

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
FINAL REPORT ON 2011 REDISTRICTING
AUGUST 15, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CRITERIA USED IN DRAWING MAPS	5
A. The Framework: Article XXI of the California Constitution	6
B. The Six Redistricting Criteria Set Forth in Article XXI, Subdivision (d), of the California Constitution.....	7
1. Criterion One: The United States Constitution.....	7
i. Population Equality.....	8
a. U.S. Congressional Districts.....	8
b. State Legislative and Board of Equalization Districts.....	9
ii. Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.....	11
2. Criterion Two: The Federal Voting Rights Act.....	13
i. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.....	13
a. Legal Standard.....	13
b. The Commission’s Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.....	17
ii. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.....	21
3. Criterion Three: Geographic Contiguity.....	23
4. Criterion Four: Geographic Integrity.....	23
5. Criterion Five: Geographic Compactness.....	24
6. Criterion Six: Nesting.....	24
7. No Consideration of Incumbent Status.....	25
8. Numbering of Districts.....	25
III. DETAILS ABOUT THE DISTRICTS	26
A. Regional Overview.....	26

B.	The Assembly Districts.....	28
C.	The Senate Districts.....	42
D.	The Board of Equalization Districts.....	51
E.	The Congressional Districts.....	52

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: District maps (Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and Congressional).

Appendix 2: Population deviation report.

Appendix 3: Population statistics for each district (Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and Congressional).

Appendix 4: County report and city report, per district (Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and Congressional).

Appendix 5: Nesting report (Senate and Board of Equalization).

Appendix 6: Hash report.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Citizens Redistricting Commission for the State of California (the “Commission”) has completed the creation of statewide district maps for Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and Congress in accordance with the provisions of Article XXI of the California Constitution. The maps have received final approval by the Commission and have been certified to the Secretary of State.

This effort has been a historic event in the history of California. A group of 14 citizens, chosen from an applicant pool of more than 36,000, engaged in an extraordinary effort to conduct an open and transparent public process designed to receive input from the people of California about their communities and desires for fair and effective representation at each district level. The amount of public participation has been unprecedented. Through the course of 34 public meetings and 32 locations around the state, more than 2,700 people participated in person, and over 20,000 written comments were submitted. In addition, extensive participation in the form of proposed alternative maps for the state, various regions, or selected districts were received from a variety of individuals and groups.

The result of this effort is a set of statewide district maps for Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and Congress that fully and fairly reflects the input of the people of California. The process was open, transparent, and free of partisanship. There were long and difficult debates, and disagreements among competing communities and interested persons. No person or group was excluded from full participation in the process. In the end, the full Commission voted overwhelmingly to approve each set of maps.

The people of California demanded a fair and open process when they adopted Propositions 11 and 20, which amended the California Constitution and created the Commission. The people participated in the implementation of the Commission, with over 36,000 applicants vying for 14 seats on the Commission. The people participated in the deliberations and debate over where to draw the lines.

The Commission is proud to have served the people of this great State, and it now urges everyone to embrace this historic process and support the resulting maps that were created in collaboration with the public.

A Fair and Impartial Commission Was Selected.

Redistricting in past decades has been conducted by the Legislature, when the Legislature and the Governor can agree, or by the courts, when they cannot. In November 2008, the voters approved Proposition 11 and enacted the Voters First Act (the “Act”) to shift the responsibility for drawing Assembly, Senate, and Board of Equalization districts to an independent Commission. In November 2010, the voters approved Proposition 20 and amended the Act to include Congressional redistricting within the Commission’s mandates. The Act’s stated purpose includes the following:

“The independent Citizens Redistricting Commission will draw districts based on strict, nonpartisan rules designed to ensure fair representation.”

The Act also charged the Commissioners with applying the law in a manner that is “impartial and reinforces public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (c)(6).) Consequently, the Act provides that each Commissioner is prohibited from holding elective public office at the federal, state, county or city level for a period of ten years from the date of their appointment, and from holding appointive public office for a period of five years. (*Ibid.*) In addition, Commissioners are ineligible for five years from holding any paid position with the Legislature or for any individual legislator, and cannot be a registered federal, state or local lobbyist during this period. (*Ibid.*)

The selection process for Commissioners was also designed to be extraordinarily fair and impartial, and to lead to a group of Commissioners who would meet very high standards of independence and would reflect the population of our state. To achieve this end, the Act created a process for the selection of Commissioners who would be free from partisan influence, and reflect the state’s diversity.

The Act established new sections of the Government Code to create a process that required the State Auditor, a constitutional officer independent of the executive branch and legislative control, to select the Commissioners through an application process open to all registered voters in a manner that promoted a diverse and qualified applicant pool. (Cal. Gov. Code, § 8251 et seq.) To ensure that the Commission was selected from a broad pool of Californians, the State Auditor undertook a significant outreach process throughout the state utilizing a wide variety of communications media, including mainstream and ethnic media, social media, a website, and staff assigned to respond to all telephone calls and e-mails.

The implementing laws required the State Auditor to establish an independent Applicant Review Panel (“ARP”) consisting of three qualified senior auditors licensed by the California Board of Accountancy, to screen the applicants for the Commission. (Gov. Code, § 8252, subd. (b).) The ARP was randomly selected in a manner identical to the first eight Commissioners, including one member for the largest party in the state, one member from the second largest party in the state, and one member not affiliated with either party. (*Ibid.*) Once the ARP was established, it held all of its meetings and interviews in public, and every event was live-streamed and archived for public review.

