And then Fair Oaks, like Fair Oaks would be to the north, and Arden -- oh, go up -- Arden-Arcade. So I want Arden-Arcade and Rancho Cordova, that would be your line, and then the other part goes similar to the prior. Does that make sense, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Would that mean, still keeping ArdenArcade and Carmichael together, or -- no?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Not on this one, thank you. And it's similar to the other one. So if you could just take my comments from the other one, because it also applies to page 4. And I'm done. Because page 3 and 4 on B were very similar to $A$, so I would -- I don't know, no sense in duplicating my comments.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Well, Commissioner Fernandez, challenge was accepted, and challenge was conquered.

It is 11:00 a.m., and we will take a fifteen-minute break. Thank you, everybody.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:00 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are continuing our review of visualizations for the Central Valley and Northern California.

In particular, we've been looking at the Senate district options that are before us, and providing direct and concise directions to the line drawers.

It looks like we have another hand from Commissioner Akutagawa, and then once we've completed all of the comments on these maps, we will move on to a review of the Congressional maps for this region.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I want to follow up on the far north. These are the other comments that I have. I will say that. I mean, listening to the COI testimony, I know that the coastal districts would like to stay the same. And I was -- I've been staring at the maps to see what, if anything can be done to preserve that request. I also heard what

Commissioner Toledo also mentioned, too.
So I would like to request one visualization, and again, this is just a visualization, but it would be -this is the one, this is on $B$, and this is on page 1, it's the SDB NOR-CA, N-O-R-C-A. And this is all of the far north, all the way down to Mendocino. It's only a minus 24 deviation. I know that there are pluses and minuses to keeping them all together.

I would like to make a -- I guess, request for visualization that would remove Sierra and Nevada Counties from this visualization, and to my previous visualization request, in which, for the Eastern Sierras, I requested that all of El Dorado County be added to that Eastern Sierra visualization. I'd like to also add on Sierra and Nevada counties to that visualization. So it would be, Sierra, Nevada, El Dorado, excluding the portion that includes up to Placerville. That would be added to that Eastern Sierra visualization.

Then, on this particular one, I would like to request adding Lake County to this visualization. And I don't know if this would throw off the numbers a lot, but I did hear the request by Sutter, and Yuba Counties to stay together with Butte. I would be interested in seeing what those numbers would look like. It may throw it off quite a bit, but $I$ just wanted to see what would
that look like if it -- if Sutter and Yuba were also included with that, and if need be, to remove Lake if you have to, to make the numbers. And that's my request. CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Any additional comments on these Senate visualizations for the Central Valley and Northern California?

If not, I will turn it back to Kennedy and Karin to move us forward to the Congressional maps.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Chair Sadhwani. We would like to discuss the Congressional Map Plan A, for again, this area, which is Northern California, Central Valley. And you should see -- let me see how many -- there should be ten slides in that package. And we're going to start with the slide on page 7 , please.

MS. WILSON: So this is a Congressional sized visualization that was drawn in consideration of -- with the VRA lawyers. And this includes a different part of this Western Fresno before it went into Fresno. This one doesn't touch the City of Fresno at all, and has Mendota; I believe Kerman is in here as well, the city here is together, the entirety of Kings, and then this part of Western Fresno that we have continued to see. And this has a deviation of negative 4.01 percent.

And the Latino -- the Latino CVAP is 54.65. The Black CVAP is 6.24. Asian CVAP is 5.08. Indigenous CVAP is 1.02. And White CVAP is 32.31.

And now I can hand it over to Mr. Becker.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Or just, Kennedy, can you actually just say that page number one more time?

MS. WILSON: Yes, that was page 7 of Congressional visualizations A.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you. Sorry about that. Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: No, that's okay. So we have the first Gingles pre-condition is met. This is majority Latino CVAP visualization. It does appear from looking at the Assembly districts that Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 are likely met, but we're still analyzing Congressional district elections which will be relevant here.

And also, I'll just make the same admonition that $I$ usually do. These visualizations are really helpful. Obviously, the deviations are going to be something you're going to need to be attending to as you start drawing the lines and getting -- at getting close to zero.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to the next district drawn with the VRA lawyers. And this includes, Tulare, it is keeping Three Rivers -- this is page 8
also, page 8 -- so this is keeping Three Rivers, not with Visalia here, but it does keep Reedley and Sanger together. And if you remember, in the Assembly, it was splitting Reedley and Sanger from each other. And this includes into keeping West Fresno and the Southwest Fresno together as well in this.

The deviation is 2.55. Latino CVAP is 55.17. Black

CVAP is 3.54. Asian CVAP is 6.43. Indigenous CVAP is
1.28. And White CVAP is 32.82 .

And over to you, Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: And as before, Gingles 1 is met. It's a majority Latino CVAP district. The preliminary indications are that racially polarized voting does exist to satisfy Gingles 2 and 3. In Assembly district race, at least we're looking at Congressional to confer.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I don't know if others are having this issue. But is it possible just to take off the CVAP data for a minute, so $I$ can see the map.

MS. MAC DONALD: We're taking it off. We're taking it off right now.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: We have only been pulling it up so that while Mr. Becker is talking about the districts that received VRA consideration.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Yeah. Thank you. Yeah.

The black is, even on the PDFs, I think is in that same area, right over Tulare, so I just wanted to see what that region kind of looks like.

MS. MAC DONALD: And we're happy to zoom in, if you'd like to --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could you possibly put terrain on also?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Commissioner Andersen. That was actually really helpful to see that this is right up against the mountain range there. Great. Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Would you like to move on to the next visualization?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay, We're now moving on to visualization 10. This is now the set of visualizations that did not receive VRA considerations.

And Kennedy is going to turn off the labels, and already did.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Oh. I'm on. Okay. So this one is on page 10, this is the Eastern California 2, this one, unlike those in the Senate; this includes this part of Bakersfield that was not included with the west. And it still has this Lake Isabella to Ridgecrest. This does have the split in Tulare, so everything that is against
that mountain range you saw in the Sequoia -- the National Park here is all together.

We have Inyo, and this part of Fresno does include -- sorry, as I zoom in so you can see -- that northeastern in Clovis with this part out there, we have that same slice through Madera. We have Mariposa, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, up to Alpine.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is 4.92 percent. Latino CVAP is 20.39 percent. Black CVAP is 3.06 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.50 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.16 percent. And White CVAP is 68.27 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we are moving on to visualization CD -- Congressional districts A to page 9. And this is going to take a similar form as previous districts as well. So here we have kind of this central part of Fresno together, including Old Fig in the middle here. And this goes down into, I believe, this part of Fresno. Let me zoom in closer, into Sunnyside. Then we go into Madera, keeping this the same as other visualizations.

And Merced, except for this part, Dos Palos is separated into this visualization that we drew with the VRA lawyers.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 2.50 percent. Latino CVAP is 44.22 percent. Black CVAP is 6.34 percent. Asian CVAP is 9.31 percent. Indigenous

CVAP is 1.13 percent. And White CVAP is 38.25 percent.
MS. WILSON: And now we are moving on to page 6 and going north to Stanislaus. So here we have Stanislaus being kept whole, and then we have some parts of the Lower San Joaquin, including Lathrop, Manteca, Ripon, Escalon, Valley Home here, and Stanislaus, all together, Turlock, and Modesto in one place together as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is negative 5.88 percent. Total population -- The percent Latino CVAP is 33.89 percent. Black CVAP is 3.74 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.64 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.26 percent. And White CVAP is 52.97 percent.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Now, we will be moving on to page 4 of Congressional District A Visualizations; continuing north, we have a similar San Joaquin -- South Sacramento, San Joaquin district, and this includes the entirety of Stockton, as well as Lodi, and Dogtown, Lockeford, all of these cities together in the farming east of San Joaquin, together, up with Galt into Sacramento. We do have a line at Sacramento here, so the Delta is not included, and it goes up to Elk Grove and Vineyard.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 0.04. Latino CVAP 27.33 percent. Black CVAP 10.67 percent. Asian CVAP 19.47 percent. Indigenous CVAP is
0.83 percent. And White CVAP is 39.80 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to page 5. We're going in to Sacramento, and I'm going to zoom in so we can see those cities a bit better. So we're going to North Sacramento. This visualization keeps the entirety of Sacramento City whole, including the Fruitridge Pocket, Lemon Hill, Florin areas. And then we're keeping Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael together as well, and it does not include West Sacramento.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is 4.30 percent. Latino CVAP is 20.49 percent. Black CVAP is 14.11 percent. Asian CVAP is 16.76 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.01 percent. And White CVAP is 45.10 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we'll be moving on to page 3, and this is going to be the Placer, Sacramento area. And so we have Rocklin and Roseville, from Placer going with the northern counties of Sacramento -- I mean, Northern Cities of Sacramento County, from Rosemont, Rancho Cordova, up to Folsom, Elverta, and this is keeping Roosevelt and Antelope together in this, as well as the Orangevale, and Citrus Heights.

MS. MAC DONALD: The percent deviation is negative 1.33. Latino CVAP 13.34 percent, Black CVAP 6.06 percent, Asian CVAP 9.35 percent, Indigenous CVAP 1.21 percent, and White CVAP 68.77 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we'll be moving onto page 2, and we're going to be looking at this central north. And I'm going to zoom out just a tiny bit more for us to see that. So this includes this River Delta Unified School District, this part of Sacramento, the Delta part of Sacramento, Solano, all of Yolo, Colusa, keeping Sutter, Yuba, and Butte together, and then Tehama, and Glenn as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 1.98 percent. Latino CVAP is 19.13 percent. Black CVAP is 2.65 percent. Asian CVAP is 8.23 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.25 percent. White CVAP is 66.67 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, moving on to the last visualization, on page 1, we have a version of Northern California that does not include coastal cities. It has counties; it has Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta Lassen, Plumas, Sierra, and Nevada together, Placer and El Dorado together. Except in Placer, we took out Rocklin and -Rocklin and Roseville, which I believe, Commissioner Fornaciari suggested and said -- and was correct, in that we would get the right size for that.

MS. MAC DONALD: The percent deviation here is negative 0.56 percent. Latino CVAP is 8.51 percent. Black CVAP is 1.20 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.12 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.59 percent. And White CVAP is 83.93
percent.

And with that, we're going to be moving over to the Congressional Plan B.

MS. WILSON: So we will be starting with page 7 . And these two VRA consideration districts are the same as they were before. So Mr. Becker does not have to come back on, but unless he has any additional comments with those two areas. And I'm going to turn off my labels now so you can see it better.

So I will just go through that district again for you, the West Fresno, down to Kern. So this similar visualization that we've been seeing, as well as Kings and into West Fresno, and so I'm going to show here that it cuts around here, keeping Biola, Kerman, and these cities together, and a slight bit into Merced.

And we've read off the CVAP already, so I'll move on to the Fresno and Tulare as well.

This is on page 8. So again, it is the same. It is taking Three Rivers out. However, it's keeping Porterville, and Tulare, and Visalia together, and keeping Tulare in two instead of three as it was previously. We also are keeping Reedley, Sanger, Fowler, in this area together as well. And we have west of the 99 Fresno, and southwest as well, kept in this visualization.

And so now we will be moving on to page 10 to another, Eastern California visualization. So this here is similar to what we saw before, but includes all of this Kern County keeping Ridgecrest, down to Rosemont together, and Tehachapi, these parts of Bakersfield as well. But it does go up higher as well. So we have the other part of Tulare, again those parts of Fresno, Madera, Inyo, Mono, Mariposa, Tuolumne, and not having Calaveras or Alpine in here.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation of this visualization is 5.38 percent. The Latino CVAP is 21.75 percent. Black CVAP is 3.83 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.67 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.06 percent. And White CVAP is 66.07 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to page 9, and this one is the same as what we saw previously in version A. And so again, I will outline that. Due to these two VRA considerations, there's not much that we were able to do in this area. But I do have Old Fig down to Sunnyvale kept together, and Northeast Fresno and Clovis are not a part of it. They are kept together going out to the eastward. So it keeps this middle part together.

And then going into Madera, we have these together. And again, Chowchilla, Fairmead, and Atwater, all in this
line, kept together as well. And these parts of Merced -- and all of Merced except for the Dos Palos area that was down with the VRA consideration.

MS. MAC DONALD: And the deviation here is negative 2.5 percent. Latino CVAP 44.22 percent. Black CVAP 6.34 percent. Asian CVAP 9.31 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.13 percent. And White CVAP is 38.25 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we'll be moving to page 6, and this here includes the entirety of Stanislaus, Lathrop, Manteca, and then the eastern side of San Joaquin, and keeping those together on this side, and before it went straight across, but trying to move out stockton and shift those around. I was just keeping these eastern farming towns with Stanislaus, Manteca, and Lathrop.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is negative 4.79 percent. Latino CVAP is 33.87 percent. Black CVAP is 3.71 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.60 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.25 percent. And White CVAP is 53.08 percent.

MS. WILSON: Now, we will be moving on to page 5, going north. We have the South Sacramento, San Joaquin, and with direction to keep Lodi going north into Sacramento, there is also a split within Stockton. I will zoom in closer so that you can see that northern part of Stockton and Morada, those are cut out and put north, and this goes into the Delta, of Sacramento, the
tail here, up to Elk Grove, Vineyard, Florin, Fruitridge and Pocket, Lemon Hill, and Green Haven area, are all kept together.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is negative 2.51 percent. Latino CVAP is 21.68 percent. Black CVAP is 12.69 percent. Asian CVAP is 23.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.87 percent. And White CVAP is 38.63 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now we'll be moving to page 4, and going up into Sacramento, still. And so here we have a visualization that includes West Sacramento with the Sacramento City, as well as down to Rosemont, keeping Arden-Arcade and Carmichael together as well, the North Highlands area as well, up into Elverta, keeping Antelope on the other side, and all of the Natomas area as well, all in this visualization.

MS. MAC DONALD: The percent deviation here is negative 4.69 percent. Latino CVAP is 19.22 percent. Black CVAP is 11.72 percent. Asian CVAP is 11.65 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.22 percent. And White CVAP is 54.57 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now, moving to page 3, we have the Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento areas together; and so this includes El Dorado Hills, and Cameron Park, Granite Bay, Loomis, Rocklin, Roseville -- Antelope, Roseville together, Citrus Heights, all the way down to Rancho

Cordova, and Mather, keeping those areas together.
MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation here is negative 6.08 percent. Latino CVAP is 11.75 percent. Black CVAP is 4.06 percent. Asian CVAP is 9.23 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.17 percent. And White CVAP is 72.70 percent. MS. WILSON: And now our next visualization will be on page 2, and we will look at another; Greater Sacramento visualization. I'm going to turn the cities off so that we can see those counties better. We have Yolo without West Sacramento, Colusa, keeping Sutter and Yuba together, Sierra, Nevada together with El Dorado, Placer, Amador, Calaveras, and Alpine. And of course those -- that Roseville, Rocklin area taken out with Granite Bay, and then El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, those are also not a part of this.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation is 7.68 percent.
Latino CVAP is 15.09 percent. Black CVAP is 1.63
percent. Asian CVAP is 6.41 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.93 percent. And White CVAP is 74.10 percent.

MS. WILSON: And now we will go on to our last one on page 1. And this is a visualization that does include the coast. And so we have Glenn, Butte, Plumas, Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Tehama, Siskiyou, Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity, in the visualization together here.

MS. MAC DONALD: And for this visualization the
deviation is 8-point -- 0.87 percent, I apologize. Latino CVAP is 10.5 percent. Black CVAP is 1.58 percent. Asian CVAP is 2.92 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 4.28 percent. And White CVAP is 79.87 percent.

And that concludes this particular set. Kennedy will walk you through the major differences, very briefly, of the $A$ versus B. And we would appreciate it if you could perhaps just let us know, again, if one of these visualizations, generally, works better for you than the others, so either $A$ or $B$.

And then we can perhaps start working off without a little bit, perhaps starting from one, and then saying: Okay, but I did like this particular piece in the other one better. That would probably move us toward our whole map a little bit more efficiently. So thank you so much.

MS. WILSON: So I have put visualization A and red and $B$ is in black. And of course starting off, as most of these visualizations, a big difference is including those coastal cities and taking them out. So having that difference when they are taken out, I do have to reach lower for population. And so that's where Sierra, Nevada, Placer, and Eldorado are all put with that north, and taken out of that Rocklin-Roseville. And then that causes an effect of Butte, and Sutter, and Yuba not being able to be kept together.

And then here, in one version, we do have Yolo that does have West Sacramento and one that does not, and so in red -- let me turn the black on off -- in red, Yolo is kept with it, and down into this Delta area, but in black --

MS . MAC DONALD: Red.

MS. WILSON: -- oh, red is A. And again, red is the A visualization and black is in $B$, and so again, having that taken out, I didn't go into Solano when it was taken out.

And then moving down into the Sacramento area, I'm going to zoom in a bit closer -- oops, I turned them both off, my apologies. I'm going to move a little bit closer in here. And so there are just some slight differences. In Version B, Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael were kept with Sacramento as long as -- and let me zoom in just a slightly bit closer, sorry, so we can see those cities.

So Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael being with

Sacramento in version $B$ means that Elverta, and Rio Linda -- and why are the cities not turning on? It's because I don't have them on. There we go. Those are keeping Elverta and Rio Linda with Sacramento, but the red takes that chunk out, and keeps that with Antelope, and those other Northern Sacramento Counties.

And then as we move down, we see a difference
with -- where Sacramento was cut, with this tail. So version B, it is kept in with Sacramento and San Joaquin, but in version $A$, in the red line, it's taken out and put in with Solano and Yolo. And then moving down we have here in San Joaquin a major difference with Stockton.

And so I'm going to turn the A version, and you can see that Stockton is kept here with San Joaquin entirely whole. But then, and B, we just took the top part of it, and that is left out with Mountain House and Tracy down. And then Stanislaus was able to be kept whole in both of these visualizations.

And as we move closer to our VRA districts it does start to stay more the same, and we start to see that next difference down in Kern County. So I'm going to zoom out so we can see that.

And so in version $A$, this red line does not take in Tehachapi, it's splitting Ridgecrest from these desert cities as well. But in version B -- I'm going to turn off version A -- you can see that these are all kept together, that eastern part that's left out of this Western Kern, the VRA consideration district. Everything else of Kern is kept together, but in turn, is put north with those counties as well. And those are some major differences between the two.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Kennedy. At
this point, we'll move into directions from Commissioners; starting with Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I'm just going to start with the southern. So right where you're at, can you look at -- could you just zoom in right there where the line is -- yeah. By Bakersfield, I wanted to see what some of those smaller communities would, potentially, be split out. Okay. Thank you. I just needed to see that clarification, thank you so much.

I was just concerned that, potentially, some smaller communities that neighbor each other were being -- excuse me -- split. And that always concerns me because they tend to unite and have partnerships, and different relationships. So thank you. I will hold my comments until we get further north. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'd like to go to the other direction, if we can start back at the top, with Maps A and B, page 1. So for this one, I'll go down and just tell you what my preference is between the two. I prefer A. I think A had the coastal cities excluded, which we heard testimony about them wanting to be kept together. So let me go B on map one -- at page 1. And then going down, you showed us CDA-CE in North for $A$, and then for $B$
it was this other configuration that I think you said you had to cut down further. Or actually, they look the same. These two are the same, Colusa, Sierra, Yolo, Calaveras.

MS. WILSON: This is version B right now. Would you like me to turn on version $A$ ?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Because I can't see them together, so I have to -- I'm doing them separate here.

MS. WILSON: Oh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Yes, so I'll watch your map now.

MS. WILSON: So version A here, is where it dips down further into Placer and El Dorado, and creates another district here in the middle, but that's with version $A$, but with version $B$ and we have the coast, then it takes that top part of that middle part out. And then don't dip as low down into El Dorado.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: But I think with that one, that's the one where the ripple effect allowed you to be able to keep Butte, and all of those, together, in the center?

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. May you repeat that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Which one of the -- one of the versions allowed you to keep Butte, I think Sutter
close some of those in the center together based on the way that you cut the maps.

MS. WILSON: Yes. And this is version $A$, and this has Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, Colusa, Glenn, and to Tehama together.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So yeah, so I'd like to try and keep those together. So that version. And then let's go down further. In the two versions that you showed, San Joaquin, the preference would be to keep San Joaquin whole, and not cut out the top parts of Morada. That happens to be where I live, and I think we are part of San Joaquin County. Oh. And yep, after that there's like some farmland space, so it makes sense to me to keep Morada into that.

Let's go down further. And I think then we had some of the VRA considerations, right? So we didn't do too much with that.

MS. WILSON: Yes. And that is here from Fresno down to Kern, and then this part of Tulare into Fresno as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And both of those kept Merced whole, if I understood --

MS. WILSON: Yes. And except, while there's a tiny sliver, so Merced dips down this way and doesn't stay completely straight. And it goes right above taking Dos

Palos from Merced into the West Fresno area.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And is that the same version
that keeps West Fresno -- oh, I see it. Okay. And they were cut out of either version?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And that was VRA.

Okay. Well, then, okay, let's go further and see if we can do anything.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Was that the end of your comment, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm trying to look at the last --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- down at the bottom. We're almost there.

MS. WILSON: So here we had a difference where the line was cut here at Kern, keeping Lake Isabella, Ridgecrest, just kind of going this way, keeping those together. And then on version B, all of Kern is together, that is not a part of the VRA district.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Yeah. And I would like to try and keep all of Kern together as well. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: : Thank you. Just for the

Merced-Fresno map, in the A. Actually, they're the same in both, if you can bring that up. So in looking at the map, it looks like we did a really good job of keeping essential communities together, especially the agricultural sector in this area. I see a lot of farming communities, and agricultural communities.

And into the Fresno area, even the portion of Fresno that was kept is in essence is mostly -- is high levels of essential workers. And I'm just wondering if there's a way to create a district that really focuses on the essential workers of the Central Valley, and maybe try to bring in either -- whether it's a little -- the little communities surrounding there that may have more of the agricultural and other workers.

But in general, I just wanted to express that I thought it was a good map. And if there's a way to bring in more essential communities around there, and bring them together, that would be -- especially around the agricultural sector, but even some of the industrial, and other sectors that exist in that area. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Toledo, were there specific areas that you had in mind?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO:: Well, I was actually -- I was looking at, and $I$ know there's VRA -- this is a district that's a little bit difficult because it's surrounded by

```
VRA districts, and are potential -- areas of potential
VRA interest. And we would -- I would not want to harm
other districts, but if there's a way to -- potentially,
below and towards the -- I was looking at the -- some of
the more rural parts of Fresno County, around there.
    And it's hard to tell on this map the little
communities that are around there. But there may be some
little communities around there that might have essential
workers that we could bring into and -- bring into this
community, if it doesn't impact some of the other maps.
So that was my feedback.
    CHAIR SADHWANI: Great.
    COMMISSIONER TOLEDO:: Thank you.
    CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much. Commissioner
Andersen.
    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you very much
for that, Commissioner Toledo. That's exactly the area.
This is kind of locking us in. And as I see on
visualization A, essentially pages 7, 8, 9, or it's
Merced, Madera portion, the Fresno-Kern, and also the
Fresno-Tulare.
    I'm wondering if -- so I believe what Commissioner
Toledo was referring to is, rather than doing this the
way we've broken it up, it's sort of the North-South
route. So actually maybe rearranging a little bit here
```

because like in this one, I see Fresno being in actually four districts. And I'm wondering if we might be able to rearrange this.

I'd like the line drawers with their VRA consultant, look at how we might possibly restructure this because Stanislaus is, in this version, it is whole, but it really affects everything else on the far-east. And I'm wondering if we -- if we might get a bit more play by rearranging these three. So I'd like you to have a look at that, please, those three different versions that, on pages 7, 8, 9 of visualization A.

And then if we go up to, on visualization A, if we go up to the -- I believe it's page 1, up to the north. And it's actually on the very first one, Nor Cal, and then Central North. And what I'd like to do, I'd like to see the Nor Cal take out Sierra, Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado, then add all of Central North except Yolo County.

So you'd add -- so this would keep Butte, Sutter, and Yuba together, and it would add all the way down here. Then what $I$ would like to do is add Sierra, Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado to the east group.

And then I'd like to pull out, I think population wise, that might give you enough population to going further south, get out of the Kern County so -- because Kern, $I$ know Kern can't stay together, it's too big, but
all those people really do not want to go up north.

And then what I'd like to see is with Yolo going back up again, adding Yolo with portions of Solano, which would, basically, allow things to shift back down a little bit. Because San Joaquin being cut in half like that is -- it's just not what we've heard from anybody. And I think we're kind of -- it's artificially being manufactured, because of that line at Fresno -- I'm sorry -- Merced.

And so I'm hoping to sort of do a little rearranging in this area, to try to refit the districts in, or even if page 7, 8, 9 can give us a bit of flexibility with where it goes we might -- that might allow us to do a little bit more shifting in this area.

And I will just -- I think I'll just stop with that, because that would -- that's quite a lot of direction there. So was that clear?

MS. WILSON: (No verbal response).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair. Is it okay if

I let Commissioner Akutagawa go ahead of me, because I think she has a time constraint? And then I'll go after her; is that all right?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. I think Commissioner Andersen just said one of the visualizations that $I$ just wanted to request, but just in case, I'm just going to repeat it. I apologize that if it is the same. This is for B, page 1. It's the one that says CDB-Nor-Ca, or Nor Cal, I guess. It is the eastern Sierra -- no. It's not. It's all of the far north. Yes. Thank you.

On that one, I would like to request a visualization that would remove Butte, and possibly Glenn from this visualization, and to add Mendocino to this visualization. I am conscious that they had -- the coastal counties have requested to stay together. I know that that may not be practical based on population, and also the desire. I also share what Commissioner Toledo also noted. But I'm thinking that Mendocino and Humboldt had also very strongly expressed that they belong together, too.

So if we could keep the two of them together, and then the entirety of the far north, I'd like to see that. If then, in removing Butte, and possibly Glenn, what I would like to see is for visualization -- for another visualization, this is on $B$, page 2 .

Okay. Thank you. On this one, I would like to add
possibly, Glenn, Solano, Butte I think is not part of it. So Glenn, Butte, Solano -- wait, am I getting it wrong? Sorry. Is that Solano down there? I'm getting a little confused now. It's hard to see the maps --

MS. WILSON: Solano is -- yes, this Yolo, Solano is right underneath here. And this is Sutter and Yuba there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Maybe I was getting confused. Okay. Definitely, I want to add Glenn and Butte to that. I want to remove Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, and possibly El Dorado -- the portion of El Dorado that does not include Placerville South; and added to that East Sierra. I think if in the visualization B, page 2, if there is not enough population, $I$ think that would include Glenn, Butte, Colusa, Yolo, possibly add Lake to that, if you need to pick up more population.

Sorry, I know I said Solano, but I didn't mean for it to go that south, so. Yes. Thank you.

And oh, last one. This is on B, page 10. And if we -- and on that visualization, if El Dorado was added, I would like to see Kern removed completely from that. I know that they don't want to go north, and I don't think they want Kern to be included.

I think that that would -- there would be just other different interests and issues, also, the size of the
cities are so much different than the Eastern Sierras. I'm just -- okay. Yeah. I'll just stop there. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.
Commissioner Fernandez, do you have more?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I think I had a similar one to Commissioner Andersen, so I'm not going to repeat it. So I think -- well, let me start with A, A-2. Okay. Thank you.

A-2, I was thinking maybe -- and again, this is going to have that ripple effect. So I'm not going to know how that's going to impact everything. But on this one, what I was thinking was to draw the line at Colusa, Sutter, and Yuba, and then add Solano. So I guess that would be removing Tehama, Glenn, and Butte; and then at Solano.

Again, I have no idea what it's going to do to the numbers. I'd like to see that visualization. In terms of A-3, I prefer B-3. And I'll just leave it at that instead of actually getting into -- I'm being concise.

A-4; thank you for catching up with me, Kennedy, on that, are we there? Let me see.

MS. WILSON: What was the title of $A-4$ ?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. WILSON: No, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: South Sac and North San Joaquin.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Here we are.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Uh-huh. On this one I'd like to draw the line like right before -- right below Elk Grove and Wilton. I do feel that Galt and Clay, that's more of a San Joaquin. I would defer to Commissioner Turner for that. Again, it's going to have the ripple effects, so that's just my comment on that. And then also on this one, I'd like to see if there's a possible VRA coalition for that.

And for $A-5$, it's the Nor Sac. Okay. Oh, wait. Is that -- can you zoom in just a little bit, please, Kennedy? This is a difficult one, only because like Arden-Arcade, Carmichael, that area is very different than the rest of it.

So I was trying to think of, if we get rid of that, and then add Elk Grove, and maybe Vineyard and Wilton, possibly. That might make more sense. And then move -you see I'm moving everything all over the place, then move Arcade and Carmichael in with probably the Rancho Cordova area. Again, I haven't looked at the big picture, and what that's going to do to the ripple effect.

Again, and moving on to B, I'd like to see the
coastal areas remain together, of course, it's going to require some of the other counties to be moved. And I believe Commissioner Andersen, her visualization or CDB, which is the Greater Sacramento area. I believe her additions and removals -- I'm going to wait to see what that looks like. So thank you for that.

I liked your CDB-3, which is your Placer, El Dorado, Sac. And then I also like the CDB-4, which is your West Sac and Nor Sac. I like that iteration.

And my last one is CDB-5, which is the South Sac and San Joaquin. That's similar to my prior -- oh, you've got it, okay. One, please look at it for possible VRA coalition. And then, similar to my prior comment, I would like to split that out from under -- to have Galt and Clay go -- yeah, right there. But however, I do want to have -- include make sure we include the Walnut Grove, Rio Vista area, and try to add more of the Yolo County to that. Thank you. And that's it.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. I'll jump in on this.

I'm wondering if we can go back to those VRA districts. I'm hearing the comments from Commissioners Toledo and Andersen in particular. I wanted to, actually, just take a look at what has been proposed here in comparison to the current Congressional district lines. Is that then in that greenish sort of color? Oh,
they're not --

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. We're making it bigger right now. I just wanted to clarify. These are really not proposals, they're just, you know, trying to --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Preliminary analysis.

MS. MAC DONALD: Very preliminary. Yes.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Very preliminary analysis. So it looks like it's following a very similar pattern of what had already existed. Is that a fair assumption to say; somewhat similar? I guess what I'm -- then, I guess what I'm hearing from Commissioners Toledo, and you know, in this idea of: Are there additional essential workers?

And I think -- correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner Toledo of what your comment was. But $I$ guess this does look fairly similar to what was already there. Of course, there might be good reason for that. But I'm just wondering if there are ways of rethinking this area that we haven't explored yet. And so I would just offer that as direction in this area, is to think through the range of possibilities.

More broadly speaking, I just wanted to find out from the line drawers, as we are looking through these, you know, prior to this process of visualizations, we spent a lot of time looking at a community of -communities of interest testimony in geographic format.

Now, I know that that testimony is available on our website, and we can go pull those up, testimony-bytestimony. But we had -- you know, the line drawers had done an amazing job of really showing us kind of the overlaps of some of that testimony.

I don't know if it's possible, but I feel like, especially as we're moving into some areas where I don't know the areas as well. It was different in Los Angeles and Southern California because I'm from those areas. But I'm curious if it's possible to start pulling up any of that testimony to show us where some of those COIs actually laid.

We don't have to do that now. I think that would get us off track, but I'm curious if that's even possible. I know, for example, when we ask for terrain, there's a thought that it takes a very long time to add it and such. So I'm just trying to figure out what's possible for making sense of these visualizations.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you for that question, Chair Sadhwani. I will discuss with Jaime and get back to you. I know that we have had a really hard time with the software, with having, you know, hundreds and hundreds of COIs loaded, and there has been quite a bit of crashing going on.

But you know, having said that, there's probably
something that we can do. I just have to figure out what -- we have to figure out what the something is, and we'll get back to you on that. So thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you so much. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I was going to say, well, so by the time you get into the Central Valley, there's essential workers in all of those areas. You know, so like Fowler, Reedley -- I mean, pick us -pick an area. And we know where the urban centers are, which, you know, of course, would not be on any of the agricultural workers, essential workers.

I wanted to just respond to Commissioner Fernandez.

Yeah. So for the areas of Galt, Clay, I think Walnut Grove, those areas are more like Elk Grove than San Joaquin; so just answering that. Thanks. CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. And thank you for that, Commissioner Turner. I kind of go back and forth because I kind of -- pretty soon we'll be connected straight to Stockton from Sacramento. So it'll be LA, right? So thank you for that information. So that's, Kennedy, if you could please take that into consideration, that would be good.

I just had one thing else. I apologize for that.

And that actually does not have anything to do with the maps. It has to do with the visualizations for B, page 9, and A page 9, they're both Merced, Fresnel, and that one is -- if we can take a look at that for possible VRA coalition. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good.
Commissioner Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, let me see. Sorry I wasn't here earlier. Just a couple of comments on this, and so sort of philosophically, I'd really like us to stay away from pairing the mountain -- the southern mountains with city and the valley. Because, you know, I think they'd go -- if they were paired with Bakersfield, they'd go from having the drive Visalia to drive to Bakersfield, to talk to their representative.

And so for me, I like the idea of putting all the mountain counties together. And then as far as the visualizations for the North State, I think I tend to support the visualizations in A for the North State.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you. Any final comments or directions from Commissioners on this area of Northern California and Central Valley? Because with this, we are wrapping up this conversation and we'll be moving to the mapper, Tamina, who's going to take on the Bay Area and coastal regions.

Seeing no additional comment, I'd like to suggest that we just take a five-minute break. Just to get ourselves situated and allow the mappers to switch over. Hopefully, allow Commissioners and the public also to identify those maps.

We are up against our mandatory lunch break at 12:45. So we'll just take five minutes now and come back and utilize the rest of that half hour. Thank you. (Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:10 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR SADHWANI: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We're continuing our review of visualizations from around the State of California.

We just completed our review of the Central Valley and Northern California; and are now going to be taking on the Bay Area, and the coastal regions, with our mapper, Tamina, from All Star Line Drawing Team.

With that, Tamina, I will hand it over to you. Tamina and Karin, are you ready?

MR. MANOFF: Just a moment, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: While we wait for the map to get fully loaded, I'd like to remind everyone that we have an online tool for the public, where you can provide realtime feedback to the Commission. I know we've received a
whole lot of feedback, I believe over 400 comments alone just for these last several days. So please keep them coming. That is available on our website, under the Meetings' tab you'll find a Feedback Form that you can link to. And so we appreciate the public's input in this process.

As a reminder, what we are reviewing are not draft maps, they are simply visualizations. And our process, thus far, has been looking at communities of interest testimony, and pairing that with census population totals, receiving preliminary analysis for the Voting Rights Act.

Karin and Tamina, how are we doing on the map? It looks like it might be frozen.

MS. MAC DONALD: No. We have a -- I'm sorry. We still have a technical glitch here. One second, please. CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. (Pause)

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner -- I mean, Chair? CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to say, is it okay -- we've received a few questions about the maps and the details of the maps via the forms.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: And since we have a second, is
it okay if $I$ just say to the public?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Explain it. Okay. The handouts that you're -- that the public is seeing is the same handouts that the Commissioners are seeing. And yes, they are missing a lot of details in certain areas. And the line drawers, we talked about it yesterday and we're going to try to do a better job in the future of figuring out how to be able to give every -- give all the details to everybody on -- you know, in a good way.

But right now, it wasn't possible. But nobody -we're not keeping anything from anybody. This is, we all have the same challenges.

CHAIR SADHWANI: That is true.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you want to jump in?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just want to say, just kind of echo all of the feedback that we're receiving. And just a reminder to please, if you're going to say: no, or it's horrible, to please provide more information. And maybe also -- maybe suggestions in terms of: no, not this area, but that area. And like my fellow Commissioners have said, we're reading them, and it's so helpful, and that's exactly what we want to hear. So thank you so much.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that. Commissioner

Fernandez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, Chair. I'm wondering if you might just give us a little overview of what remains to happen in terms of sort of visualizations, read backs, and public comment, and how you are imagining that to play out, in terms of our time today, and possibly Monday. Thank you. You're on mute. I'm sorry, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Commissioner Yee. From a staffing perspective, we really want to try and get through the entirety of the map today, which is why we have held off on the reading back of notes. If need be -- I'm hoping we'll finish everything today -but if need be, we will issue a continuance of this meeting and come back on Monday to finish off reading the notes for each of the regions that we're reviewing as well as to take public comment, possibly, on Monday.

Again, my hope is that we will -- we'll be able to finish everything today. We do have a hard stop, however, at 6:30. I know a lot of staff and folks are on flights out, and we have all sorts of contracts that need to be upheld. So a hard stuff at 6:30 today, and we'll take on Monday afternoon only if necessary.

Karin and Tamina, are we ready with the map?

MS. MAC DONALD: I apologize. We're going to need a
little bit more time.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Do you have a sense of how much time? We could break for lunch at this point, if you'd like.

MS. MAC DONALD: That might be a good idea. I apologize.

CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. So let's break for lunch. We were planning a forty-five-minute lunch. It's

12:26. Why don't we plan to come back at 1:15?
(Whereupon, a lunch recess was held from 12:26 p.m. until 1:15 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Hi. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you had a wonderful lunch.

Now, we're going to move into our Inland Northern and -- wait a minute -- yeah, right, no; Coastal California and San Francisco Bay Area.

So I'm going to turn it over to Karin and Tamina.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much. We will be discussing the handouts that are posted on the CRC webpage, WeDrawTheLinesCA.org/10_13_21_handouts. And we're now going into Bay Area, North Central Coast Assembly. We will first look at the set, Bay Area, North Central Coast Assembly, visualizations A, and Bay Area North Central Coast visualizations A-1.

I will be reading off the page numbers, and we will,
again, start with the areas that received some VRA consideration. And we're starting with A-1, page 10, please.

Just another note; my colleague, Tamina, just reminded me. There is actually a -- if you downloaded this file in the last couple of days, actually before this morning, then you may want to re-download it. There was a new file posted. If you have it open in Adobe, it should say, "New_ACE_VAD_A-1" and so forth. So that was the only file that was replaced.

Thank you so much. And with that, we're going to move to page 10.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Good afternoon, Commission. We'll be starting our review of the Coast and San Francisco Bay Area. And we're going to start with our VRA consideration area, which you see here as VADA_San Benito Salinas. This is going to be on page 10 of document $A-1$.

The northern area of this district contains San Martin and Gilroy, comes west to Interlaken, Freedom, and Watsonville. All of these areas are whole. Includes Pajaro, Las Lomas, all of San Benito County, and then follows the 101 Corridor from Prunedale, Salinas, down through Soledad, ending at the bottom of the county in Pine Canyon.

And I'll hand it to Mr. Becker.

MS. MAC DONALD: The deviation.
MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sorry. The deviation is negative 1.85 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: One second. We're going to pull up the existing districts and also put up CVAP, and I'm going to read off the CVAP for this area, which is: Latino CVAP is 56.58 percent. Black CVAP is 1.65 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.73 percent. And White See is 33.79 percent. And this will be showing up on your screen in a second.

But Mr. Becker, if you'd like to start discussing this area; and we're waiting for you.

MR. BECKER: Sure. Yeah. This is an area with majority Latino CVAP. It satisfies the first Gingles pre-condition for that reason, preliminary analysis of Assembly district, race in this area does indicate that there is significant Latino racially polarized voting. However, we are still analyzing further data with regard to the third Gingles pre-conditioned, racially polarized voting by others in this area. We haven't reached a definitive conclusion on that yet.

So we'll be keeping a close eye on this; definitely Gingles 1, very likely Gingles 2, and still determining Gingles 3 here.

MS. MAC DONALD: So that is, actually, at this
point, the only area that we have that, is under review for Voting Rights Act considerations. And with that, we would like to move to handout A, page 8, please. (Pause)

MS. MAC DONALD: Just one moment, please.
(Pause)

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. So we're going to be starting north with no North Coast to Marin, that is not on page 8. We are looking for the pages. But I will tell you about the district while we're doing that. We start in Del Norte and come south through the coast, including Trinity, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, and then coming down into Marin.

The deviation of this district is 2.34 percent. The second district is East Sonoma, Marin, and this has the areas of the Wine Country which incorporates along the freeway, all of these cities are whole, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Cotati, Penn Grove, Petaluma. The direction was to move the line west to the freeway so that all of these cities could be whole. And this visualization district comes down into Marin County, down to at the southern point, San Rafael.

And the deviation for this is 3.71 percent. MS. MAC DONALD: Oh. Pardon me. We were trying to find it, that we thought we had the order of these
figured out, and apparently we have not.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It looks like A-10.

MS. MAC DONALD: This one is A-10.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay; so that one is right. Okay. We have one that was wrong. So let me, this particular one has Latino CVAP of -- no. I'm sorry, one more time. What happened here?

Sorry. I'm having technical problems.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Let's take a five-minute break, so that the Line Drawing Team can take care of the technical problems, please.
(Whereupon, a five-minute recess was held)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Welcome back. Thank you so much. We apologize for the little bit of technical difficulty, but $I$ think we've gotten it all reserved -resolved, reserved and resolved.

And so I will turn it back over to Karin and Tamina.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much. And apologies again. We just would like to make a correction. On the website, I said earlier that only one file was replaced recently. There were actually two files replaced recently. So if those of you that followed along with this are having problems finding the pages, that's why. Bay Area, North Central Coast Assembly

Visualizations A and A-1, were replaced. And if you have the correct files then they should say "New" at the beginning, so "New_ACE" and so forth.

With that, if you wouldn't mind, I would like to go back to page 8 of handout $A$, because we did not earlier read off this CVAP.

So if you wouldn't mind, Tamina, that's the coastal district. Maybe you could, just very briefly.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. Again, so this is the North Coast district, which begins in Del Norte County, come south to Humboldt, takes Trinity, has Mendocino whole, and then it has parts of Sonoma and Marin County.

MS. MAC DONALD: And the deviation is 2.34 percent. The Latino CVAP is 9.73 percent. Black CVAP is 1.46 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.32 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 3.98 percent. And White CVAP is 80.81 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And moving on to A, page 3. Yes. So we are moving on to East Sonoma, Marin, which is in your handout A, page 10. This visualization incorporates parts of Sonoma County, and parts of Marin County, starting up north with Lakefield, and Yucca, including all of Santa Rosa, and the Highway Corridor down through Petaluma, also includes down through San Rafael of Marin County.

The deviation is 3.71 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.59 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.27 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.84 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.17 percent. And White CVAP is 74.21 percent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, just a quick clarification. Is Sebastopol cut in half in that? Could you zoom in, I couldn't quite tell, further north. Sebastopol is up. Ah. Okay. Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. So Sebastopol is whole.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And we're moving on to handout A, page 9, please. This district is Napa, La Marinda, begins north in Napa County, keeping all of Napa County whole. Comes south into Solano County, incorporating Vallejo with Napa County, and continues south incorporating Benicia and Martinez together, into Contra Costa, going down the 680 Corridor, until Pleasant Hill, and then keeping the La Marinda area whole.

The deviation is negative 0.06 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 16.13 percent.

Black CVAP is 8.83 percent. Asian CVAP is 16.08 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.88 percent. And White CVAP is 56.41 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving east to Contra Costa, we are going to A, page 2. And this is Eastern Contra Costa County, with Concord and Clyde, moving east through

Antioch and Brentwood, excluding Oakley, Knights, and Discovery Bay, and Byron, and going all the way south to the county line.

This district is 2.06 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 20.82 percent.

Black CVAP is 11 percent. Asian CVAP 14.14 percent.

Indigenous CVAP is 0.72 percent. And White CVAP is 51.44 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We are now moving to the district named East Bay. This is actually going west a little bit to West Contra Costa County, on page 4, A-4. And this starts in the north, just south of Hercules, comes and keeps all of Richmond together with San Pablo, El Sobrante, and the Greater Richmond area; comes south through the county line, through Alameda and Berkeley, and then it takes parts of Oakland and the Hills.

The deviation is 1.4 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.51 percent.

Black CVAP 14.8 percent. Asian CVAP 18.68 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.5 percent. And White CVAP is 48.48 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Next visualization is the Oakland area. This is on page $A-7$. And this incorporates the remainder of Oakland, along with Alameda and San Leandro. The deviation is 4.05 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.15 percent. Black CVAP 25.05 percent. Asian CVAP 23.93 percent. Indigenous CVAP 0.5 percent. And White CVAP 30.23 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving south, we're going to Hayward, Newark, page A-1. This incorporates the Greater Eden area from San Lorenzo in Cherryland, south through Union City, Hayward, and parts of Fremont, including Newark.

The deviation is 1.59 percent -- oops, I skip one. I'm sorry.

I did mean to go here. ADA East Alameda, and the page number for this is page 3, page A-3. And this takes parts of the northwestern parts of Alameda County, including all of Castro Valley, Ashland, and Fairview, and comes east to include the Alamo through San Ramon Corridor of 680 of Contra Costa County, down into Dublin, keeping the Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore area together, all the way to the border of Alameda County, also includes Sunol.

The deviation is 3.27 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: And Latino CVAP here is 11.07 percent. Black CVAP is 4.68 percent. Asian CVAP is 24.32 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.48 percent. And White CVAP is 58.28 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Now, we're going to page A-1. This is Morgan Hill, Tracy -- oh. Sorry. We'll go back to -we all stay in order. So Hayward, Newark, is page A-1, and this is the Greater Eden area with Cherryland and San Lorenzo, coming south through the southern areas of Fremont, including Newark, but splitting Fremont along these lines, and then coming up and taking it in Union City.

The deviation is 1.59 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 24.02 percent. Black CVAP is 7.87 percent. Asian CVAP is 38.71 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.54 percent. And White CVAP is 26.05 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Next, we'll be moving to page A-5. This visualization is called Milpitas-Campbell. It starts with the southern half of Fremont, and then moves south into Santa Clara County, taking Milpitas, and the Berryessa area, also going south to include Burbank, Fruitdale, and Campbell, in Southeastern -- sorry, Southwestern Santa Clara County.

And this has a 0.00 percent deviation.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 17.79 percent. Black CVAP is 4.05 percent. Asian CVAP is 43.07 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.47 percent. And White CVAP is 33.31 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to A-1, page 3. This is Morgan Hill-Tracy, which since we're here, we will start zooming in on this area. This takes in the East Foothills, and Alum Rock area, keeping together the Latino communities of interest in San Jose. Comes east through Santa Clara County, and then comes up to Stanislaus County, right before Modesto.

MS. MAC DONALD: It's on A-1 page 3, please. And we're happy to zoom in, by the way.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And continues up into San Joaquin County, and takes Tracy, and Mountain House. So I'll zoom out a little so you can see what this is together. So we have Mountain House and Tracy to the north, coming south through Stanislaus County, and then taking the rural parts of Santa Clara County, south through Morgan Hill, and West through the Alum Rock, East Foothills area.

The deviation is 3.21 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 36.39 percent.

Black CVAP is 4.44 percent. Asian CVAP is 28.55 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.78 percent. And White CVAP is 28.15 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to page A-6. This is Los Gatos-San Jose, incorporates many areas of San Jose City, including Los Gatos and Monte Sereno, as well as Cambrian

Park.
The deviation is negative 3.5 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 20.14 percent. Black CVAP is 2.98 percent. Asian CVAP is 28.42 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.58 percent. And White CVAP is 46.91 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to A-1, page 4. This is Palo Alto. This visualization takes Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara, along with Cupertino, so Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino are kept together; and includes Saratoga, and unincorporated areas south to Lexington Hills.

The deviation is negative 2.96 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP 11.61 percent. Black CVAP is 2.38 percent. Asian CVAP is 38.98 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.39 percent. And White CVAP is 45.53 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to A-1, page 2. This visualization is called the South Bay: and it starts in the north with Foster City, and Redwood City in San Mateo County, keeping these areas whole, coming south through Belmont and San Carlos, Emerald Park, Woodside, and Portola Valley. And then also includes the western part of Santa Clara County, and Los Altos Hill, Stanford, and Palo Alto, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, also in San Mateo

County, as well as North Oaks and Atherton; and takes some of the unincorporated area in the south of Western Santa Clara County.

The deviation for this visualization is negative 4.76 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.95 percent. Black CVAP is 3.36 percent. Asian CVAP is 21.46 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.34 percent. And White CVAP is 59.13 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're now moving to San Francisco, this is A-1, page 1. And we are looking at West San Francisco, which is the area with the blue dots over here. And this splits San Francisco, and includes the Cities of Daly City and Broadmoor, with the San Francisco visualization.

This is a negative 5.21 percent deviation.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 13.24 percent. Black CVAP is 3.96 percent. Asian CVAP is 49.72 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.3 percent. And White CVAP is 31.43 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to East San Francisco, which is on page -- A-1, page 9. I turned on the neighborhood layers. You can kind of see what this deviation is about here. This split in San Francisco follows the neighborhood line; so as you can see from
here the western addition, and Twin Peaks coming down into the Outer Mission, and Excelsior.

So the East San Francisco visualization is 4.49
percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.35 percent.

Black CVAP is 7.59 percent. Asian CVAP is 25.48 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.59 percent. And White CVAP is 52.88 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to A-1, page 5. We're coming back to San Mateo County. This district is called the Peninsula, please excuse the typo. And this begins with Brisbane in the north, and comes south through San Bruno to San Mateo City, and then goes along the coast from Pacifica, down through Half Moon Bay, and La Honda, picking up the remainder of the county, and continuing south into Santa Cruz County, keeping Santa Cruz County up until Corralitos, and Aptos, So Cal, and Live Oak.

So this is a negative 2.05 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 16.13 percent. Black CVAP is at 2 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.58 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.76 percent. And White CVAP is 58.51 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving south we'll be going to A-1, page 6. This visualization is called the Monterey Coast. And I will zoom in on the north parts, you can see the
area where there is the county split, because we do have a little bit of Santa Cruz County, sorry, in here with the -- following the direction to keep the coastal area together, we have Pleasure Point coming south to pass Pajaro Dunes. And then this district continues along the Coast of Monterey County, as we said before, this is the freeway that comes down, the 101 , over here. So on the western side of the freeway, kept everything on the coast together through Carmel Village, going south to include all of San Luis Obispo County.

And the deviation is negative 4.55 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.65 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.49 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.88 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.13 percent. And White CVAP is 73.79 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Further south, we are going to $A-1$, page 7. This visualization is called Santa Barbara, because it includes all of Santa Barbara County, and keeps it whole. Also includes the Cities of Oakville, Oak View, Mira Monte, and Ojai.

The deviation is negative 4.37 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 29.45 percent.

Black CVAP is at 2.43 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.83
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.03 percent. And White CVAP is 60.58 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And the last visualization for this set, $A-1$, page 8. Incorporates most of Ventura County eastward of Ojai, and all the way north to the county line, and the southern areas takes all of the coastal areas, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, former Piru Corridor being intact, and includes San Marino -- sorry Camarillo and Somis; does not include Moorpark, Simi Valley, Santa Rosa, and Casa Conejo.

And this is a 1.01 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: And Latino CVAP here is 44.07
percent. Black CVAP is 2.94 percent. Asian CVAP 6.9 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.81 percent. And White CVAP is at 44.45 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're now going to be moving on to visualization ADB. So this is the second set of Assembly District visualizations for the coastal area.

And before we start these, just want to give you a little bit of an overview of what's going on in these areas. You'll see a lot of the southern visualizations here look very similar to what you saw in A, and that has to do with this potential VRA area, over here, that we looked at last time. And you'll remember that this incorporates San Benito County, the 101 Corridor, agricultural area coming through Monterey County, and then stretches upward into Gilroy, and Martinez -- sorry,

Gilroy, and San Martin, and Interlaken, Freedom, Watsonville, and Pajaro.

And this actually, because of the play -- the way that it's situated in the state geography, we have a very narrow corridor right in this part of the region. And so this is going to really limit the options for what can change for areas that are going south, because the population south of this area is actually much less than the population north.

So because of that, we'll see similar -- did take a look at a couple of different visualizations down in the Santa Barbara-Ventura area, but some of the districts that you'll see in this area, visualizations are going to be very similar because that is taking up that area. That's so central to -- so central to everything that's going on in this corridor. So if you're seeing something twice, or similar, then that is why, I'm mostly working around that visualization.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that.
Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I just had a quick clarification. A while back, a few meetings ago, we went through some of the other VRA areas, potential, and there were some Asian VRA potential in the Bay Area. So I just want to confirm that's not the case now. There are some
high concentrations or high percentages of Asian, and I just want to make sure we're not cracking any of those communities. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: I can address that. It's pretty clear from the analysis of the election results that the third Gingles pre-condition doesn't exist, in all likelihood. In those areas, we're talking about the Peninsula areas of South San Francisco, around there, and the areas around San Jose, Santa Clara. Those were areas that we looked at before. But there is very substantial crossover voting in those areas.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Karin.
MS. RAMOS ALON: So we will continue with our first district of this set, which is going to be B-1, page 10. We just discussed it, but I want to turn on the highway layer for you, so you can see what we're talking about here, about this 101 Corridor that comes right up through this visualization. This is exactly the same as the one that you saw in ADA.

So it also has negative 1.85 percent deviation.
MS. MAC DONALD: And I can read off the CVAP one more time for this district. Just to remind you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry. Karin, before you read that off, could you go ahead and turn on the terrain
layer, please. Just so we can look at that while you're reading. Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Certainly. So Latino CVAP here is 56.6 percent. Black CVAP is 1.65 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.73 percent. And White CVAP is 33.79 percent.

MR. BECKER: And as I indicated before, this is a majority Latino district. It satisfies Gingles 1. We are still analyzing Gingles 2 and 3, but it looks likely that they're both going to exist here. So we're going to -- we'll get confirmation on that. But that's where it's looking right now.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. We are going to move on to B-1, page 2. We are heading back up to the North Coast. This visualization starts in Del Norte, takes Humboldt and Trinity Counties, includes Mendocino, and then comes south taking the eastern part of Sonoma County; so Cloverdale, Geyserville, Healdsburg, Windsor, Lake --Larkfield-Wikiup -- Larkfield-Wikiup, Fulton, and Santa Rosa. This differs from the previous visualization where we came down and took this area of Sonoma and included parts of Marin as well.

The deviation of this visualization is 1.16 percent. MS. MAC DONALD: I apologize, if we're butchering names. Sometimes it becomes pretty difficult when you're
reading off all of these different names quickly, to pronounce them properly.

Ladino CVAP for this area is 13.27 percent. Black CVAP is 1.61 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.47 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 4.37 percent. And White CVAP is 76.3 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to B-10. And we are in the visualization called Tehama-Napa, and this includes Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Yolo, Napa, and Lake Counties. They are almost all whole in the very southern part of Napa County, American Canyon has been moved into the neighboring district just for sakes of population; because we are at 4.93 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 21.98 percent. Black CVAP is 2.23 percent. Asian CVAP is 7.31 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.98 percent. And White CVAP is 65.76 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to B-1, page 1. This is Sono-Marin, which takes the western half of Sonoma County. So here you see Guerneville, and Forestville, down to Graton and Sebastopol, down through Marin County, and ends with Marin County being whole. There is a split in Santa Rosa City.

And the deviation is 4.88 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 11.88 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.09 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.52 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.88 percent. And White CVAP is 78.85 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We are going to B-1, page 12. This visualization is called Solano because it has all of Solano County, and includes American Canyon.

The deviation is negative 4.89 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.98 percent.
Black CVAP is 15.46 percent. Asian CVAP is 17.22 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.95 percent. And White CVAP is 44.87 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Next, is B-1, page 6. We will be moving to the East Bay visualization. This incorporates the western areas of Contra Costa County, from just south of Hercules, coming south all the way to the county border. Richmond and Greater Richmond areas have been kept whole, and then come south through Albany and Berkeley, takes Emeryville, Piedmont, and parts of Oakland. And I'm going to turn on the freeway later just so you see where that that line is.

The deviation is 1.40 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.5 percent. Black CVAP is 14.8 percent. Asian CVAP is 18.68 percent. Indigenous CVAP up is 0.5 percent. And White CVAP is 48.48 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going east, we're going to B-1, page 7. This is Rodeo-Dublin. And as the name suggests, we begin in Rodeo on the -- right along the water area here with Crockett, and Port Costa, in Contra Costa County, coming down to Martinez, and following down this 680 Corridor all the way through, down south to the end of the county.

We also have Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga intact together in this visualization. And this comes down taking all of the incorporated areas, along the 680 Corridor, including Blackhawk, Camino, Tassajara, and coming south to incorporate the City of Dublin.

The deviation is 4.58 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 9.27 percent. Black CVAP is 3.72 percent. Asian CVAP is 21.34 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.54 percent. And White CVAP is 63.72 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving east, we were on B-1, page 8. This is East Contra Costa, and this takes Concord and Clyde as the western boundary, they are both intact of Central Contra Costa, and then takes all of Contra Costa east to the county line, including Bethel Island, Discovery Bay, and Byron.

The deviation is negative 1.2 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: And Latino CVAP is 23.67 percent.

Black CVAP is 12.17 percent. Asian CVAP is 12.96
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.87 percent. And White CVAP is 48.45 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We are now going to B-1, page 9. This visualization is entitled Alameda, takes all of Eastern Alameda to the county line, keeping Livermore, Sunol, and Pleasanton intact; goes west through the Northern Eden area, keeping together San Lorenzo, Ashland, and Castro Valley at its northern border.

The deviation is 3.07 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 21.72 percent. Black CVAP is 8.32 percent. Asian CVAP is 24.08 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.53 percent. And White CVAP is 42.99 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to B-1, page 3. This visualization is named Oakland, and it has the majority of Oakland City, including up to the hills and the border of the county. Also includes San Leandro, and Alameda City.

And the deviation is 4.12 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.14 percent.

Black CVAP is 25.03 percent. Asian CVAP is 23.92 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.50 percent. White CVAP is 30.26 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We are going south and heading to

B-1, page 5. This visualization is called whole Fremont.
It incorporates the whole City of Fremont, part of Union
City, Newark, Milpitas, and the Berryessa area of San Jose City. And this is a 3.57 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: And the Latino CVAP is 15.97
percent. Black CVAP is 4.12 percent. Asian CVAP is
54.48 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.49 percent. And

White CVAP is 23.31 percent.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay, do you have a clarifying question?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (No verbal response).

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Go ahead, please. COMMISSIONER SINAY: On that last one, the Fremont, is that one not considered a VRA district? MS. MAC DONALD: Mr. Becker. MR. BECKER: That's an area with very high crossover, as indicated before, that Fremont, Newark, San Jose, Santa Clara, South San -- and then on the other side of the Bay, South San Francisco, that area, a lot of crossover voting.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.
MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to B-4. B-4 is Morgan
Hill, River Bank, starts in Stanislaus County, using the City of Riverbank as the easternmost border, taking Empire and Modesto; coming west through the western areas

```
of Stanislaus, taking Eastern Santa Clara County,
incorporating these areas of San Jose City.
    And the deviation is negative 1.20 percent.
    MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 35.87 percent.
Black CVAP is 3.92 percent. Asian CVAP is 8.27 percent.
Indigenous CVAP is 1.19 percent. And White CVAP is 49.45
percent.
```

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, do you have a clarifying question?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Please. Could you just turn the terrain on for -- as we're looking at this one, please? Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. If you can, turn the terrain back on, please? I just want to make a brief comment too, you see that the road it says 130 , it's about one-and-a-half-lane wide road with no center divide, center line, and it takes about four hours to drive that road. So there really is no easy way to get from the Central Valley across.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: What's the road, Commissioner Fornaciari?

MS. MAC DONALD: 130.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It says 130. I don't know the name of the road, though. Yeah, I don't remember --

I know if you go up from Livermore, it's called Mines Road, but it changes up there at San Antonio Valley.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We'll move to B-1, page 4. This visualization is wholly incorporated within the City of San Jose, and in unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County. This takes the Alum Rock, and the Chino neighborhood COIs along this line, and incorporates areas down to -- oops, sorry -- incorporates areas of Downtown San Jose in the western side.

And the deviation is negative 0.09 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 34.20 percent. Black CVAP 3.67 percent. Asian CVAP 39.22 percent. Indigenous CVAP 0.41 percent. And White CVAP 20.97 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: B-1, page 11. We're moving west to Los Gatos-Burbank. These are areas of Western Santa Clara County, which starts in the north of Burbank, come through Fruitdale and Campbell, to Monte Sereno and Los Gatos, also include areas of San Jose, and unincorporated Santa Clara County.

The deviation is negative 2.98 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 16.97 percent. Black CVAP is 3.38 percent. Asian CVAP is 22.08 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.63 percent. And White CVAP is 55.96
percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to B, page 3. This visualization is called Lexington-Sunnyvale: and it starts in the south of Lexington Hills, comes north through the unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County, to Saratoga, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara. It also includes Mountain View on its western side.

And the deviation is 0.01 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.21 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.73 percent. Asian CVAP is 37.96 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.39 percent. And White CVAP is 45.63 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: B, page 2. We're moving to Palo Alto-Redwood; which takes the western part of Santa Clara County, including Palo Alto, Stanford, and Los Altos Hills, including Loyola, and the eastern part of Santa -San Mateo County, including East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and Atherton. And the Portola Valley, through Woodside, Emerald Lake, and San Carlos, all the way north to San Mateo; and no cities are split here. Also includes Redwood City.

The deviation is negative 4.76 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.93 percent.

Black CVAP is 3.36 percent. Asian CVAP is 21.46 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.34 percent. And White CVAP is 59.13
percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to B, page 1. This is West San Francisco. And again, I'll turn on some of the layers here, and you'll see the following of the Inner Sunset, and the Twin Peaks neighborhoods, as well as Presidio Heights in the Inner Richmond.

The deviation of this visualization is negative 2.63 percent. And again, this incorporates Daly City to the south, and Broadmoor.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.11 percent. Black CVAP is 4.23 percent. Asian CVAP is 50.13 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.29 percent. And White CVAP is 30.92 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And if I may point out, the difference between this visualization and the previous one you saw, they're very similar, except right along this line; you see how we have the Excelsior and Visitacion Valley. In the previous visualization, the line was there to preserve the Bay View Community, whereas, this visualization took into -- incorporated several communities of interest, which is what creates this line here. So that is the difference. And this is East San Francisco. We are on page $2--$ oh, sorry. We are on page 1.

And the deviation for this visualization is 1.91
percent. Oh. I move to page 9. I'm sorry.
(Mappers confer)

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. East is on page 9. West is on page --
(Mappers confer)

MS. MAC DONALD: I'm going to read off the CVAP for District East San Francisco, with the deviation of 1.91. And that is the one that Tamina just described. And the Latino CVAP here is 12.43 percent. Black CVAP is 7.4 percent. Asian CVAP is 24.5 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.61 percent. And White CVAP is 53.88 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Now, we'll move to B, page 5.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And the circle off to the

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: What is the circle off to the left?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It's the Fairlands.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. B, page 5: This is the San Mateo Coast visualization. Starting in the north at Brisbane, San Mateo, and Colma, and coming south through San Bruno, Millbrae, and Burlingame, and Hillsboro, we do end at San Mateo City here, with Baywood and Highlands before going to the coast, starting in Pacifica, all the
way down through San Mateo County. And then coming south into Santa Cruz. Right up until Live Oak, Soquel, and Aptos.

The deviation of this visualization is negative 2.05 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 16.12 percent.

Black CVAP as 2 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.58 percent.

Indigenous CVAP is 0.76 percent. And White CVAP is 58.51 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: B, page 6: We're continuing south along the coast. This is the Monterey Coast. It looks very similar to the one we saw before. So we're starting north with the Coastal Cities of Pleasure Point, Capitola, and Sea Cliff, coming down through Pajaro Dunes. And then taking the coastal areas of Monterey County, Moss Landing, Marina, and Seaside; Monterey, Del Monte, Carmel-by-the-Sea; and continuing south, to incorporate the coastline all the way through San Luis Obispo County, which the entire county is whole in this visualization.

And this is negative 4.55 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.64 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.49 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.88 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.13 percent. And White CVAP is 73.79 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: On to B, page 7. This
visualization in Santa Barbara, takes the entirety of Santa Barbara County. Comes into Ventura, takes Oak View, Mira Monte, and Ojai. The deviation of this visualization is negative 4.37 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 29.44 percent. Black CVAP is 2.43 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.83 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.03 percent. And White CVAP is 60.58 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And last for this segment, this is B, page 8: Taking all of Ventura County north to the county line, keeping intact the Port Hueneme, through Piru Corridor, taking Somis, and Camarillo, not including Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, or Santa Rosa Valley.

And the deviation is 1.01 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 44.06 percent. Black CVAP is 2.94 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.9 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.81 percent. And White CVAP is 44.45 percent.

And that concludes the set. And if you would like, Tamina could walk you through the major differences of these two plans really quickly, and then perhaps we could start to discuss.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That would be great.

MS. MAC DONALD: Would that work? Thank you so much, Chair.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. So I'm going to turn on, let's see, make a different color here. So visualization A, which we saw first, set $A$ is the yellow line, and set B is the black line. I'll make the yellow line a little thinner so you see it. Okay. I'm being told yellow is not the best color. Let's try again. Let's go green.

Is that better? Fluorescent green; a darker green?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Could you remove the labels?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: So just turning off the county lines for just a second. This is the map of $A$. And then this is the map of $B$. So we talked about a few of the differences as we went through. For example, the main difference in the North Coast area is where the southern end of this area lies.

So in A where we saw that it came all the way down and took this area down to Marin County, we didn't do the same thing for B. In B it came up and it stopped short, and instead of taking Western Sonoma, it took Eastern Sonoma, and did not go down into Marin County. We also see in Visualization B that we have this district which is -- we didn't represent in $A$ because it was mostly --
this is a crossover between Kennedy's area, which you've seen before, and this one.

But this was an attempt to include Lake with this area and creating a district which would follow some of the testimony that we received here. So this does not have a counterpart in visualization A, but I wanted to let you know what that would look like.

This area of visualization A has Napa County whole and coming south into Contra Costa County. Whereas, you can see here, with the previous visualization that started all the way up here in Tajima, this took all of Napa County. So this took this out of consideration for being moved into another district. And this came down and allowed for Solano County to be kept whole, and taking that small part of American Canyon in with it.

So you'll see here with visualization A, there's this visualization created for the wine areas, that was requested before, as well as keeping Napa whole, in this area, which did require more population to come from the south. And so that's where we moved down.

Whereas, visualization B, because we took population from these other areas, we were able to do that, although the wine area does not necessarily have its own district in this visualization. But it does keep Solano County whole, in keeping with that particular testimony.

Moving south into Contra Costa, this is
visualization B, and so we see Contra Costa County divided into three, with the one that caused that 680 Corridor coming down into Dublin. We'll zoom in here a little bit. Whereas, in visualization A, we actually worked on keeping the Benicia and Martinez together, the Vallejo and American Canyon together, coming down through Central Contra Costa County.

We still have a division of Contra Costa County into three, a big county. But in this visualization the Eastern District does end before Knightsen, and Oakley, and Discovery Bay, and comes up into Concord. So you can see a little bit of what that looks like with the difference there.

The western area of the East Bay here stayed similar. So this district stayed the same in both, and then coming down into Oakland, that split is the same in both of these visualizations. This takes in more of the hills and crosses over into Contra Costa County.

Another major difference here is where the population that came down -- or the lack of population, I should say, that ends up from a bubble in Santa Clara County is going to be taken from, and so in visualization A, we included Mountain House and Tracy, coming down through Crows Landing, and Newman, and then coming into

Morgan Hill to create an area that would finish off the population for Santa Clara County, the Alum Rock area.

Whereas, visualization $D$, we did not go up to Mountain House and Tracy, instead, we went further east in Stanislaus County and took all of the Modesto area, keeping those cities whole, and stretching westward to the county line of Santa Clara, here.

The difference in the San Francisco line we already talked about, it was just neighborhoods versus some communities of interest, but a very similar line. The Peninsula visualization is exactly the same as is its partner, right next to it.

What comes different here is when you move into Santa Clara City. So visualization A has this area of Southern Fremont, with Milpitas, and the Berryessa area linked to Campbell over here. And then that really took in the -- trying to keep in the Asian communities up here, and keep the Latino communities in this central area with Latino communities in the south, for the communities of interest, as with testimony. And we did keep Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara, and Cupertino together in A.

In $B$, it is similar. The line here, this is the top of San Jose City, and so San Jose City is not included in visualization $A$, where it is included in visualization B.

And then moving south: You saw these before, which is why they sounded similar. We have this district, which is San Bernardino County and Monterrey, which affects much of the districts around it. And so that is the same in both visualizations as well as this San Mateo district is the same -- this long coastal district, which, I don't have the label, but I'm pretty sure it's like Mont-Coast (ph.), or something like that, comes south and it's the same on both of those. And then these two visualizations stayed the same as Well, for Santa Barbara and Ventura.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioners, now will be the time to provide your comments with an emphasis on direction for the line drawers.

We'll start Commissioner Fornaciari, followed by Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Thank you for this. I know it's a lot of work. Just being part of Zone E, if you could -- I like the southern part of Zone -- with the southern part of Zone E. Can you zoom into the Santa Cruz area there for me, please?

So you know, I was the one who gave the direction about skirting along the coast there, and what the intent of that direction was, to not put Watsonville with the main part of Santa Cruz County, because of -- because I
assumed we were going to have this VRA district.
So the direction I give is instead, to keep as much of Santa Cruz County, kind of together, if you can. You know, maybe swap out some other cities further south. This little sliver of Santa Cruz County, going all the way down to San Luis Obispo County, is a little funky. So if there if there's a way you can massage it around, by moving some of the cities to keep more that sliver of Santa Cruz County together, that would make more sense. Yeah, that one is crazy, the Ventura one is crazier that I thought it might be. But thanks for that. MS. RAMOS ALON: To add the -- to get rid of those sections of Santa Clara -- I'm sorry -- Santa Cruz County, which areas did you want to add from, which one? COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. Up north. MS. RAMOS ALON: Right, but if I -COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Going to Santa Clara, or something.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. I will explore moving these areas into Santa Cruz, and taking more of something else. COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, just -- I don't know how much -- yeah, I mean, if you can do that, maybe you can go further inland and catch Aptos, or I mean, whatever South of Aptos, and Corralitos, or something like that. Then if you could just go -- oh, yeah, just
zoom out a little bit. And go north, yeah, I think -- so in both cases you have these districts going from Santa Clara to Stanislaus, in one case, to Tracy. We've got a lot of feedback that that's not a desire, so.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, this is the Santa Clara bubble, and I would love some direction on where you would like me to get the population from to complete Santa Clara County. Because $I$ have this potential VRA district here, taking all the way up to San Benito, and the eastern part of Santa Clara County is mostly
uninhabited. Where can I go to get more population for this area that would not require me to go into Stanislaus or San Joaquin?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So I'm going to give you some other direction that may make -- I don't know -- may help. This whole coastal thing that goes from Santa Cruz to San Bruno, I'm just not a big fan of that. I like the idea of starting Pacifica, and going down to Santa Cruz. But if you if you have to grab population from that side -- from the other side of the hill there, I'd grab it from Los Gatos. I grab it from the South Bay, not from the Peninsula.

I mean, I'd start building districts south of San Francisco, and stay on the east side of that hill and go down. I think that would make more sense. And I don't
know if that would help with your Santa Clara bubble or not.

And if we go to the East Bay, if you could turn on the terrain. I mean, you can see the hills right there. They go between Hayward, Pleasanton, Fremont; Pleasanton, all the way up to Berkeley. You know what I mean? You know, and it separates Berkeley and Oakland from Orinda. So you can turn the terrain there off.

I mean, I'd like to -- you know, crossing that hill is a different world, right. And I know that there was direction to go from Hayward to the Tri-Valley. But I mean, those are two very, very different areas. And I'd like to see us stay away from that.

And then finally, if you'd go north, and I know there's a lot of tradeoffs, and probably making it worse, but if you go north and turn on B. Is this B? Yeah, if you can go all the way to the north; so I like this visualization of the coast better, where it goes into Santa Rosa rather than all the way down to Marin, I think, for me, that's sits better, matches better together.

And then the Central Valley district that you have here. Yeah, I kind of like that. I mean, the Central Valley is, you know, heavy, heavy, heavy-duty farming all the way down that that Central Valley, and Lake County --

I mean, Lake is not a farming county, but it kind of makes sense to go with it.

The one thing that is really interesting to me is, is Napa with it, I would think that Eastern Solano would go better with that farming, heavy-duty farming theme, than Napa. I don't know how my colleagues feel about that. But I'll stop there.

Thank you for all your hard work.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.
Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. A couple of things, we are receiving a lot of feedback that Ashland, the unincorporated area of Ashland, which was taken -- is a highly diverse community fits better with Hayward and San Lorenzo. They actually share school districts, and park communities, and other things. So they've been requesting a please put Ashland, the unincorporated area of Ashland with Hayward and San Lorenzo, which is, all three of them are called the Eden Area.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. This is kept together in visualization B, that you're seeing right now.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Because we've gotten -they must have only seen one of the visualizations. So let's keep that visualization, since that's the one they like, since we've gotten a lot of input.

On the San Francisco visualization, A-1, where you have it divided, I found it kind of -- I was uncomfortable that Bayview is cut up a little bit there, because Bayview is traditionally African-American community. I know that it's gentrifying and such, but I think it's important to keep Bayview together. And then when you look at all of it together, the thought of having Bayview and the Marina in the same district is quite interesting, if you know San Francisco.

So I was wondering if we could move them out -- move the line a little, so Bayview is with the east group, so with Excelsior, and Crocker, and all those, and Presidio is with the Marina. I don't know if population-wise that will work, but community-wise, you know, if you need more people, I would go into Sea Cliff,

But I definitely would put Bayview with Excelsior on that one. I was curious on -- should I stop and let others speak and then come back.

Chair, how would you like to do it?
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Go on, continue.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I was wondering in the East Bay, if we are diluting the Black vote. It is one part of our state where we do have large Black communities. And I'm not sure if the Black -- you know, I know that we will be receiving a lot of input next
week, but it just feels like Bay Point, Pittsburg, you know, and others should -- some of them are in the same -- yeah, there it is. Thank you. Bay Point, Pittsburg, Antioch, Martinez, you know, I'm just curious -- and then you go down to Oakland, Alamitos, San Leandro.

So I just would like -- if we can just keep our eye on that, and listen when we hear from the Black community, kind of what their preference is in that area.

And finally, American Canyon sent us twelve different communities of interest. So that was -- that's pretty significant for a community, asking us not to be separated from Napa. And so I would like, as much as we can, to please keep them with Napa. They were separated last time, and they've asked to please be kept with Napa this time. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Let's see. I'd like to start up north, and with, I guess you know -yeah, all the way north, please. Oh, sorry. And this visualization $A$, what I'd like to do -- what I'd like to see, you know, actually, it's different than Commissioner Fornaciari.

I heard that Lake wants to be with Mendocino, and
you know, in the coastal, not with the inland. And so what I would like to see in this is: add Lake, and then the Wine Country is Napa-Sonoma, and they're not together in either one. And I'd like to see Napa, and then the wine section of Sonoma, together.

And then that would, by adding Lake, taking that section out of the Sonoma, then I'd like to see the coast going from Del Norte all the way down to Marin, because I think population-wise that would take it, because Sonoma is actually quite large. And if you take a chunk of Sonoma away, then you keep all the coast together and add Lake. And then going south on the Peninsula.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me. May I also request to keep the city names on as much as possible, for several Commissioners, please? Thank you. Continue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Going south, we asked for -- and this is, you know, where can you get the population for Santa Clara? I totally agree with Commissioner Fornaciari. We'd sort of asked for a visualization -- actually, if you could turn on the 280 , you know, the Freeway line. And then also, I don't know, with the terrain. Could you just quickly turn terrain on, and if that's too confusing or we can take it off, but -- okay, yeah, just briefly. Okay. Now, you can go and take that off because you can't read anything else.

But what $I$ like to see in this one is, start at Pacifica, like we've sort of asked before, and go on the west side of the -- so it would be Pacifica down through -- and basically take San Bruno, San Mateo, et cetera, start with that population in a separate district. And so you're essentially moving that particular one that you're in there, moving that up.

So you're starting at the coast -- on the Bay side and going down from there. And the population to put back into the Pacifica border would actually be Stanford, Atherton, everything west of 280 in that whole area, which is, the Portola Valley, Atherton, Woodside, and Los Altos Hills, Loyola, that entire area going into Palo Alto, and that whole section. Not East Palo Alto, because that goes with Menlo Park, and on down.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Can I just clarify? You want Stanford over here with the Pacifica area?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, we need to get population so --

MS. RAMOS ALON: So if you are going to cut off this area, which will not have enough population.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, okay. The San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, is going to start a new set -- a new area, and $I$ know in talking to -- and going down from there, going south until you've reached into population.

Then you cut that off.
So essentially what's happening is, where you go from Foster City right now down to Loyola that population is going to move up, that district will move up. And so then you're essentially moving all of these up, and for your Santa Clara, all of a sudden you'll be coming -well, you've kind of gone north-south across these areas, like through Cupertino and that -- I can't remember the -- Lexington Hills, Saratoga and parts of Campbell, and stuff, will be part -- with parts of San Jose.

Does that make sense?

So you're moving these sections up, and you're cutting in from the mountainous area on the west. You're cutting in to the underside of these of the -- from Loyola, possibly -- exactly. See where you have that entire -- that line, the line going up, Portola Valley, Woodside, no, no, go west, your zone line, your black line, going west, that one. That is going to move east. That line right there will move east to grab your population.

As your Foster City line will be going north. So essentially, you'll be going along the Bay to get your population, and moving cross like that. And that's going to move your Santa Clara line up a little bit. It'll shift -- it will shift over into East Bay, to give you
some more room in that whole area.

And then, if you pop down to the Monterey -- the Monterey Bay area, where Commissioner Fornaciari was talking about the coast. Again, I totally agree with him. And yeah -- actually not quite so if you would zoom into the Monterey Bay area, where he's saying Santa Cruz got all sort of chopped up.

MS. MAC DONALD: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Commissioner Andersen, may I ask a clarifying question?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Certainly.

MS. MAC DONALD: Tamina explores what you just suggested up there. So the visualization that she shows, basically, doesn't split any cities. And what you're suggesting, are you okay with her splitting cities then?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I don't think you need to.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. You would. We'll take a look at it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: I just wanted to make sure.

Because we need big direction here right now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right, right. Yeah.

MS. MAC DONALD: So we're happy to look into this, but --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, basically what I'm trying to do is move things up a little bit, because San Mateo all the way down to santa Cruz, it's too much. So I'm trying to move is sort of -- is move it, divide along the ridgeline essentially, and try to shift populations up the Bay. And so you kind of come all the way over, and then you're kind of like: Okay, I don't have enough population in the Santa Clara area, the Santa Clara County.

MS. MAC DONALD: May I, please, ask whether you like A or B better to work off of.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: In the Peninsula, they're pretty much the same.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay. So irrespective? COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you. COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then down here, I'd like to keep Santa Clara -- Santa Cruz County, if you could cut it right at Watsonville, and go all the way over to include Moss Landing -- well, you have Moss Landing. Yeah. Go Watsonville over to Moss Landing, in terms of that's your VRA district. I think if you -- if you went across that way, so La Selva Beach, Aptos, all that would go back up, population with Santa Cruz. And that might help.

Then, can we go up to the East Bay? On this one I like the $B$ is a little bit better for the East Bay than A, because in $A$ you had -- you're trying to get, you know, Benicia, Martinez, but you came all the way down to LA Miranda, and that just -- that really doesn't work. I understand what you're trying to do there, but this one works a little bit better, although, again, like Commissioner Fornaciari said, there are some areas where, here, we're going in sort of a little bit north-south.

Well, I would cut off like at Alamo, and go from Orinda going east; and from Alamo going south, in terms of the district, and try to see how the numbers work out there. And that, again, might also give you enough population from Lower Alameda into the Santa Clara. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners, I realize that I missed the break. I guess I had in my head, the break was at a different time than it -- I thought it was at 3:15, apparently was -- should have been at 2:45.

So our next to speak is Commissioner Akutagawa. Would you mind if we went to break, and took your comments when we come back? You're okay with that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: (No verbal response).

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, great. So we're going to take a fifteen-minute break, and we should be back at

3:03.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:48 p.m. until 3:03 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, everyone. Hope you had a nice break.

We were in the middle of Commissioners' comments and directions to the line drawers. So at this time, I'd like to move to Commissioner Akutagawa. And thank you, for those who had your hands raised, for your patience?

Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair. Okay. Actually, maybe it's more clarification, and it might reflect what Commissioner Andersen was just talking about. I'm looking at visualization $A-1$, and then I'm comparing it to visualization $B$, and this is specifically for the San Mateo to Santa Cruz district.

So I think it's on the one that's A-1. I'm just kind of curious; could you just zoom in on that upper part, the northern part in that San Mateo area for visualization A-1? I couldn't move to the map fast enough when you were talking about it, for me to understand what it included.

Okay. Thank you. And can you just scroll down just a little bit more so I see what other cities. Okay. All right; that is helpful. Between $A-1$ and $B$, $I$ guess my
general comments are the same, and it may be resolved by some -- I don't know if it'll be resolved -- but I guess it'll be somewhat addressed by what Commissioner Andersen said.

It just strikes me that you have cities like Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo in city -- or in a in a district, or in an area that also includes probably a lot of the more affluent areas of the Peninsula, stretching all the way down to Santa Cruz.

I heard what you're saying about, you know, the potential VRA district that includes San Benito, and I forgot the other side of that, but that particular district, I would like to just ask and see if there is some way -- and I guess maybe that's why I would -- it may be addressed by what Commissioner Andersen was talking about, is to remove those areas near the san Francisco Airport, and instead, dip a little further east in and take in Palo Alto, so that at least the communities themselves are somewhat similar.

I just wanted to make that general comment. I mean, to be honest, I'm still trying to go through all of these visualizations, still. But that was the one thing that jumped out at me. I thought it was an odd combination. And in this case, I'm not sure if I'm a fan of the
coastal district. But I understand, I'm hearing what you're saying about, you know, the kind of limitations that you have.

But I'll just stop here. It's just a general comment about, yeah, that that combination. It just doesn't seem like it's going to serve either parts of the community well. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just wanted to express support for the B-1 North Coast map. I would -if it's possible, to take out the portions of the Karuk Reservation Tribe that is in the Humboldt, Del Norte area, and to put that into -- connect that with the part that is in Siskiyou, that would be -- that would make sense. The Hupa Tribe is whole in this map as well. So this map looks good to me.

In terms of the Sonoma, I would support having Sonoma and Napa, and the wine portions of Yolo County together. I think those would be great in that -together. It makes sense to have a Wine Country Assembly district, if it's possible, if the numbers work out.

That would be my comment. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Commissioner Toledo, that was a good lead in to what $I$ want to talk about. I'm trying to remember which one it was. It is the B-10 Tehama-Napa, I believe. That's what we are -- wait. Yes, on that one.

You know, I'm getting like -- maybe I don't need to say this because on the prior, the northern comments I had already noted for Yolo County, I prefer the Colusa, Yolo County, Solano, Napa, kind of coalition, versus going too far north. So I just want to make sure I put that out there.

So I don't necessarily like this one, because if it takes us all the way up to Tehama. Yolo County, it is agriculture, most of it, well, probably like ninety percent of it, but not -- has more connections with Solano and Napa, than with the other counties that you have noted on there. And I think Commissioner Fornaciari had noted the Eastern Solano with farming, and that would definitely roll in with Yolo.

And I guess, overall I like -- I prefer the A visualization, but again, it's so hard to compare the two because there're parts that $I$ like about the $B$, and parts of A. But $I$ think, overall, if $I$ had to pick one, it would be A. Thank you. That was it.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner

Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Starting off again with Lake County, and I would just like everybody to at least picture in their mind again what we saw last night, which is the topographical layer. Lake County is not the same as Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Yolo there, it looks much more like Napa, Solano, and -sorry, Napa, Sonoma, and Mendocino.

There is plenty of Wine Country in Southern Lake County, and Northern Lake County, looks a lot more like Mendocino County, but it's not a -- it's not a valley place, really.

Second, the area around Alum Rock, I was just -- it looked like there were small communities being divided there. I just wanted to make sure that all that got cleaned up. As far as Tracy, you know, my understanding, and I wasn't familiar with that area previously, but my understanding is Tracy links much more to Livermore than to places much farther south. And I'm just wondering if we can better reflect that.

And finally, on the Peninsula, I'm agreeing with Commissioner Fornaciari, and Commissioner Andersen, and Commissioner Akutagawa, and the intent of the instructions, as I understood it, was to come up with something that was ocean-facing, and something separate
that was Bay-facing.

And if I recall, your Western San Francisco district was below the target, so you might even pick up Colma, or something else bordering it to boost your population.

And then as Commissioner Andersen was saying, shift some of these districts farther north along the Peninsula, with the understanding that anything that's south and west of the 280, until you get down to Cupertino, would be with the coast.

I think that's what was not coming through clearly, was that, you know, let's look at the 280 as a dividing line between an eastern-facing district on the Peninsula, and a west-facing district on the Peninsula. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Two last comments. First of all, it looks like you've got a little bit of Alameda and San Francisco in both of your visualizations, like a little tip of the runway at the Naval Air Station there. I don't think anybody lives there, so I don't think it matters that much, but anyway.

So I just want to be clear. I have a different perspective on how we should connect Santa Cruz with the rest of the Bay, if we have to connect. I don't think
there is -- I don't think 280 is the dividing line. I think the Ridge is the dividing line. I think Skyline Boulevard is the dividing line.

I don't think Santa Cruz, and Atherton, and Menlo Park have anything in common. And if we've got to go over the hill, $I$ think we take Highway 17 over the hill, into Los Gatos, in that area. And/or we go over to Morgan Hill, in that direction.

But $I$ don't think there's anything in common with Atherton, and Palo Alto, and Stanford, I don't think there's a connection there in the same way there would be, if you took 17, or if you went over to Morgan Hill.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner. Any other comments, direction, on this portion?

Okay. With that, I'll turn it back over to the Line Drawing Team.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you so much for that direction. We are going to be moving on to our Senate districts. So I'll be turning on our -- not that one -Senate District A. And unlike in the Assembly where we had a possible VRA consideration area, we do not have one in the Senate or in the Congress. So these districts are -- we're just going to go ahead and start from the north and head south, since we don't have one of those to cover initially.

Unless Mr. Becker has anything he would like to.
MR. BECKER: I just want to say, it's for a simple reason, these districts are so large that the minority populations that could potentially be protected are not sufficiently large enough, or concentrated enough to form a majority in one of these districts.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. Well, then with that, we will start with page 1 of A. Senate A, page 1: This visualization is called North Coast, takes Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity, Mendocino, Sonoma County, and Marin County, keeps all of these counties whole, together.

And the deviation is 3.02 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.59 percent. Black CVAP is 1.86 percent. Asian CVAP 4.51 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 2.60 percent. And White CVAP 77.59 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 2, we are moving east to NapaByron, and this visualization takes Lake County, Napa County, and Solano County whole. And then comes into Contra Costa County to take Clyde along the 4 Corridor through Bay Point, Pittsburg, Alameda, all the way to the county line with Byron, Discovery Bay, and up to Bethel Island.

The deviation is 1.53 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 21.27 percent.
Black CVAP is 12.87 percent. Asian CVAP is 12.92
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.18 percent. And White CVAP is 49.77 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: To page 3, this visualization is called Contra Costa. And this takes in the remainder of Contra Costa that was not on page 2. So Concord and Clayton, west through the 680 Corridor along the 4 to the 80 Corridor on the coast, goes all the way up to the county line, and then comes down into Alameda County taking the Cities of Albany and Berkeley.

And this visualization has a negative 2.42 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 14.12. Black CVAP is 8.10 percent. Asian CVAP is 18.75 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.56 percent. And White CVAP is 56.89 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 4. This visualization is called Alameda, and it takes the northern and western areas of Oakland as its boundary, without splitting Oakland, takes Emeryville, and Piedmont, comes down through Alameda to San Leandro, and includes Ashland and Castro Valley whole. Goes east to Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, includes Sunol, and then goes east to the county line.

The deviation is negative 1.82 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 14.76 percent.

Black CVAP is 16.76 percent. Asian CVAP is 22.58
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.49 percent. And White CVAP is 43.58 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 5. This is Eden Tech, which takes San Lorenzo, Cherryland, and Fairview, with Union City, Hayward, Fremont, and Newark. Come south, taking Milpitas, the northern area of San Jose, and then Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara.

The deviation is 3.64 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.98 percent.

Black CVAP is 5.86 percent. Asian CVAP is 42.05 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.47 percent. And White CVAP is 30.55 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 10. This is Santa Clara, and it takes the Berryessa neighborhood of San Jose, south through San Jose City, also incorporates Burbank, Fruitdale, Campbell, Saratoga, Monte Serrano, Los Gatos, and Cambrian Park.

And the deviation is 0.74 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 24.65 percent.

Black CVAP is 3.33 percent. Asian CVAP is 35.04 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.47 percent. And White CVAP is 35.30 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 11. This visualization is called Stani-Cruz, and it encapsulates all of Stanislaus County to the borders, the eastern areas and southern areas of Santa Clara County, and the southern areas of Santa Cruz County.

The deviation is negative 0.90 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 32.01 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.87 percent. Asian CVAP is 9.43 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.11 percent. And White CVAP is 53.54 percent.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo, do you have a clarifying question?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. Can you zoom in so we can see the cities? It was really hard to see what was included in this.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, of course. Would you like us to read them off?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. I just wanted to look at them. Thank you. You're good. Thank you. Appreciate it.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're going to page 7, to Peninsula. Starting with Brisbane, incorporating South San Francisco, going to San Bruno, down to Woodside, Atherton, all the way down to Mountain View, the line between Mountain View and Sunnyvale, also does take the
coastal areas of Pacifica to Half Moon Bay, and down to Pescadero. And then come south into Santa Cruz, right up to the end of Santa Cruz City.

This is a 0.38 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 14.91 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.71 percent. Asian CVAP is 22.37 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.52 percent. And White CVAP is 57.60 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 6. This is San Francisco.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Do you have another question, Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, thank you. I was trying to figure out the page, but $I$ found it.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome. Okay. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Well, page 7 is San Francisco. It incorporates all of San Francisco City and County. And then also includes Broadmoor, and Daly City.

The deviation is negative 0.34 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 12.8 percent.

Black CVAP is 5.79 percent. Asian CVAP is 37.42 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.45 percent. And White CVAP is 42.29 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And we are going to page 9. This district is called South Coast, and it incorporates

Monterey County, San Benito County, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara Counties. The areas of Santa Barbara County, which are excluded here, are the coastal areas from Goleta, through Santa Barbara City, to Carpinteria. The deviation is 3.14 percent. MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 31.44 percent. Black CVAP is 2.43 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.81 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.1 percent. And White CVAP is 58.13 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And last of this set is page 8. This is Ventura, which incorporates the areas just described in Santa Barbara County, Ventura up to the northern county line, and the rest of Eastern Ventura, except for Bell Canyon, and Oak Park.

The deviation is 4.78 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 30.5 percent. Black

CVAP is 2.34 percent. Asian CVAP is 7.52 percent.

Indigenous CVAP is 0.76 percent. And White CVAP is 58.23 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And that concludes this set. And if you would, please move over to the Senate B visualization set, then we can start there with page 1, please. Page 1 is NorCal-Super Region, the first of the Senate B set. And I'll zoom in so you have the counties here. This visualization includes -- is a east-west
visualization, which includes Del Norte to Modoc, down to Nevada County, to Sierra, Butte, includes Colusa and Mendocino County.

The deviation is negative 0.24 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latina CVAP is 10.95 percent.

Black CVAP is 1.43 percent. Asian CVAP is 2.66 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 4.05 percent. And White CVAP is 80.12 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 2 is Lake Marin. This visualization includes all of Lake County, Napa County, Sonoma County, and Marin County. And the deviation is negative 3.35 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 14.67 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.12 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.42 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.37 percent. And White CVAP is 75.63 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 3 is East Contra Costa-Solano.

Keeps Solano County whole, comes in to Contra Costa County, keeping Martinez with Benicia, and going along the 4 Corridor to the county line, down to Byron, and down to the Alameda County line, and keeping the 680 Corridor intact, south of Martinez.

The deviation is negative 0.77 percent. MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 20.94 percent. Black CVAP is 13.38 percent. Asian CVAP is 14.33
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.92 percent. And White CVAP is 48.3 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 4 is called Alameda. It actually starts in Northwestern Contra Costa County, with Crockett, following the water line down through El Cerrito. It also includes Albany and Berkeley from Alameda County; then includes the 680 Corridor, from just south of Martinez and Pleasant Hill, so Alhambra Valley, Pleasant Hill, coming down the 680, all the way to San Ramon. Also includes Moraga, Orinda, and Lafayette. And then comes south to keep San Ramon, Danville, together with Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and Sunol.

The deviation is 3.63 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.92 percent. Black CVAP is 7.72 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.90 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.49 percent. And White CVAP is 56.4 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 5 is Oakland. The Oakland visualization keeps Oakland whole with Piedmont and Emeryville, as well as Alameda City, and incorporates the Eden areas, San Leandro, Castro Valley, Ashland, San Lorenzo, Fairview, Cherryland; including Hayward, and Union City, as well as unincorporated areas. Hayward is split right along this line. This little piece right here is also Hayward; that is in the neighboring
district.

And the deviation is 2.90 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 19.32 percent.

Black CVAP is 18.19 percent. Asian CVAP is 25.59
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.49 percent. And White CVAP is 33.97 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 6, please. This visualization is called Fre-Berry, starts with the City of Fremont, which is kept whole with Newark, takes Milpitas, the northern areas and the downtown areas of San Jose, including East Foothills, Alum Rock, and Berryessa. Also includes Santa Clara and Cupertino whole.

And the deviation is negative 1.08 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 22.99 percent. Black CVAP is 4.02 percent. Asian CVAP is 43.93 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.42 percent. And White CVAP is 27.18 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 10. This is Santa Clara-San Benito; which takes the rest of Santa Clara County, including the remainder of San Jose City, comes down through Morgan Hill, San Mateo -- Morgan Hill, San Martin and Gilroy. And then also includes San Benito County, coming over to Monterey County, to get Prunedale and Elkhorn, and Aromas which is kept whole. And then ends at the -- ends the bottom of San Benito County.

This visualization has a negative 3.44 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 23.2 percent. Black CVAP is 2.67 percent. Asian CVAP is 26.54 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.67 percent. And White CVAP is 45.84 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 8. South-San-Sunny; we start in the north with Brisbane and South San Francisco, coming along down through the 280-101 area, to the line for Santa Clara County, and including the areas in Santa Clara County, up through Mountain View and Sunnyvale.

This deviation is negative 3.36 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.33 percent. Black CVAP is 2.85 percent. Asian CVAP is 27.47 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.35 percent. And White CVAP is 52.08 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 7. This visualization is called San Francisco, and takes the entire City and County of San Francisco, along with Broadmoor, and Daly City.

This is a negative 0.21 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.8 percent. Black CVAP is 5.79 percent. Asian CVAP is 37.45 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.45 percent. And White CVAP is 42.27
percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 9. This is SLOMateo; starts with Pacifica in Northern San Mateo County, follows the coast, down through San Mateo County, down through Santa Cruz County, which is kept whole in this visualization. Down through Monterey County, and then takes the entirety of the County of San Luis Obispo. The only area cut out of Monterey County, over here, is the Prunedale, Elkhorn area, and the half of Aromas.

And this visualization has a 4.84 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 24.79 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.19 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.79 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.03 percent. And White CVAP is 64.13 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And lastly, is page 11. This is Santa Barbara-Ventura; keeps together all of Santa Barbara and most of the County of Ventura. The areas not included from Ventura, are Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Casa Conejo, Oak Park, Santa Susana, and Bell Canyon.

The deviation is 2.32 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 36.31 percent.

Black swap is 2.66 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.56 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.94 percent. And White CVAP is 52.77 percent.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay,
do you have a clarifying question?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Thank you. On the one, Ventura, I think you said that Moorpark was taken out, but it looks like Moorpark and Simi Valley were separated.

MS. RAMOS ALON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.
MS. MAC DONALD: With your permission, should we just do a little overview of both the A and the B.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Please. Yes, thank you.
MS. MAC DONALD: Okay.
MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. I'm going to do the same thing, and turn on $A$ and make it green. And we will go back up north with the first big difference which, of course, is the way that the North Coast is split up versus the Nor Cal Super Region. And so in visualization A, which is the green one, the North Coast area from Del Norte going south to Marin County is one district; versus, in visualization $B$, which takes an east-west approach of the northern California region and the counties up there.

I'm going to remove the labels so that we can see. I remember they helped last time. Okay.

So in VSDA we had this district kept Lake, Napa, and

Solano together, with the area of East Contra Costa. In B this area was Lake, Napa, Solano -- sorry, Sonoma -oh, no, I don't have my labels. Sonoma and Marin Counties -- I know the counties, really. And then it kept Solano County with Eastern Contra Costa instead. In A, as we went to the East Bay, hard lines on these sides, coming from the first visualization from A, taking from north to Southeastern Contra Costa County, and then another district for Alameda County which cleans up the rest of that area. Versus, this is B, which kept intact the 680 Corridor from North Contra Costa County, south all the way through Sunol, and the Alameda County line.

Visualization A has this larger district which keeps intact the Fremont area and North San Jose, along with the Cities of Sunnyvale and Cupertino, and Santa Clara, including Milpitas. And it produces another district down south from it, which is other areas of San Jose, and keeping together some communities of interest over here and in the downtown, as well as Saratoga, Los Gatos, and Campbell area; which leaves the rest of Santa Clara County to be joined with Stanislaus County, and the western part of Santa Cruz.

Visualization B starts here in Fremont, takes Milpitas, again this northern area, and the Berryessa
area of San Jose, but takes Santa Clara and Cupertino, not Sunnyvale, and keeps the hard line at the Santa Clara County border, by stretching south into San Benito County. And including Prunedale, and Elkhorn, and Monterey County, and the half of Aromas, which is split between the two counties.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioners, comments and direction for line drawers, please?

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Just giving very high level; I did appreciate the A more than the B visualizations, except for the Oakland one, where I did appreciate the Oakland B visualization appeared to be -I thought it better represented the COIs in that area. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I think I have less notes on the A, so I am going to assume that I preferred the A. In terms of the B, the Nor Cal, Super Region, I don't like because I would prefer to keep the coastal cities -- I mean, the coastal counties together.

And then I had a question on -- oh, on B-11, which is Santa Barbara-Ventura; and that's where they split out

Moorpark with Simi Valley. And we've heard over and over that we would make those two communities together, and yeah.

And then also, I mean, with that, along the same lines there's -- oops, sorry about that, Tamina. There's also the other small towns that are kind of right next to each other. And I'm thinking they probably -- it's probably best to keep them together as well, like the San Rosa Valley, and Camarillo, and maybe Somas, but hopefully, we will get some feedback on that.

And then the last one was B-9, with SLO-Mateo. And I wrote down Prunedale, Elkhorn. You can take me to that. Yes, you can go all the way to -- right there, oops, we're good. Stop. Can you just zoom in, please? And keep zooming in, right above, no, up, please. Right there, the little piece you carved out from San Benito, can you just zoom in on that piece?

I found it odd, and I realize it's because of numbers I'm sure. But I'm pretty sure those communities would prefer not to be carved out. And of course, it's going to affect everything else. So that was Prunedale and Elkhorn, and Aromas. And then $I$ think in one of them you actually split Aromas. And I definitely would not want to split Aromas. And those are all my comments. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you. Aromas, is together in both.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. What was the one you said -- no, there was a smaller.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Aromas is actually split between two counties. So that's not my fault.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. No, no. I think it was one of the -- it must have been a different town. Oh, no. Thank you. This is good.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I guess you know what, let's start there, because I just have a question -- well, $I$ have a clarification question, and then I guess I'll get to my other comment. Can you tell me why Prunedale is, and Elkhorn is carved out and put in that way?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry. I'm looking for my labels that are not here, but the intent was to keep with this agricultural corridor as much of this area going down as possible, and population stopped it right here at Pinedale. So this, the intent was to kind of come down pass Salinas, but this is where we met the deviation.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay. Yeah. I think that's part of the reason why $I$ was just asking about,
why just stop there, and I guess -- I guess the other question $I$ also had is if you if you zoom in again a little bit more, particularly, going up towards, you know, like if you take that little black line, and you, you know, capture part of -- or at least Watsonville, and I know it makes it like a really thin area.

But I don't know if that'll -- you know, if that'll throw off the deviations. But $I$ mean, just in terms of, you know, thinking about a more agricultural area, I know Watsonville is also as agricultural as, you know, that central area there, and less so coastal; so that, I was just trying to understand, or to get clarification on that.

I will confess that -- I mean, I'm still -- I guess for me unlike -- I'm just a little, right now, I mean, I guess I was just thinking that the -- some of the maps, and I'm still, again, just trying to, you know, just I think just process all of it a little bit more.

I will say that there's a map on the B-H, it's the SDB-San-Sunny one. I do kind of like that one better, but I also see that there's a version of it in your A visualizations, which is -- encompasses the entire coastline plus that entire area. I'm kind of torn, to be honest, but I guess -- I don't know, I think I'm just -I'm still trying to decide whether or not -- I mean, if
that's what it's going to be, it's going to be. So I just wanted to say that of the ones right now, that's the one that I'm most favoring, but I also understand the choices that you're making.

So I will also say, you know, the super -- I guess the super district, which is the SDB-Nor-Cal, which is page 1, B-1, or visualization B. I personally -- you know, I'm not going to say I love it. Again, I'm taking into account what the folks on the coast also said that they wanted.

But at the same time, we're also -- you know, we also looked at some visualizations that I know some of the Commissioners also indicated that, you know, something like along this lines may work. It would help to ensure that the tribal areas in that particular Del Norte, and Humboldt, and Mendocino stay together, along with the Siskiyou. From a nesting point of view, it seems like it would nest pretty well. So I think I'm just -- I just wanted to just express that that might work also too.

But thank you for these. I know you had a lot of choices, and a lot of interesting decisions that you have to keep into account because of the VRA districts.

I'm still also kind of thinking about that Santa Clara -- I don't know. I forgot what you called it. But
it is still so odd. It just seems like -- it just doesn't seem like a great match for either one. So I think, like the rest of us will continue to think about, are there other solutions, or other suggestions? So thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'd have to say going -- starting at the north, I like -- I prefer A, I'm similar to Commissioner Fernandez, because the coastal and -- the coastal communities -- counties together, including Lake, though, I really prefer Lake with that. And a lot of this, it's because of terrain and the 101.

You know, you can't get there. Like from Del Norte you can't get to Siskiyou, unless you go into Humboldt and over, or into Oregon and over. And that's kind of true all the way down here. And $I$ keep on thinking people who like to get to see their representative and can't -- are not able to. So I prefer that.

Then going to the East Bay, and I understand, you know, you're doing a lot here, but unfortunately, in every visualization, you're -- going down the ridge from San Pablo south, and then, you know, the Orinda, Moraga, you know, over, and Martinez at -- how people transit, you know, there's the BART, which goes from Richmond all
the way down to San Jose. The bus lines run from the north there, up and down through the south.

And there's a lot of public transportation through this, this entire -- the eastern -- you know, from the Ridge West, at the Bay. And to cut it up like this, and you know, taking Oakland, Alameda, and putting it with Dublin, Livermore; it's just two different worlds. And completely different issues, what's -- you know, the housing is completely different. Up and down the 680 Corridor, that's all driving; you know, and if you want to get anywhere, you have to get in your car and drive. And that's just not -- the ethnicities are different. You know, the types of food are different. I'd really like to see us not go from Richmond out to Danville, but go from, you know, Hercules down to San Leandro, and then go Martinez -- actually out to Bethel Island. And then dropping down, probably doing a second one in San Ramon, through Dublin, Pleasanton.

Because those are the communities that actually live and shop together, and they are very separate and different from, you know, going over -- it's a complete different climate even, once you cross from Oakland up and over the hill, it's 20 degrees warmer. And it's and it's a completely different way of life.

So it really doesn't make sense. It looks nice on
paper, but it just doesn't flow. And particularly the representative issues would be very, very different. You know, there's tight, dense housing on the -- at the coast. And when you go inland, it's much larger open spaces.

So doing that, I believe would lift, then going further south. Now, if could move south, that would lift some of the population up to prevent the Santa Clara, all the way down to the south of San Benito. I don't think anyone in San Benito would like to be represented by someone in San Jose. They're just, again, a completely different world.

And if we can do that, I think we can -- what
Commissioner Akutagawa was saying, essentially keep some of the population in the Santa Cruz, San Jose area together, and have San Benito, Monterey together going south. I think that makes a lot more sense in terms of the -- that's where you transfer -- that's where the people live back and forth through that area, not go -yeah, in that one that is -- is the green now visualization A?

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is visualization A. COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. That makes a little more sense, going south. And then going all the way down to Ventura, I also agree, you know, Simi Valley,

Moorpark, want to stay together. In the one, I can't remember which one it was, but your population is a little over. And if you pull Camarillo out, I think your numbers work. And I do not recall which visualization that one was in. Okay. Clearly not that one; yeah. But if you pulled Camarillo and Moorpark out of that, I think the numbers will -- because you were high on that. I think those numbers might come back down. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari. You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. That works better that way. I just want to echo Commissioner Andersen's comments on the East Bay, and on this idea of -- yeah, on starting at Hercules and going south along the Bay. Taking a look at that, I think that better represents folks of common interest.

And if you're -- you know, I do love the SLO-Mateo, love the effort. Awesome. But I would -- if you scroll down, I agree with Commissioner Andersen, if you just put -- keep doing down -- put San Mateo -- or San Benito with Monterey County, and then start breaking up Santa Clara and Santa Cruz County to get the -- to get the population.

So I just to provide some clarity to my colleagues,

I went back and checked this. We only got three comments from Moorpark. And one said, "We'd like to be with Simi Valley." The official city position of Moorpark is, "We want to be with Ventura County." All of -- as near as I can tell, every other comment about Moorpark in Simi Valley came from Simi Valley. And there was a roughly $50 / 50$ split on, you know, staying in Ventura or staying with Santa Clarita.

But you know, while we got a lot of input. I mean, one of the, you know, things that we cited in our document to give favor to is: What is it the people who live in that city want? So I just want to remind everyone of that. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Most of the comments that we've gotten on the Airtable have been covered. Most of it is around the East Bay, and just going more North-South first, and keeping the 680 separate from the other parts. So you know, what Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Andersen said was accurate.

I would say that I liked B better, once you -- you know, part of the Bay Area, and the Central Coast more
than A. Though, I hear what everybody else is saying. So I have no problem. But I do want to make sure that we do keep Concord, Clayton, and Walnut Creek together, because they just all shop, they do all their stuff together. And it is together in this one. And there not -- Concord is not -- Concord, and Clayton, and Walnut Creek -- yeah, in this one they area. And Pleasant Hill, all those areas just kind of -- it's all one really.

But I think this is -- this is a tough area, and you all listened to us, and there's every once in a while, as we said, we just say: Ah, that doesn't work.

And so I want to ask Commissioner Fornaciari, since you like the coastal San Mateo, that was one of your visions at one point. I like it as well. I like that -if I had to live in one of them, that long district looks really nice to me to live in, and visit, and play, and do all that.

But do we still want to keep trying, yeah, splitting San Mateo that way or not? Is it time that we give it up? Because it helps the line drawers when we tell them no on something, so they have more space to move around? Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So you posed the question, Commissioner Sinay.

Do you want to respond to that, Commissioner

Fornaciari? Are you ready to let it go?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah -- no, I think we can
allow that flexibility. I mean, it's hard, especially with these Senate districts. It gets really, really funky. But $I$ mean, I'm fine with that, if it makes things easier, for sure.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Great. Thank you. Okay. It looks like all of the comments for this area. So we can move to the next section.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. Then we will be moving on to Congress. We will be starting with Congressional District A; and Congressional District Visualizations A. And just as in the Senate, we do not have a visualization here which takes into account any VRA possible areas.

So unless Mr. Becker has something he would like to comment on for this area, I will start on the north.

MR. PEREZ: This is Sal Perez, from the VRA Team. I'm pinch-hitting for David for the rest of the afternoon. He's gone for the rest of the evening. I guess --

MR. BECKER: I'm just on right now, just for the very end here. But no, I don't think -- I don't think either of us have anything to add here. It's the same comment before, given the size of the district.

And I will say goodnight to you all. Thanks.

MS. RAMOS ALON: In that case, we will start on page 8 of Congressional District A. This is the Congressional version of the Nor-Cal-Super-District encompassing Del Norte east to Modoc, down to Plumas, including Butte, Glenn, Tehama, Trinity, Humboldt, and Shasta, might as well name Siskiyou and Lassen, since we're here.

And this has a 0.83 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: And Latino CVAP here is 10.50
percent. Black CVAP is 1.58 percent. Asian CVAP is 2.92
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 4.28 percent. And White CVAP is 79.87 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And I apologize. That was page 8. We're now going to page 10. This visualization is called Mendocino-Solano. It starts in the North with Mendocino County, and keeps whole the counties of Mendocino, Lake, Napa, and Solano.

Deviation is negative 1.86 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.23 percent.

Black CVAP is 10.19 percent. Asian CVAP is 11.71
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.78 percent. And White CVAP is 56.27 percent.

And I just want to make sure that everybody has
found these pages.

Okay. Then we'll move on to page 9.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 9 is Sonoma-Marin. And that's
exactly what it is, Sonoma and Marin Counties.

And the deviation is negative 1.59 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.53 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.01 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.25 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.19 percent. And White CVAP is 77.18 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to A-1, page 1. This visualization is called West Contra Costa, and it takes from Contra Costa County, Richmond, El Cerrito, and Kensington, are the West Contra Costa cities which are not incorporated in this visualization. Richmond up to 80 Corridor, to Crockett, and then goes to east to Clyde, and down the 680 Corridor all the way to the county line. Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga are together in this visualization as well.

And the deviation is 2.01 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.21 percent. Black CVAP is 8.22 percent. Asian CVAP is 18.26 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.58 percent. And White CVAP is 56.19 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to $A-1$, page 2. This is East Contra Costa, San Joaquin, and it begins to the west with Bay Point, and Pittsburg, and Clayton, takes in the rest of eastern Contra Costa County, and goes east into San Joaquin County, to Garden Acres, August, and Kennedy,
down to French Camp.
The deviation is negative 1.70 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 30.28 percent.
Black CVAP is 14.04 percent. Asian CVAP is 15.82
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.83 percent. And White CVAP is 37.13 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page A-13. This visualization is called Oakland-El Cerrito. It takes El Cerrito and Kensington from Contra Costa County, comes south through Albany and Berkeley, keeps Oakland whole with Emeryville, and Piedmont, and Alameda, and includes unincorporated areas of Alameda County. There is a block -- a few blocks of San Leandro County, which are also incorporated here -- sorry -- San Leandro City.

And this is a negative 4.99 percent deviation.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 13.58 percent.
Black CVAP is 20.03 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.44
percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.44 percent. White CVAP is 43.53 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page A-1 -- sorry -- to page 4 of A-1. This visualization is called Alameda-Alum Rock. And it starts with San Leandro, Castro Valley, and the Eden area, incorporating all of Hayward, goes east to Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and the Alameda County border; and comes south to take the East Foothills, and

Alum Rock, and Berryessa neighborhoods of San Jose.

The deviation is negative 4.52 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 22.73 percent.

Black CVAP is 7.97 percent. Asian CVAP is 27.29 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.53 percent. And White CVAP is 39.26 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Next, we'll be going to page 1 of A-1, of $A$-- I'm sorry -- A, page 1. This is Union CityCupertino, which begins in the north with Union City, keeps Fremont whole with Newark; comes to take the northern area of San Jose, including Milpitas, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino.

The deviation is 1.96 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 15.31 percent. Black CVAP is 3.81 percent. Asian CVAP is 46.83 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.45 percent. White CVAP is 31.98 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 4 of A. This is East Santa Clara. Starts in the downtown areas of San Jose City, goes all the way east to the county line from Santa Clara County down to the southern county line, including Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy; and stops in the -stops before we hit the Los Gatos, Cambrian Park area, where we still have a little bit of San Jose on the western side over here.

And the deviation is 0.05 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 28.62 percent.

Black CVAP is 3.38 percent. Asian CVAP is 36.92 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.58 percent. White CVAP is 29.24 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 2 of A. This is Silicon Valley. Starts in the southern part of San Mateo County, including Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, West Menlo Park, Ladera, and Portola Valley. Coming east through Palo Alto, Stanford, Mountain View, Los Altos, and Loyola, as well as Los Altos Hills, and Palo Alto, and including Saratoga, Campbell, and Los Gatos North through Burbank; unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County here as well, South Lexington Hills.

And the deviation is negative 2.02 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.92 percent.

Black CVAP is 3.63 percent. Asian CVAP is 23.07 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.45 percent. And White CVAP is 57.67 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're going to $A-1$, page 5. This visualization is called Peninsula. It starts in southern San Francisco City, and incorporates Brisbane, Broadmoor, Colma, Daly City, South San Francisco, and all of North San Mateo County, south to Atherton, Woodside area. And then south, further, to the county line.

The deviation is 4.24 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.25 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.79 percent. Asian CVAP is 34.24 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.36 percent. And White CVAP is 42.31 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to A, page 3. This is San Francisco incorporating most of the city and County of San Francisco to what population would allow; and
removing the neighborhoods of Outer Mission, Excelsior, Vis-Valley, and Crocker Amazon.

The deviation is 1.72 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 10.77 percent.

Black CVAP is 6.14 percent. Asian CVAP is 32.37 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.51 percent. And White CVAP is 49.09 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 5 of A. This visualization is called the Mid-Coast, it take Santa Cruz County, Monterey County, and San Benito County, and keeps them whole together.

The deviation is 1.32 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 32.55 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.63 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.54 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.99 percent. And White CVAP is 56.27 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving on to A, page 6. This
visualization is called South Coast. It keeps San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties whole and together; and takes in the areas of Ventura County, north to the county line; and south to Ojai, Mira Monte, and Oak View. It does not include the Piru, Fillmore Corridor, which goes down to Oxnard. Nor does it include Ventura City.

And this has a 0.34 percent deviation.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 23.96 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.05 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.20 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.08 percent. And White CVAP is 67.07 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Last for this set, we'll move to page 7. Page 7 is East Ventura, and it begins with the City of Ventura, going up through the Santa Paula, Fillmore, Piru corridor, keeping it with the COI of Oxnard Port Hueneme. Also includes Camarillo, Moorpark, and Simi Valley together, and Thousand Oaks, all the way to the county lines, with the exception of Oak Park and Bell Canyon.

Deviation is 4.23 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 33.21 percent.
Black CVAP is 2.39 percent. Asian CVAP is 7.98 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.78 percent. White CVAP is 54.94 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And this concludes the set. We
will be moving on to the B set of Congressional District visualizations.

MS. MAC DONALD: And the $B$ set has only one handout, and there should be fourteen slides in it.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm going to start on page 1 with the North Coast. North Coast contains the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Sonoma -- and Sonoma.

And it has a 0.06 percent deviation. MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 14.06 percent. Black CVAP is 1.61 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.76 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 3.26 percent. And White CVAP is 76.33 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 6. This is Yolo Lake; includes the Counties of Lake and Napa together. Includes all of Solano County, and takes in the Delta areas of Isleton, Walnut Grove, up north through -- into Sacramento County, and into Yolo County, to pick up Davis; so Davis, West Sacramento, Freeport, Clarksburg, Hood, Cortland, and Walnut Grove.

The deviation is 4.95 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 18.54 percent.
Black CVAP is 10.17 percent. Asian CVAP is 13.97 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.25 percent. And White CVAP is 54.20 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 5. This visualization is called North Contra Costa County, and it incorporates all of Western Contra Costa, down to the county line, up through 80, across Highway 4, all the way across to the other side of the county line. And then keeps intact the eastern county line as well, down south to Byron. This does not include Concord, or Walnut Creek.

The deviation is negative 4.14 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 22.88 percent.
Black CVAP is 15.05 percent. Asian CVAP is 15.8 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.84 percent. And White CVAP is 43.36 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We'll move to page 4. This is called Oak-LaMarinda, begins in Albany and Berkeley of Alameda County, keeps Oakland, Emeryville and Piedmont together, with Alameda City, also incorporates Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga, and unincorporated areas of Alameda County.

Deviation is negative 1.34 percent.
MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 13.11 percent. Black CVAP is 18.94 percent. Asian CVAP is 19.66 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.43 percent. White CVAP is 45.96 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving to page 2. This
visualization is Concord-Tracy. Tracy begins in the north with Concord City in Contra Costa County, comes south through the 680 Corridor. Completes the rest of Contra Costa County moving south into Alameda County; takes Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and Sunol from Alameda County, and then moves east to incorporate Mountain House and Tracy from San Joaquin County.

Deviation is negative 2.01 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 13.9 percent. Black CVAP is 3.44 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.42 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.64 percent. And White CVAP is 60.24 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 3. This is a Greater Eden, keeping the Greater Eden area together. San Leandro, Castro Valley, Ashland, San Lorenzo, Cherryland, Fairview, Union City, Hayward, Newark, and Fremont.

And the deviation is negative 1.43 percent

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 21.72 percent.
Black CVAP is 8.76 percent. Asian CVAP is 37.72 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.56 percent. And White CVAP is 28.71 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We're going to go to page 14. This visualization is Cupertino-Berryessa: keeps Sunnyvale, Cupertino and Santa Clara together with the northern areas of San Jose, including the Berryessa neighborhoods,

Alum Rock, and East Foothills, as well as Milpitas.

Deviation is negative 0.24 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 20.59 percent. Black CVAP is 3.49 percent. Asian CVAP is 43.07 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.42 percent. And White CVAP is 31.16 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Go to page 13. This visualization is called Santa Clara; takes the western, southern and eastern borders of Santa Clara County, comes into Downtown San Jose City, takes Burbank and Fruitdale, right up against Cambrian Park and Los Gatos, to include unincorporated areas of County and Lexington Hills.

And this visualization is a 0.55 percent deviation. MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 27.09 percent. Black CVAP is 3.15 percent. Asian CVAP is 29.10 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.62 percent. And White CVAP is 38.89 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 9. This is greater San Mateo. It starts in the north with Pacifica, goes down along the coast to Half Moon Bay, all the way down south to the county line, following the county line for Santa Cruz, incorporating Belmont, San Carlos, down to Woodside, following the freeway to Mountain View, Los Altos, Loyola, and Los Altos Hills. Also included in this visualization are Saratoga, Campbell, Cambrian Park,

Los Gatos, and Monte Sereno.

The deviation is 1.70 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 12.82 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.95 percent. Asian CVAP is 22.41 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.42 percent. And White CVAP is 59.93 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Next is page 8. This visualization is called North San Mateo. And it starts in San Francisco County, comes south to Brisbane, and Daly City, and follows San Bruno, down the freeway, through Millbrae, Burlingame, Hillsborough, down to Highlands and San Mateo.

And the deviation is 1.99 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP here is 15.04 percent. Black CVAP is 4.02 percent. Asian CVAP is 35.79 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.37 percent. And White CVAP is 42.98 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 7. This visualization is called Golden Gate. Takes all of Marin County, and comes south and takes the northern and eastern areas of San Francisco County.

Deviation is 0.64 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 10.9 percent. Black CVAP is 5.29 percent. Asian CVAP is 27.11 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.54 percent. And White is 55.19
percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going to page 12, please. This visualization is Mid Coast: Santa Cruz County, Monterey County, and San Benito County.

Deviation is 1.81 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 32.55 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.36 percent. Asian CVAP is 6.54 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.99 percent. And White CVAP is 56.27 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Page 11 is South Coast, which is San Luis Obispo County, and Santa Barbara County; with a negative 3.91 percent deviation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 24.09 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.13 percent. Asian CVAP is 5.33 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 1.08 percent. And White CVAP is 66.73 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And the last one is page 10. This is Ventura. This takes all of Ventura County with the exception of unincorporated areas, Lake Sherwood, Oak Park, and Bell Canyon -- and what was -- and part of Thousand Oaks.

The deviation is 2.67 percent.

MS. MAC DONALD: Latino CVAP is 34.05 percent.

Black CVAP is 2.37 percent. Asian CVAP is 7.68 percent. Indigenous CVAP is 0.81 percent. And White CVAP is 54.38
percent.

That concludes the set. Would you like us to go over the differences between the plans?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Let me do a time check. We are up on a break that will be coming up at roughly 4:33; so why don't we go on and do the overview, and then we'll take the break, and then take comments.

MS. MAC DONALD: We'll do that. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. While we're south, I'm going to show you the differences between the Ventura areas of A and B; again, $A$ is the green area, and black will be B. So A incorporates the Port Hueneme through Piru Corridor, and all of Eastern Ventura, not including Oak Park, and Bell Canyon; while B includes just -- it takes out part of Thousand Oaks, and the areas that we just described, Lake Sherwood, Bell Canyon, and Oak Park.

Mid Coast and South Coast were the same for both visualizations. So we will start back up north. Much like the Senate we have -- I will remove the labels -much like the Senate, we have the difference between a north-south visualization for the North Coast, and an east-west visualization. In $A$ we have the north -- we have the east-west visualization. And in B, we have the north-south visualization. The north-south visualization creates -- I'm sorry -- the east-west visualization
creates a second area which starts in Mendocino, and takes Lake, Napa, and Solano.

While the north-south takes Lake County, Napa, and Solano, and parts of the Delta area. In visualization A, the visualization goes all the way down south through Marin County, keeping it with Sonoma and the North Coast. In visualization B, Marin crosses the Golden Gate Bridge, and takes parts of San Francisco County.

Moving to the East Bay, on A, we have an eastern visualization which takes part of San Joaquin County, out to stockton and surrounding areas, and keeps it with Central and East Contra Costa County, and then creates a Western Contra Costa County district, which does not cross the Contra Costa border.

And in B, we have a Northern Contra Costa County visualization, which does not include Concord, but keeps all of the cities, north along the 4 and along the 80 together, to the county line.

It then creates Lafayette, Orinda, Moraga area that
is kept with the Oakland, Alameda, and Berkeley area. And a 680 Corridor area, which includes Concord, goes down to Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, and also includes Mountain House and Tracy.

Here, in the Eden and San Jose areas, visualization B, up here, starts taking a greater area of the Eden area
and putting it together with Union City, Hayward, whereas visualization -- oops, I'm sorry; that's visualization B, whereas, visualization A connects this Eden -- part of Eden area with Dublin, Livermore, and Pleasanton.

Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara are kept with Fremont and Union City in visualization A; whereas, in visualization B, Sunnyvale, Cupertino and Santa Clara are kept with Milpitas, and the eastern areas of Berryessa, and other areas of San Jose.

In visualization A, the Golden Gate Bridge is not crossed. And so San Francisco loses a little population to a southern district, and the line here in San Mateo County would be right between Menlo Park and Atherton, coming down to Portola Valley.

Whereas, in visualization $B$, we had the more inland area, those coming down to Highlands, and San Mateo, kept away from the coast, and the coastal area came back in -around Belmont, Redwood City area, and came down to Santa Clara County, into the Cities of Mountain View, Los Altos and Loyola, also taking Saratoga, Campbell, and Los Gatos. And then stops at the county line.

And then lastly, the Santa Clara, we kept the Santa Clara line on both of these. And the difference is where it's split down here in the downtown, in the middle. So visualization B comes right up against Cambria --

Campbell, Cambrian Park, and Los Gatos.
Visualization A takes the downtown, but then leaves part of this unincorporated area separate, going north instead of west. And those were the main differences.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. So I see we have some Commissioners queued up. We're going to take our break, and we will be back at 4:58. And we will begin with Commissioner Fernandez. And Chair Sadhwani will be back at the helm. Enjoy your break.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:35 p.m. until 4:58 p.m.)

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, and welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. As we continue our review of visualizations, currently focused on the Bay Area and Central Coast regions.

We had just finished a review of one area, and I see a lot of Commissioners are ready and prepared to give direction to the Line Drawing Team.

Before we jump into that, I just wanted to give an update. These meetings have taken longer than we had anticipated originally, and for good reason, there's a lot of work to be done here. California is an enormous and complex state, so I'm glad we've been able to have the time to do a thorough review of these visualizations.

As I mentioned this morning, if need be, we would

```
continue this meeting on Friday -- or excuse me -- on
Monday afternoon. I think that that's going to be the
case here. What that will mean is that public comment
will not to be taken today, but instead will be moved to
Monday afternoon. We will be posting a continuation
order at that point in time, when we get to 6:30, which
is a hard stop. I anticipate the time for that meeting
to on Monday to start at 2:00 p.m., to continue this
conversation.
```

With that, let's move back into these directions from Commissioners, and we'll see how far we can get. We do you have a hard stop at 6:30 p.m. tonight.

Commissioner Fernandez, I see you as first on the list.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just quickly, I will be as concise as possible. Overall, I have more likes on visualization B. However, for visualization $A$, the Nor Cal-Super District, and the Mendocino-Solano, I'm not going to repeat comments I've done in the past, well, I'm going to high level it, so I'm not going to get into the all the specifics, but I do prefer keeping the coastal counties together.

And although, however, I do recognize that the Super District does keep the Tribal communities together. So obviously that's something that we have to weigh, moving
forward.

The next one $I$ would like to talk about, Tamina, please, is Congressional District $A-1$, page 1, it's the West Contra Costa. If you can zoom in, I put El Cerrito, so I'm hoping that once I see it, I will know what my comment was. Oh. Because we carved that little piece in there, that's what it was. My comment was going to be: I would like to see El Cerrito, Kensington, and Albany, maybe kept with the district right above it, instead of carving it out. Since they are somewhat connected to the San Pablo, and the other communities. But we'll have to see what the number shows. So that would be my -- I would like to see that visualization.

And then the next one would be Congressional District A, page 7. That's the East Ventura. And if you can zoom into the -- I put Oak Park and Bell Canyon -oh, there we go. Oak Park and Bell Canyon are kind of carved out of that district. So I would like to see if we could somehow keep that together.

And I know I -- I believe I know why you did it. Because in the next one that I'm going to talk about, which is the equivalent, which is 10 , you split out Thousand Oaks and I did not want to split out Thousand Oaks. So that, again, it's going to be something that we have to wait -- yeah, there we go. And I believe you do
that because of members, so.

As we move forward, we will make those decisions. Yeah. But I guess if you ask me, I'd rather split Thousand Oaks than Oak Park and Bell Canyon, because those do appear to be smaller communities. But right now, hopefully we don't get to that point, because $I$ would not want to split up Thousand Oaks.

And then the last one $I$ want to talk about is Congressional District B-6. And that one is the Yolo Lake. If you can zoom into that, that will be great. Thank you. Yeah. And you can zoom in more, but that's okay. And my comments are going to be kind of the same regardless of how much we zoom in or not. But in terms of that whole -- what do you -- call it the Delta, from Freeport all the way to Rio Vista. I would prefer -- I like having it with Solano. I prefer to have that go more towards Yolo County, because you just got a little bit of Yolo County.

And those areas are very agricultural, small towns, and they actually have more in common with other Yolo County, and Solano Counties' ag, small-town feel. And that's it for my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. Yeah. I just
wanted to thank the line drawings for showing us these visualizations they are -- and to helping us explore the possibilities for these districts. It's quite interesting.

And with that, in terms of direction; in terms of the Super Northern Coast district, I'm in favor of keeping the coast together, as is -- as Commissioner Fernandez just mentioned as well. I do think it probably would be appropriate to really focus on the coastal rather than having -- thinking about it as potential to do the larger block, given the community of interest input that we're getting, and also just the possibility that we can do that.

As well as the other -- in terms of the other area, the other side of that is the Golden Gate Bridge; I think what we said, was if VRA required us to move across the Golden Gate Bridge, or we needed population that we would. It doesn't look like the VRA is something that would require us to do -- to move across the Golden Gate Bridge.

And population, I'm looking at the map with -- the Marin-San Francisco map. I just have difficulty in putting a metropolitan area with Marin County. I could see -- and I'm not suggesting we do this -- I can see it with other parts of the Bay, but mot -- I have a hard
time connecting it with Marin County, if we don't have to.

Of course, if there's population requirements, or if there's VRA requirements, then that's something that we would explore. And that's one of the reasons why we did this, was because we didn't know if there were going to be VRA requirements in this area. And so those would be the two main points, I think.

I concur with Commissioner Fernandez about the Yolo County, and the Delta areas, moving those -- the Delta areas a little bit more into Yolo County, potentially, maneuvering some of these other areas so that we can make it all work. Thank you.

But very good visualizations, overall, I really did appreciate exploring all of the possibilities. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you for that. And I would generally agree with your comments there.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to also echo what Commissioner Toledo said. Generally, I think, yeah, I was pretty comfortable with a lot of the visualizations. I do have a few questions.

Specifically, this one is on -- let me just -- okay this is on visualization B, page 8 and 7 , so 7 and 8, they go
together it looks like.

Could you just zoom in on that one area of San Francisco, and I guess I'll first start with the question. And if you zoom in like really tightly into the city, kind of where those two puzzle pieces meet, now can you a little bit more so that we can see the area names, or the regional names in the city there? Thank you. Okay. So I guess, is there a reason why those, like those surrounding areas were chosen?

And specifically, my question is because -- and I guess maybe this is just going to be awkward, and maybe it's just not going to be workable, but you have Chinatown, basically, in the midst of some of the more affluent areas, at least as it pertains to the ones that, you know, perhaps are north of south -- SoMa (ph.), I guess, I'll say, or including Tara Hills. So I guess I'm just kind of trying to understand the choices. Was it to just make it clean? Was it because of population?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, on both. So definitely because of population, and trying to follow the neighborhood lines, and keep the communities of interest together.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Yeah. Okay. I see this now. I think when you first showed it, I thought, hmm, maybe $I$ was just going to ask you if it's possible
to, like, carve into and capture Chinatown, and then maybe -- not that it's super ideal, but maybe move the mission into the other district. But it's not looking like it's going to be doable, cleanly. So unfortunately, maybe I would just leave this one alone. Thank you for clarifying that for me, though. That was helpful.

I do have -- okay, this one I'd like to go to visualization $A-1$, page 5, and this is the San Mateo one, or the Peninsula one, specifically. Okay. I think this is the one. Was there a different one that included the Peninsula, but the cutoff line was below Woodside?

Okay. Yeah. Yes, that one. Sorry. I think maybe then $I$ got the wrong one. But on that particular one, do you see how Woodside is included in this one? I guess I was just thinking that for the numbers, if you were to remove Woodside from this, would they be better off being in the other district? Then, what that would do is it would bring down the standard deviation a little bit, and then it would bring up the other standard deviation for that other district, which I thought was a minus deviation; unless it's going to throw off the numbers a lot because of the populations. I guess that's a question for the line drawers.

MS. RAMOS ALON: It will go above the plus/minus five percent, unless we split the city.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see. Okay. Okay. Because right now you're at, I think, what, at 4.24 percent on this one, or somewhere thereabouts?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry. Let me, let me take a look. I don't have my labels on anymore, but $I$ can get it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Unless I'm looking at the wrong one, I could be -- I mean, I could be looking at the wrong one, too. But $I$ think that's the one -- it should be that one.

MS. MAC DONALD: Would you happen to know what page it's on -- okay, we got it; 4.24 percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Yeah, okay. Okay. So if you moved all of that out, and you moved it into the next visualization, it would just -- it would take it above the five percent; is that correct? Is that what I'm hearing?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, that's correct. COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Okay, then. Thank you for clarifying that. And one last one, and this is, I think on East Ventura; if you could just zoom in on East Ventura. Okay. Okay. Sorry. I thought I had the right one pulled up. I guess, either way. It's okay. Sorry. I'm going to -- I'm going to just stop here. I'll just -- I'll raise my hand again if.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. So I want to look at $B-4$, a chime in for the hometown here. So I was trying to compare B-4 with $A-1-3$, so those are the two visualizations for Oakland. And the difference seems to be in, before you go out to La Miranda, and then in A-13, instead, you picked up El Cerrito. So choosing between those two, I don't think it's hard at all. I think El Cerrito makes much more sense than La Miranda, between the two of those.

And meanwhile, I guess I'm struck by how much population has grown, because these strike me as smaller than I would have imagined, these districts, you know. I know population has grown, but it is striking seeing it here.

Okay. Then I also want to look at A-1-1. And wondering on the 680 Corridor there, does that -- how far that goes down? Does that go down into the Tri-Valley area?

MS. RAMOS ALON: It stops at the county line?
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Let's see. We're looking at it right now. So can you go download -- yeah, because you're already into Alamo, and such. Okay. So you're picking up the top of the Tri-Valley but not -- like one or two of the valleys, but not the third, probably, yeah. So in that case, yeah, I would probably go with the B
version of that as well. Yeah. Yeah. That makes much more sense to me.

Then a question about process; so you know, there're some strong feelings about some of these visualizations. Some are effectively getting X'ed out, I think. But what happens next? I mean, not all -- you know, we're not making a hard choice between options here on all of these. So what happens next?

MS. MAC DONALD: Well, there are ripple effects, you know. So we're going to look at all of the direction that you're providing, and we're going to try to put this together as best as we can, and then bring it back to you, and then, you know, we'll keep working on it until we get it right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Which sounds great; so in your minds are there A and B options still in our future or? MS. MAC DONALD: No. I think what we're trying to do is just come back with one map that we can then work off of. So it's going to be less confusing, for one. COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Yes. MS. MAC DONALD: Because then we can really see the ripple effects through the other regions also, because at some point it just doesn't make sense anymore to be in pieces.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So we really do need to make some
hard choices, even now. Yeah?
MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thank you.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes, thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I, too, want to thank you for this, and all your hard work. Just going back 30,000 feet here, I'm just going to reecho the comments about the East Bay, in the Senate. North-south would be better in the East Bay, starting, you know, Hercules-ish, down, if we can look that way?

And then sort of a question for you: I'm looking at these districts, and it kind of makes me think that part of the driver for the design of some of these districts might have been, you know, a lot of feedback we had on Asian VRA districts; is that part of what drove the design of some of these districts?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Not necessarily. So we took into consideration, of course, Commissioner direction, keeping cities and counties whole to the best extent possible, and then communities of interest.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Okay. Well, there was a lot of communities of interest testimony about keeping specific cities together, and with the thought that there would be an Asian-majority district, two Asian
majority-districts, right? So I mean, now we know that that's -- it doesn't meet the Third Gingles Test. So maybe we can relax those constraints. And that might make things easier if it was a constraint. I'm just throwing it against a wall.

But what I would I'd like you to do, one last thing for me, is if you turn both $A$ and $B$ on, and cruise down to Santa Cruz. Okay. And then just slowly go south. Is there some difference here that I'm not getting? Keep going all the way to where you were going, all the way to Ventura.

Okay. So the only difference is in Ventura -- so no, I mean -- but I don't understand how this works if -what am I missing here? Okay. I'm just going to have to look at it. The only the only difference there is those other two visualizations are the same. So I'll figure it out. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen.
Commissioner Andersen, you're on mute.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually, stay down in Ventura, please. Because I was sort of looking at the same things like: That doesn't really make a lot of sense. And then I recalled, and I'd like to see the visualization. We talked about in LA County, actually, and people from there might really shoot me. But the

Malibu, the Calabasas, doing that little section, and including Simi Valley, Moorpark, Camarillo, that area with the portion of Malibu as a separate district, which would keep the -- you know, the Oxnard, all the way up through Piru, away from the areas that they, you know: Really, please don't put us with those guys. And I was wondering if we could do something like that, which would then give us a bit of a shift in population. I'd like to see something like that down south.

Then, going completely the other way, up north; I totally agree with what Commissioner Toledo said. The only reason we are talking about going across the Golden Gate Bridge is if VRA district sort of required us for that. And they just, yes there's a couple of -- you know, right along the 101 there's, you know, population, but Marin is really -- most of Marin is rural, and it's just not San Francisco. And so I really don't -- I don't see how that makes a lot of sense.

And what I would like to see, I also like the coastal areas together, starting from Del Norte on down. I'd like to put lake in with that. And it's similar to what I've said before. Take Sonoma -- the wine of Sonoma out; put it with Napa.

I agree with Commissioner Fernandez. Yolo and Solano have way more in common. Those are the areas I'd
like to kind of -- in terms of numbers -- put that area together. And then in the East Bay, and I know the numbers are a little different here, but $I$ really don't want to see -- you know, Richmond, which is in West Contra Costa. And it is -- they actually have a complete different school system, because Western Contra Costa, and it has no relationship whatsoever to Eastern Contra Costa.

And Richmond, El Cerritos, Albany, Berkeley, you know, and then North Oakland are, you know, one of the same. They just are one and the same. And I would, again, want to see keeping that, because actually I believe, you know, Oakland where it looks lovely here putting it all together, it's usually -- it's always, it has been cut, just because there's so much of San Leandro, there's so much interface with it.

There's you know, again, public transportation, goes back and forth. So I would really like to see us explore staying on west of the ridge, and then east of the ridge. And I prefer -- well, I prefer parts of both $A$ and $B$ in this. But the Orinda -- you know, the La Miranda area really needs to be with Contra Costa. It just completely does.

So again, that this looks -- parts of this look good and parts that don't, so -- also, I'm sorry. The
unincorporated areas that you have in the screen, that you're showing right here, that is really, has way more in common with Moraga and Danville, than it does with Oakland. Again, it's a completely different -- even fire issues are different. So I think I'm gonna stop there. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I'm going back to the Karuk people in Northern California. I was looking at a map of their lands, and I don't want us to feel like we have to choose, necessarily, between, you know, a strict $A$, or a strict $B$, the bulk of their lands are in Siskiyou County with very small portions in Del Norte and Humboldt. And you know, a tribe is a community of interest, which is on the same level in criterion four, as keeping a county together.

So you know, given that the carve outs would be relatively small, and particularly if the tribe is interested in doing that, I would think that Siskiyou County -- or put it the other way -- the small areas in Del Norte and Humboldt that are part of Karuk lands, could be kept with the rest of their lands in Siskiyou without forcing us into a -- what I consider a false choice between A and B. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Commissioner

Kennedy.
Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you. And if you'd go back to the West Contra Costa maps, A-1, pages 1, 2, and 3 is what I'd like to see. Under the Contra Costa, let me see, when you get it up -- and scroll down so I can see the cities again. I think I wanted to echo the -- where is it? Oh, to the left. Okay. Yep. I definitely want El Cerrito included there. And I would want to have, let's see, that area is over already a little bit, perhaps down on that far south end, we can move those. I think there's been testimony given there.

I just want to include El Cerrito, with that going forth. On page 2 of the $A-1$, that's right next to it. Show me where we are. I'll bring it up. Thank you. Is that it?

MS. MAC DONALD: Is it $A$ or $A-1 ?$
COMMISSIONER TURNER: A-1.
MS. MAC DONALD: Oh, A-1. I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. It's the one that's the East Contra Costa, I think it is.

MS. MAC DONALD: We got it now. Thank you so much. COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh.

MS. MAC DONALD: We were on the wrong handout.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And if you would,
expand just a little bit there. Yeah. Okay. So here, yeah, I didn't -- I don't think I liked this, because this was that east-west thing, right? So let me just say, I think north -- yeah, north-south. I don't like the east-west at all going into San Joaquin County because it actually then pairs all the way from Clayton, Pittsburg, on over to Garden Acres, August, et cetera. So I think just, I'll just say north-south rather than east-west. And I think that was your version B that went north-south. Yeah, that's the one. Okay, so B instead of $A$.

And then on your page 3, here I think, I wanted to be able to add Castro at the bottom of it. At the south -- southern end was Castro Valley. I wanted to see about including Castro Valley and perhaps -- you're already over there -- yeah, I wanted to see what it would look like to include Castro Valley, and perhaps not put Lafayette, Moraga, Orinda, over with Walnut Creek. And include Castro Valley, San Leandro into this visualization. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So starting with the Oakland area. I agree with Commissioner -- with what's been said about not including the Contra Costa portions. I believe

Commissioner Andersen was the person who raised that. And I think also Rita (sic), I believe -- Commissioner Turner -- thank you Commissioner. Commissioner Turner raised that as well. And I completely agree with Commissioners Turner and Andersen on those fronts.

In terms of San Joaquin, I also agree with Commissioner Turner, not including -- going north-south, rather than east-west, and in the next visualizations. And with the Karuk Tribe, trying to keep those -- adding the portions of Humboldt that cover those areas, that Commissioner Kennedy mentioned, both the Humboldt and I believe it's -- I believe it's Humboldt and Del Norte. That is in that area where the Karuk have space to put them into -- or to capture those in the Siskiyou area, rather than in the North Coast area; so essentially to keep the Karuk Tribe whole, if possible, in the next iteration. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa. COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I had a chance to look a little bit more again at the maps, and I think I just want to state that for me, I think in looking at the maps, my preference would be the version A page 3
where -- and I think this has been reflected by some of the other Commissioners, about its combination with Marin. The version $I$ think that's on -- I think it's on
visualization B. Yeah.

The more $I$-- yes, the more I'm just looking at that versus the one on visualization A. I like the one on visualization A. I prefer to see -- and I think based on COI testimony too, I'm just thinking about what we heard. Both for the Marin side, but I think, you know, just thinking about those on the San Francisco side, I think people would be better served to be in separate districts.

I'm also concerned in looking at some of the communities that are included in that visualization $B$, where there's that weird puzzle piece, carved out or knobbed, where half the city goes down, and goes down south in the district, and then the other half of the city goes north up into Marin. And you know, just given how, how diverse the community is, just not -ethnically, but also more importantly, socioeconomically, I think there's a lot of, just diversity in the San Francisco area.

And I think they're better served all being, at least as much as possible, in a single district, and not one that is mixed in with Marin. So I did want to state that.

I also want to just echo what Commissioner Andersen said, and I think that's where I kind of laugh, because
when Commissioner Fornaciari was trying to, I think, hone in on that East Ventura area, I think he and I had the same exact kind of reaction in some ways. But I think it was expressed by Commissioner Andersen about taking portions of, or at least most, if not all of Simi Valley in Thousand Oaks, and putting it with the LA County cities that -- including like Malibu and some of those cities, Calabasas, I think, and things like that.

Because hearing the $C O I$ testimony from those areas, it did sound like, you know, they would not necessarily be a -- you know, a real equitable match. My only concern about this, and this is where I would ask the line drawers, I think as -- and I know that there is going to be ripple effects on this, is would that then create a need to, instead, go -- instead of north, you know -- $I$ don't even think you could go east, it doesn't seem like, you know, going east is an option. And if you go north, then you're going to capture some of the other areas. Okay. Anyways, I just wanted to state that. Thank you very much for listening.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Any questions from line drawers on that direction?

MS. MAC DONALD: No. Thank you for the direction. CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Commissioner Sinay. COMMISSIONER SINAY: Almost everybody covered what
the comments have been that have come in. Can we stay in Ventura for just one second, and then I'm going to make you go all the way to San Francisco. So I do want to acknowledge that the comments that have come in have covered, except for a few. People have been very, very vocal about not doing Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, and Malibu, like we kind of had that one visualization. And then we said, okay, let's just do Malibu with Santa Monica.

And so I want to acknowledge that Simi Valley and Thousand -- when the first set of COIs we got, most people said: If you're going to split Ventura County to do it east-west, not north-south, meaning the coast -you know, the coastal versus the inland. So just to kind of go back to some of those communities of interest testimony we got here.

And definitely keeping -- I appreciate what was done by keeping Piru, Santa Paula, Fillmore, all of that, because we got a lot of input on that area as well. And some groups had said: If you need to -- you know, if we split it north-south, meaning kind of Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Santa Rosa Valley to -- you know, I don't remember exactly how they had said it, you know, I'm unclear with that.

But some of the committees of interest had said, you
know: If you take Santa Paula and stuff, and if you need more to go up to Ojai, and in that area. Others said not to. So we may just need to review that a little bit more.

Heading up to San Francisco, I just wanted to see if we can look at that. The one cut out -- the one that keeps San Francisco whole, except for that one little cut out. And again, when $I$ first saw it, I kind of thought: Those are not the groups that -- those are not the neighborhoods that $I$ would want to cut out of San Francisco, because when you look at them compared to San Mateo, they're so different, Visitacion Valley, the Mission.

I would actually go to the east -- no, that's the west. Yeah. Lakeshore and Daly City have kind of more in common because that's where Cal State -- you know, San Francisco is, San Francisco State Fair, and a lot of the students from San Francisco State now are living in Daly City. And you drive easily between the two, and stuff, versus Excelsior or Visitacion Valley.

All that area, and then Brisbane, it's just more choppy; so I would like to see those neighborhoods stay with San Francisco and maybe Lake Shore and Ocean View. I don't know. I mean, I think we need to really get some input from the communities -- and no one is going to want
to leave San Francisco. So it's going to be a tough one. But just thinking through where the demographics are more aligned, and where people's voices are going to be heard better.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I'll jump in here, myself, on one small piece. And I'm going to go back to the Ventura County visualization we were just looking at there, please. Sorry, to make y'all jump around. But thank you, Tamina. Let's see. I think about this area a little bit differently, because we received strong testimony throughout the summer from folks, from Port Hueneme to Piru. I haven't had the chance to go back and really look at all of that testimony, but I will between now and our next stage.

What I recall from that testimony is that it was an economic divide that they felt was the concern that in this area, they're lower-income areas, they are areas of farmworkers, and other essential workers, and they didn't want to be drowned out in other areas.

I understand that we're hearing very loudly from the folks in Simi Valley right now. And I think let's explore what the possibilities are. I don't love pairing the Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks with Malibu. But at the same time, you know, the population is what it is. There are constraints there. You know, there are
crossovers in either direction. And so I wouldn't want to switch to the north-south configuration that was mentioned.

I think that that would cut up those communities of interest from those working-class neighborhoods. And you know, certainly, economic ties also tied together communities of interest. And I would just really want to uplift that testimony from the summer, even if it's not quite as loud right now. Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I wanted to go back to the Solano, Napa, Lake, district, and just, in terms of hearing, I was looking at some of the feedback we've been getting, and one resonated with me, and that's the feedback from American Canyon, I believe, Napa County as well. Just highlighting the importance of the 37 , the

37 connects Solano County, Napa County, Sonoma, and Marin, actually. And it's an important transportation corridor for the area, connecting the Sonoma Raceway with the rest of that area, but also just connecting -- it's another way to get to Marin and Sonoma from the other portions of the area -- from Wine Country essentially.

So I would -- I'd be in favor of certainly maintaining Solano, Napa, but adding portions of Sonoma that are there, especially because of the need to
advocate for upgrading of that -- all of these communities are working towards connecting this -- with the smart train, and expanding that into this area, but also the roadway, the 37, which would -- essentially run around there.

But also, potentially -- and connecting Yolo -- a little bit more of Yolo County, if it's possible, because that would be the community of interest there. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay. COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. Just two things, I was actually agreeing completely with what you were saying, Chair, that maybe I didn't explain myself well, but I was saying keep the communities of interest, what we heard in the summer around the river, as well as listening to the other communities of interest that we're getting now, the input we're getting now. And maybe it's a diagonal line in Ventura.

The way they had defined it was the coast versus inland. And that's why $I$ was saying kind of looking at it separately. But if you look at the river it's -well, that gets confusing. So it's kind of a diagonal line from -- you know, from that corner up by Piru -- I always want to say [Pe-ru] -- Piru, kind of -- you know, kind of down I'm not -- you know, over Moorpark, under

Carillo (ph.), is kind of what they had described.
But again, $I$ don't know -- no, under Carillo. So it would it would be number -- you know, it's figuring out the numbers, but that was kind of how they did -- how some of the community -- so I agree with what you're saying, Commissions Sadhwani, so I didn't want it to confuse the line drawers, that we're both saying the same thing. I also -- completely forgot what I was going to say -- so I'm done.

CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. It's been a long three days.

Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess I wanted to -- maybe this is just a general comment that applies to how we look at the far north and the conversations. You know, I'm hearing some of the conversations supporting the district that is coastal, earlier in the day there was conversations that, I guess, encouraging us to think about keeping one of the Native American Tribes that have lands throughout Humboldt, Del Norte, and Siskiyou Counties as that -- as a community of interest, they have a particular interest in.

I was just taking a quick glance at some of the current public inputs that have come in, and I believe folks in Humboldt County are listening because there is
quite a bit now that has been posted to the current website. And very much stating that they feel that they are -- you know, the coastal communities are very different from the more inland communities that are inclusive of Siskiyou, and Shasta, and others.

And so I think -- I guess, perhaps just maybe more of a -- I guess, you know, these are the hard choices that I know, you know, we're going to need to make. I think the dilemma also, too, is that if we do one for -you know, for, let's say, for example, Congressional district, you know, should we also be doing the same for both in Assembly and Senate districts as well, too? And I think this is really more a question to be, not so much as direction for the line drawers, but I do want to ask this of my fellow Commissioners, and also perhaps encouraging the public who are listening to call in and give us your input on what you want to see. Not just saying, you know: Don't change our district. Or you know: Keep Humboldt separate.

But you know, some of the considerations that we've been talking about. It would be really interesting and helpful to hear, you know, community input on this as well, too. But for our Commissioners, I think these are going to be some of those hard choices that we're going to eventually have to make. And I'm realizing, you know,
in just these conversations that have taken place today that we're just at the beginning of it. I knew it was coming. But we're now starting. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I do want those folks who said: Hey, let's mix it up a little. Or I do feel we will be heard more if we go north -- I mean, go east-west $u$ in the northern area; that we also read your comments as well. They might be -- they might be less than the others. But I do want to acknowledge that we did get both.

Have we made that hard choice between -- oh, I feel like I keep reading, West Sacramento wants to be with Sacramento, and that would kind of loosen up Yolo a little bit, along the lines of what you were saying. But earlier I said: Oh. I heard someone say, we'll just figure it out later. But I just feel like that -- that that has been something we've heard constantly, and that can actually help the line drawers in their thinking about Yolo and Sacramento. So I wanted to put, yeah. You know as we said, it's time, you know, let's make some of the hard decisions so that we give the line drawers some good guidance, so --

And I'm getting thumbs-up from the line drawers. So

I heard -- you know, is anyone opposed to that? I don't know how we do this part, if we like, do thumbs-up, thumbs-down, whatever. But I just wanted to put out there, West Sacramento with Sacramento.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thumbs up.
CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So Commissioner Sinay, to your point, I think it's certainly possible to still do iterations at this point. I do think when we get to those hard choices you're talking about, we move from option A, option B, option C, to a more definitive answer. And that's a little bit of a different process than what we're doing now. Just to clarify that.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So I think what Anthony is suggesting is, if you want to see West Sacramento with Sacramento, just provide that direction to the line drawers, and --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we please see West Sacramento and Sacramento. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa, were you waiting to get back in the line?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: (No verbal response).
CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Any final conversations on these Congressional visualizations? All right, team, that's exciting. I think we're done. Are we done, or is
there another section to do? I missed part of this, this afternoon, so please inform me.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I believe we're done.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Excellent. So it is 5:30. We have the go ahead to go until 6:30. I do know that some Commissioners need to take off. So before we go to the readout from staff, I wanted to say thank you to our Staff for this amazing week. Many of us had the opportunity to meet in Los Angeles, LA Trade Tech, so big thank yous to all of the Staff who played an enormous role in putting this together. It is no small feat to try and get people together, particularly in COVID, with the various restrictions that we're operating under, and safety precautions that we're taking.

So big thanks to all. Thank you. Big thanks to Kristian for flying with -- or driving with all of the equipment, and set up; to ASL for their willingness to go late as well.

At this time, we will move to a review of the notes in that process. Staff will be reading back the notes that were captured, in terms of the direction that was given to line drawers over the last three regions, including Southern California, Central Valley, Northern California, Bay Area, and Coastal California. We already read out the directions for Los Angeles.

We'll see how far we get over the next hour. There's a lot of directions, so it might take the entirety of that hour, and therefore, we will be issuing a continuance order for this meeting to meet on Monday, beginning at 2:00 p.m.

And public comment will be taken at that time. My sincere apologies; I see that there are a lot of folks in the comment queue already, having called in with their hands raised, and unfortunately we won't be able to get to today. Hold those comments. You are welcome to submit them on our online form, and we absolutely welcome you back on Monday afternoon to provide those as well.

You can also at any point in time send us an email to the Voters FIRST Act email, which is available on our website.

And with that, $I$ believe Kimberly is available to begin the reading of the notes. Kimberly. And if Kimberly is not ready --

MS. BRIGGS: We're right here. I'm right here.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh, perfect. Okay, great. Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: And $I$ do have a quick request, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes.

MR. MANOFF: From the Interpretation Team, if we could please go at a reasonable, steady pace, as all of
this is being interpreted. Thank you so much.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you for that reminder. You know, I also forgot to thank our -- both our Line Drawing Team, and our Legal Team, who have had the enormous task of putting together this entire week, all of these visualizations, providing legal guidance on, particularly, the VRA districts, but also other issue areas. So I wanted to offer a humungous thanks to all of you. Particularly the Line Drawing Team who traveled to join us in Los Angeles, in person.

And with that, Kimberly, it's over to you.

MS. BRIGGS: Okay. These are the notes from Zones I, J, and K. I'm going to start with Assembly feedback; I, J, and K.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioner Sadhwani, we haven't done a readout for $I, J$, and $K$ yet. Did you want to start there? Or did you want to start with A, C, E from today?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Whatever you guys are ready -- are prepared to do first, I think it's fine. I think if we could do the $A, C, E$ that we just did it, it'll be fresh in everyone's mind. But whatever you have up and ready to go is fine.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think Staff is going to need to clean some of those up a little bit from 5:00
p.m., on so --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Let's go with the I, J, K, yeah. Start with I, J, K. That's fine.

MS. BRIGGS: Starting with Zones I, J, K, Assembly feedback. Commissioner Fernandez: ADA, pages 10 and 12. There's a high percentage of Asians and Latinos in both of those districts, so I would really like to have a closer look at that for possible coalition for VRA.

Commissioner Fernandez speaking on ADB, page 12: Same comment in terms, it is a high -- very high Asian population, but it's also a high Latino population. So look if there is a coalition there.

Commissioner Fernandez added on ADB, page 1. That one's a high Asian, high Latino population, so maybe there's a coalition there.

Commissioner Fernandez added for ADB, page 8: this is the third one to be considered for coalition.

Commissioner Sinay spoke: A is better, especially for San Diego, than B. What I liked out of B was that the tribal lands connected with Imperial and Coachella Valley, whatever we can do to keep the tribal lands together in a district where they will be heard. But on the whole, I liked A more.

Commissioner Akutagawa stated: There were some conflicting definitions for where exactly Little Saigon
was, but this particular division was based on some community of interest input. Also happen to overlap with where the census bloc groups are, so it might be someone selecting their community based on census bloc groups.

Commissioner Akutagawa added: For example, it would be the western edge of the county looking at potentially a city like Cerritos in Artesia, that the possibility may be better to align them with some of the Orange County cities like La Palma, Cypress, Buena Park, Fullerton, La Mirada, maybe looking at some adjustments there.

Moving from Cerritos, Buena Park, Fullerton, up into the areas of Brea, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights: We got a lot of committee of interest input asking to combine or bring together Brea, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, La Habra Heights, and Hacienda Heights together in a district, also.

Some of the visualizations, the intent was to try to preserve or avoid crossing too many county lines. I saw there are a couple of visualizations where Brea, Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Anaheim, and I think Orange, were also kept in one district. I'm assuming because to try to preserve keeping them and at least the Orange County area, and then pulling from Chino Hills.

I would like to see if we could cross over into LA County, and pulling some of the Orange County Cities of

Brea, La Habra, and Fullerton in with some of the Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar, as we had gotten committees of interest testimony. Don't know if there was any VRA analysis around that combination of the LA and Orange Counties, possibly even going into Chino Hills; any kind of analysis around those particular communities.

Last, I want to ask if you can go down to the coast. It looks like Laguna Beach is one, and Luna Niguel and Aliso Viejo are separate. I would be curious on any visualization.

Commissioner Vazquez, speaking on Victor Valley and Fontana: Doesn't make sense. It's the same thing that I was trying to avoid in the Antelope Valley of grabbing a community that $I$ don't think has a lot in common with Victor Valley. Look toward Apple Valley and see if we can maintain the integrity of some of the voting rights considerations without including any of Fontana.

Commissioner Kennedy said he echoes Commissioner Vazquez. Victor Valley needs to be kept whole.

Splitting Apple Valley off doesn't make any sense. I don't see either option as being workable for the Coachella Valley. I suggested a visualization with Inyo and Coachella linked with Imperial County, and Far Eastern San Bernardino County along the river. But both

A line -- but both the $A$ line and the $B$ line in the Coachella Valley are problematic.

Commissioner Sinay said: Keep Oceanside, Bonsall, and Fallbrook with Vista. North County, San Diego, really does feel connected to Camp Pendleton and provides services. I'm concerned about what would be the ripple effect. Remove Vista and include Fallbrook could be another option, because Escondido does a lot together.

Commissioner Akutagawa stated: Clear community of interest testimony asked that South Orange County, of any kind of district, stops at San Clemente. The one I've been thinking about, Yorba Linda and Placentia, removing them from the visualizations that would include Brea, and Fullerton, and what to do with them; and Anaheim Hills.

For example, if you were to remove and make the cutoff at between Laguna Beach and Dana Point, you'd probably have to pick up extra population somewhere else. If you were to place Rancho Mission Viejo in lieu of Laguna Beach because of its proximity to the Marine Corps Base, I don't know if that would make more sense. As I look at Laguna Beach included in there, the more I think about it, it doesn't make sense.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on Assembly District A-1, page 9: Odd combination because you have Coastal Laguna Niguel, and also Aliso Viejo, and Laguna Woods all
go together with Laguna Niguel, not having a lot in common with North Tustin. I don't know if Villa Park is included in that, it looks like parts of Irvine, the more single-family home portions of Irvine, even though they would share some things in common in terms of more single-family homes, from Laguna Woods on down, there's more of a beach focus. Don't know if they would see themselves having a lot in common with the more inland Irvine, Tustin, and North Tustin communities.

Commissioner Akutagawa added: It would be better to go North Tustin, northern part of Irvine that's above the 405. Go to Lake Forest, and then go into, if you had to, that's what $I$ would recommend. Look at Orange, and Placentia, Yorba Linda, and Villa Park, instead of going too much further south.

Commissioner Akutagawa added for visualization B, page 10: This is the North Orange County Coast; that is basically the Long Beach Harbor area. It's around where Nepal is and the Long Beach Harbor, all the way down to Newport Beach. I'm pretty sure we're going to get some comments around that.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on the districts of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside border: Another way to create a potential district is to include Norco, Corona, and Coronita, with the Cleveland National

Forest District. And depending on how far down you have to dip, include Silverado, and Modjeska (sic) -- I'm sure of if that's the correct word -- Modesto -- it would be part of Inland South County, and maybe combining with Norco and Coronita, and some of the cities that fall in between.

Commissioner Andersen stated: Want to uplift what Commissioner Fernandez said earlier. It's that Little Saigon area. It's in the $B$ visualizations on $B-12$; it sort of bleeds into Cyprus to Placentia, which is the $B-1$ packet.

Commissioner Andersen added: And that area, we're looking at large Asian populations. It appears they're broken up. Can we look in that area to see if there is an Asian VRA, and/or a coalition VRA in that area? Three areas are cut.

Commissioner Andersen added: Don't know if Commissioner Kennedy already spoke about that one tribal area that was cut east of Anza. I don't want to see any tribal areas broken up. In that area, I would like to include that large tribal area if possible.

Commissioner Andersen added: Ontario is cut up. I like that Fontana, San Bernardino forest area, because these are the areas that said: We really want to be in with the San Bernardino National Forest. Don't want to
have us ignore who's actually taking care of the forests. This is across the county line into Claremont to get that, because that was also an area along, going west from San Antonio Heights. Add more population that way, because all those areas were interested in maintaining forests. I would like to keep that together, instead of going down into Ontario.

Commissioner Andersen added for visualization B, B1, page 7: New visualization of Moreno, Perris, Hemet, include East Hemet.

Commissioner Andersen added: We're always cutting at a freeway line, and that's what makes perfect sense if it's residential, it does not make sense when it's commercial because a lot of the cities and areas around the freeway work with the freeway. There's storage yards under the freeway, and the industrial areas, I don't want to divide up businesses in those areas. Access to and from the freeway is an important concern for them, so if we could -- I know we've been kind of cutting up the freeway in a lot of areas that does not make sense. Please have a look at that.

Commissioner Kennedy stated: Norco would be fine with the Cleveland National Forest if it weren't for Corona in between them. Norco and Corona are very different. Norco would probably identify more with

Eastvale and Jurupa Valley than with Corona. Putting Norco with Corona is probably not the best approach at this point. We can certainly listen to public comment, but that's my initial reaction to that.

Original quest was Indio, Coachella, Thermal, Mecca, Oasis, with Imperial County, et cetera. Having both of those lines, I think would need to move east at least to between Indio Hills and Sky Valley. Having La Quinta with Indian Wells, Vista, Santa Rosa can be with Indio, Coachella, Thermal, Oasis, Desert Palms, and then Bermuda Dunes. I would keep those to the left and have the line come down between those, and Indio follow the Indio line.

Commissioner Sadhwani speaking on the City of Anaheim: Across the two different proposals in one, I believe, the blue one, it looks like the City of Anaheim is split about four times. I recall it was a City Councilmember from the City of Anaheim calling in saying they wanted to be split. I'm noticing the city is getting split up a lot. I recall testimony over the summer that was very detailed at the street level in the City of Anaheim.

Moving forward, I'd go back to COI testimony and make sure we're taking it into consideration, even as we think about the VRA district that's being drawn here in the center part of Santa Ana and Anaheim. I remember
some coming from the coalition that had formed down in that area, talking specifically about the Latino community. I want to make sure we're being responsive to that testimony. I don't think that portion of Orange County, LA border, necessarily needs to be maintained, if there's a reason to cut across it, then it should make sense to do so.

Commissioner Kennedy speaking on the City of Grand Terrace: Grand Terrace is surrounded on three sides by Colton. Looking to see if there's a way we can cross the county line there and include Grand Terrace with Highgrove, Jurupa Valley, or alternatively, if there's a way you can come through Riverside County, north of Moreno Valley, and link Grand Terrace with Redlands or Loma Linda.

Commissioner Andersen discussing the Coachella area where Commissioner Kennedy was: He moved the line there further east and consequently lost population from that. The Southeast California area, where we lose population if we shifted over to La Quinta, wondering if we can grab more of the tribal areas going north, dragging that line a little further up through the Idyllwild-Pine Grove, wondering if we can grab some of that tribal population through that area.

Commissioner Kennedy said: In response to

Commissioner Andersen, the Coachella Valley has an active council of governments that knits the valley closely together. Whitewater is a potential dividing line where you enter the Coachella Valley, the tribal lines -excuse me -- the tribal lands to the west of that Morongo Reservation, we have received concerns from the Chairman of the Band that they were split between two Senate districts last time around, and don't want to be split. Definitely want to be careful of that.

Idyllwild was one of those areas where looking at a flat map isn't helpful. This is where we need the terrain layer turned on. You really can't get from Palm Springs to Idyllwild easily. We need to look at how far off, moving the dividing line in the Coachella Valley, puts our numbers before we start looking at how to make up that population.

Moving to Senate feedback; Commissioner Fernandez, for a possible coalition VRA district for a Senate District A, page 8: Santa Ana and Anaheim; and for Senate District B version, page 8, North OC.

Commissioner Sinay stated: Version A is better.
Commissioner Kennedy, for page 1, $A-1: ~ I f ~ w e ~ c o u l d ~$ include the entire Colorado River Valley in California on the Morongo Coachella visualization in A, it's going to be problematic to separate San Jacinto and Hemet.

Commissioner Kennedy discussing San Diego City: It might be better having MCAS (ph.), Miramar all in one district, or the other. Defer to Commissioner Sinay, but

I believe I've driven through there and it's on both sides of the highway. It would make sense to put it on one side or the other, rather than splitting it.

Commissioner Kennedy discussing Eastern San Diego County: He believes that topography and other features would be a strong argument against including Temecula in that district. Really struggling with Corona, Murrieta, and Beaumont districts in visualization B, I have to think more about that and what could be done. Speaking on the high desert; really need to see if there's a way to keep the Victor Valley whole on those last two in B.

Commissioner Sinay said: It makes sense to put Miramar in one, right by Miramar is also the state park, so that's open space. Sometimes we forget that it's going along the 52 you've got a lot of open space there. I would also go along with what Commissioner Kennedy said and look at where the population is needed.

Commissioner Andersen stated: I prefer A. I like keeping the Salton Sea all together and in B it is split. When you go to the eastern portion, I prefer B, particularly Pomona, Ontario, Fontana, and Rialto. It makes a lot of sense where -- to keep cities whole. But
then on A -- essentially B, I like on the west; And A, I like on the east.

Commissioner Andersen discussing visualization 4-A: The entire Temecula Valley put with Camp Pendleton, I don't see that one at all, they are two different counties. There's a whole mountain range in between, and all the communities of interest that we did hear from Temecula, Murrieta, and Wildomar, have a lot of common shopping and everything. It might go down to Rainbow, but it doesn't go all the way around. It has nothing to do with the coastal. I'd like to combine part of the $A$ and B areas, the way you've modified that, keeping parts of the eastern, and then the two different plans. Splitting, mixing, and matching them in the middle from east to west.

Commissioner Kennedy added: To resolve the issue of Miramar, looking at satellite mapping, it looks like the runway's main facilities are on the west side of the 15 Freeway. It would make the most sense to include it on the district on the west side.

Commissioner Sinay, discussing visualization 10-A: Feels like if we didn't do 10-A, that might open us up to do other things.

Commissioner Sinay discussing Anaheim Hills, and Anaheim Valley: They have been asking to be connected
with Santa Ana. And in this one, it does do that. Wanted to bring that up, these communities keep asking for those to be together.

Commissioner Akutagawa stated: For South Orange County and the Riverside County combo, direction on this would be to separate Orange County and Riverside in this particular case.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on visualization A, page 9: Northeast OC, and the other visualization B, North C. I like this one over another one on B. It's the one that says North OC. I like that this other one -- better than the other one. One of the concerns I have is that it does include the entirety of Anaheim. We got very distinct and quite vocal COI testimony, that the east side and the west sides, particularly those parts that go into Anaheim Hills, are very different, desire to have separate districts for each of them.

Commissioner Akutagawa, speaking on visualization B, page 9: The comment $I$ have is to include Santa Ana in this particular visualization. She asked: What would it do if you removed Santa Ana, and you picked up another city to the south, whether it's Laguna Woods, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, and/or Laguna Beach? What might that possibly look like?

Maybe, instead of going towards the coast, maybe
it's one of the cities next to Viejo, like Ladera Ranch, or Coto de Caza. I don't know how far you have to go down, but maybe another inland city to perhaps create something. I'm concerned that part of Santa Ana is very different from the entirety of the rest of that visualization.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on the full Orange Coast visualization: Kind of torn because $I$ think sizewise, this works. Some people would say there's a very distinct North OC Coast community style and vibe, and a very distinct South Orange County Coast style and vibe. I also want to respect that we heard quite a bit of testimony asking for a full coast visualization, and COI consideration.

Commissioner Akutagawa added: For the North OC Coast visualization, instead of Buena Park, would it adversely affect the other visualizations if you were to include just that portion of Irvine that is south of the 405 , and that's next to Newport Beach; because they have a lot more similarities with the other cities that are grouped right now?

Commissioner Akutagawa added: For the Inland visualization, I like Rancho Santa Margarita, Ladera Ranch, Or Coto de Caza for consideration instead of Santa Ana.

Moving to Congressional feedback; Commissioner Sinay stated: Neither A nor B excited me; For A-1 through 12, moving to $B-1$ through 11, make sure we confirm the Latino population. For the visualization B-8, wondering if we moved to the west a little bit, that would strengthen the VRA analysis. For visualization B-4, there's very little in common with Rancho Santa Fe and Ramona. We need to think this one through a little more.

Commissioner Fornaciari speaking on Orange County and Cleveland Forest: There is a big giant mountain range here. No roads to go across it. Don't want to cross that mountain range. It would be more effective to show us the deviation and number of people rather than percent.

For Commissioner Kennedy: Going back to the Orange County district, where Commissioner Sinay highlighted, the split of Garden Grove. On the north side of the coast, by the time you get to Buena Park, it's hardly coastal, wondering if Garden Grove could be pulled together with Westminster, into Mountain Grove District. And then shift Buena Park perhaps into Santa Ana and Anaheim, along with whatever part of Fullerton might be required.

Commissioner Toledo spoke in support of the $B$ set of maps. Thought they were a good foundation. Refinement
is what we will be doing for the next couple of sessions. They seem to capture the community of interest quite well. Make sure we are not diluting any of the potential

VRA district. And make them stronger, but not weakening them any more as we look through to refine these.

Commissioner Fernandez stated: For a potential coalition VRA district would be -- the Congressional visualization A on page 9, the Northeast OC, and then the Congressional District Visualization A-1 on page 9, for Garden Grove, Santa Anna.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on the full coastal map: If there is a way to incorporate Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Aliso, that would be ideal. But I think it will take us outside of the deviation that we would need for the Congressional district. And be able to retain a full coastal district.

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on visualization A1, page 11: It would be better to shift Costa Mesa and Newport Beach. And this is one of those that I think it's a little bit of an odd pairing and that $I$ think the visualization that you have does include Costa Mesa, and Newport Beach might be a more appropriate one.

Commissioner Akutagawa, speaking on the visualization of Irvine, Tustin, and Santa Ana: I don't believe Laguna Woods and that little portion of Laguna

Hills should be there. They are very different.
Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on Cleveland Forest North: It goes from La Habra, Brea, and all the way into March Air Force Base. Would highly recommend not putting those together, they are very different communities.

So that concluded the Zones I, J, and K. I'm going to go into B, D, F, G.

CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds good. Why don't we at least get started with it, with the remaining twelve minutes, or however long it is that we have; and we will have to stop at 6:30. But thank you so much, Kimberly. I hope you're doing okay.

MR. MANOFF: And thank you for that excellent pace. The Interpreters thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thanks, Kimberly. You can continue on.

MS. BRIGGS: Okay. I didn't take these notes myself, so I will try to read them as clear as I can.

CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. We understand. I think it's just a process piece of ensuring that it's being read into the record.

MS. BRIGGS: Okay. Again, this is feedback on Central California visualizations, starting with Assembly districts; these are four Zones B, D, F, and G.

Starting with page 1, handout B, West Bakersfield:

Commissioner Turner; likes visualization A of Bakersfield and Tehachapi.

Commissioner Turner speaking on visualization B:

Keep southeast Bakersfield as you -- in that area with Benton, Cottonwood, and La Cresta, keep them together.

Commissioner Turner, speaking on visualization B: Likes to keep Fresno whole.

Commissioner Turner speaking on another visualization: She prefers Stanislaus, with Lodi, Linden, Lockeford, Oakdale, and Knights Ferry.

Commissioner Turner, speaking on a visualization that included Mountain Town House (sic), and Tracy up through: Asking if it kept Stockton whole.

Commissioner Turner speaking on a visualization that goes around Lathrop, and Manteca, and keeps Tracy with Stockton; adding: Keep Stockton together.

Commissioner Turner, speaking on visualization B: Keeping the Lemon Hill, Fruitridge Pocket with Elk Grove and Florin.

Commissioner Vazquez speaking on visualization B: Keep Three Rivers and Visalia together.

Commissioner Vazquez speaking on Mexican Colony: Shafter, all those communities together.

Commissioner Kennedy likes the visual visualization that keeps Sonoma, Lake, and Mendocino together.

Commissioner Sinay likes the visualization that keeps Lake, Napa, and Sonoma together.

Commissioner Sinay, speaking on visualization B-1, 51, likes the one that keeps Sacramento City and West Sacramento together.

Commissioner Fornaciari speaking on the visualization that keeps Tulare, Fresno, and Kings together; he added: Keep small communities together.

Commissioner Fornaciari stated: Consider a visualization that keeps the coast with other coast communities, and not with the inland part of the North State.

Commissioner Akutagawa asked: Consider a visualization where Humboldt not to be together with the north, consider eastern portions like, Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, and Modoc. It seemed like they wanted to be on the coast. Also consider Trinity.

Commissioner Akutagawa, referring to page 9: If you look at page 8 on that same PDF, this is the one that has El Dorado, Placer, Inyo, parts of Madera, and parts of Fresno. Is there a way to make it so that deviation, which is minus 7.56, to be about five percent?

Commissioner Akutagawa speaking on the visualization on A-1, page 6: It's the same area, which is the Far Eastern counties, this one includes [Too-lo-me] -- I
apologize on the pronunciation.
CHAIR SADHWANI: I believe it's [Tu-o-lu-mne].
MS. BRIGGS: Tuolumne, okay.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Someone can correct me, if I got it wrong.

MS. BRIGGS: This one includes Tuolumne and Inyo, and this area looks like a tail portion of Kern County, which portion of Kern County is that? It is a little odd.

Commissioner Akutagawa asked: To please remove Bakersfield. Remove all of the urban areas, and try to keep it as close to the mountains and to the east as possible.

Commissioner Toledo, speaking on the visualization on A-1: Lake may be better suited with Mendocino and Sonoma rather than with Napa.

Commissioner Toledo added: For the northern part of the state, asking for visualization with Humboldt, Del Norte, and Trinity. I can see Trinity being part of the North State potentially, and I think we got conflicting community of interest input for Humboldt and Del Norte.

Commissioner Andersen speaking on the visualization B, page 9: It is the Northeast. In that area what I would like to do is add Butte County, and take out Sierra and Nevada.

Commissioner Andersen added: Moving to page 8, I would like to add Sierra Nevada to this page.

Commissioner Andersen asked: Can you get rid of Fresno, and just stay with the northern part, the hill part in Madera if we have to; and if we need to go further south, from Inyo into Bakersfield?

Commissioner Andersen added: Take Glenn and Butte, take Glenn, and Butte, and Plumas, and put those in the north. Then we have Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, and Yolo, put those together.

Commissioner Sinay stated: Consider keeping the far north together, for forest management purposes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I just clarify there? It was, we were considering, I wasn't necessarily giving the line drawers. That was the reason why we had the far north. Does that make sense -- I just want to make sure that people know that we're actually listening to you. She didn't smile.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that clarification, Commissioner Sinay.

And Kimberly, we are up against our 6:30 deadline. So I think if there's maybe like one more sentence, or something, that needs to be finished off, we have about two minutes left.

MS. BRIGGS: The next section goes into the next day
of the report, so.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. So this might be a good place to kind of leap off then, and might make a whole lot of sense. Okay, perfect, Kimberly, thank you. Because you've just been reading aloud for the better part of an hour, so $I$ really appreciate that.

There will be more to come on Monday afternoon. We will come back at 2:00 p.m. and finish this reading of all of these notes. Followed by agenda item number 3, which is public comment.

So again, my sincerest apologies to the public that we weren't able to finish in the time we had anticipated, but I think it was a really fruitful conversation, and certainly a necessary one to provide a thorough review.

We look forward to that public comment. So please feel free. So if you don't want to forget your comments, I see a lot of folks still in the call-in queue, send it to us now. You send it to us now. You can shoot to shoot us an email. You can use our live feed form, which will continue to stay open throughout the weekend, and twenty-four hours a day. So whenever that that thought crosses your mind, you are welcome to contact us with your thoughts. But we will do call-in comments on Monday.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just real quick; do you have an end time for Monday, just so that we know, is it 2:00 to 8:00?

CHAIR SADHWANI: I'm anticipating 2:00 until 5:00.

All we have will be the finishing of the reading of the notes, followed by public comment.

But I will work with Legal Counsel to make sure that we -- I don't know that we've ever issued one of these continuances.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: No, but it does say, 'Or upon conclusion of business," too, so.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Yeah. So we'll figure out the exact timing, and we will release information also about when we anticipate public comment to be, and what time public comment lines will close.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just want to say, you know, for the folks who are listening, we're reading your feedback real time. And so you know, we're hearing what you're saying. And you know, I mean, phone calls are great, but --

And just thanks to the whole Staff. I want I just, in public, thank the whole Staff. This has been a marathon, and everyone who is supporting us. This is incredible.

CHAIR SADHWANI: And I definitely agree with you on that, Commissioner Fornaciari. I think we all share that sincere gratitude to all of our staff, consultants, and folks who were able to make this meeting happen.

Any final words from Commissioners?

If not, this meeting -- oh, Commissioner Sinay. COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I just wanted to say it would be great to hit 1,000 today. We're at 957 public comments. So you know, as long as -- we're setting goals, 1,000 would be great for today.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just want to echo, Commissioner Fornaciari's thanks to everybody; the staff, the whole team, the line drawers, as well as all of our Video Services Team, the ASL, and the captioners, and the translators -- or interpreters.

I also want to add on to what Commissioner Sinay said, and you know, just again, say that your -- as you're listening tell your friends, post it on your next door, onto your Facebook, on your Twitter, all your social media, tell people to write in, and tell us their comments about their communities. Again, I think these are not the final maps.

These are not even the draft maps. These are just what we're just exploring. And so the more we can get
input during this time, the better we can, again, create better maps, when it comes time to the to the draft maps that we put out. So yeah, I just want to just say please keep -- encouraging those comments to come in. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: And lastly, Commissioner Kennedy. We are keeping ASL over for these final words. But I want to give you the chance to jump in.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And thank you to them for their work. And $I$ think it was Commissioner Akutagawa said earlier today, if not, it was someone else; that the more constructive the input is, the better, suggestions are most helpful, certainly more helpful than just flat out criticism. We know that we're not going to make everybody happy. I am thinking this is kind of like trying to Christmas shop for forty million people at once. But we're doing our best and constructive input will certainly help us. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: That's right. This is democracy in action.

So with that, have a good weekend, everybody. This meeting is in recess until Monday. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the Live Line Drawing Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.)
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