The ARP engaged in a review of all applicants who had preliminarily qualified after being screened through a detailed set of conflict of interest rules. (Gov. Code, § 8252, subds. (a)(2) & (d).) The selection process was public. The ARP was charged with selecting 60 qualified applicants, consisting of 20 from each of the three political subgroups. (*Id.*, § 8252, subd. (d).) The applicants were chosen based on their “analytical skills, ability to be impartial, and their appreciation for California’s diverse demographics and geography.” (*Ibid.*)

After this initial pool was selected, legislative leaders from the two major political parties were allowed to exercise discretionary strikes. (Gov. Code, § 8252, subd. (e).) The leaders for the Majority and Minority parties in the Assembly and the Senate were each allowed to eliminate two persons from each pool of applicants, based on their judgment and discretion. (*Ibid.*) This

procedure allowed for further scrutiny of the applicant pool by both Republican and Democratic party leaders to help ensure that real or perceived partisan leanings were further minimized. This process eliminated eight individuals from each of the three pools of 20 applicants, leaving 12 Republicans, 12 Democrats, and 12 not affiliated with either major party. (*Ibid.*) From the remaining pool, the State Auditor randomly selected three Democrats, three Republicans, and two not affiliated with either party, who became the first eight Commissioners. (*Id.*, § 8252, subd. (f).)

This extraordinary effort to implement a fair selection process then continued, with the first eight Commissioners charged with selecting the remaining six Commissioners from the balance of the Applicant pool. The eight Commissioners deliberated on each applicant and applied all necessary criteria to establish a proposed slate of six. Specifically, the eight Commissioners were charged with applying the following additional criteria:

The six appointees shall be chosen to ensure the commission reflects this state's diversity, including but not limited to racial, ethnic, geographic, and gender diversity. However, it is not intended that formulas or specific ratios be applied for this purpose. Applicants shall also be chosen based on relevant analytical skills and ability to be impartial.

(Gov. Code, § 8252, subd. (g).) The eight Commissioners were required to, and did, agree on the proposed slate of six commissioners by a supermajority vote of at least two Democrats, two Republicans, and one affiliated with neither major party.

As a result of this process, the Commission consisted of five individuals who were registered as Democrats, five Republicans, and four Decline-to-State voters. The Commissioners chosen reflect the diversity of our state in several ways. They have different educational and employment experiences, come from different geographic regions, have worked in multiple locations around the state, and reflect the ethnic diversity of California. The Commissioners' backgrounds and biographic information are available on the Commission's website: www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov.

There was an Open and Extensive Public Hearing and Input Process.

The Voters First Act amended article XXI section 2(b) of the California Constitution to provide that the Commission "conduct an open and transparent process enabling full public consideration of and comment on the drawing of district lines." In addition, the Act required the Commission to "establish and implement an open hearing process for public input and deliberation" and to conduct an "outreach program to solicit broad public participation in the redistricting public review process." (Gov. Code, § 8253, subd. (a)(7).) The Commission took this obligation very seriously and made extensive efforts to ensure compliance by creating an open and extensive public hearing and input process.

To fulfill these requirements, the Commission did the following:

- The Commission solicited testimony through significant public outreach that included mainstream and ethnic media, the Commission's website, social media, and through

organizations such as the California Chamber of Commerce, Common Cause, the League of Women Voters, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, California Forward, the Greenlining Institute and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Commission also distributed its educational materials in English and six other languages (Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tagalog, and Vietnamese), and accepted testimony in any form or language in which the information was submitted. This included information over the phone, by e-mail, fax, petitions, hand-drawn maps, and in-person public testimony.

- During the course of the redistricting process, which began after the full Commission was sworn in during the month of January 2011, the Commission held more than 70 business meetings and 34 public input hearings that were scheduled throughout California. The Commission held meetings in 32 cities, in 23 counties. Meetings were carefully designed to be at times and locations that were convenient for average citizens to participate. For example, most meetings were held during the early evening hours, usually at a government or school location in the center of a community. The Commission extended the hours of its input hearings, allowing many meetings to go several hours beyond the scheduled adjournment where venues permitted.
- At each business meeting, the Commission regularly allowed an opportunity for public input and comment.
- More than 2,700 speakers spoke at the public input hearings and presented testimony about their communities and regions. For example, at its meeting on April 28, 2011 in Los Angeles, over 180 individuals attended and offered input. At another meeting in Culver City, more than 250 people arrived. The Commission held the session until 11:15 p.m. in order to allow as many speakers as possible to participate. These are just two of many examples of the Commission's extensive effort to engage the public and solicit input on district maps.
- Ultimately, the Commission received more than 2,000 written submissions containing testimony and maps reflecting proposed statewide, regional, or other districts. Some private individuals and organized groups submitted detailed electronic data files along with their proposed maps at input hearings and business meetings. Representative groups that submitted testimony and/or proposed maps included: the African American Redistricting Coalition; the Armenian National Committee of America: Western Region; the Black Farmers and Agriculturalist Association; the California Conservative Action Group; the California League of Conservation Voters; the California Institute of Jobs Economy and Education; the Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy; the Chinese American Citizens Alliance; the Citizens for the San Gabriel Mountains; the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting; the Coalition of Suburban Communities for Fair Representation; the Council of Black Political Organizations; the East San Fernando Valley Redistricting Coalition; Equality California; the Inland Empire African American Redistricting Coalition; the Latino Policy Forum; the League of Women Voters; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the People's Advocate; the

San Joaquin County Citizens for Constitutional Redistricting; the Sierra Club; the Silicon Valley Leadership Group; the South Bay Committee for Fair Redistricting; the Tri-Cities – Fremont, Newark, Union City; the United Latinos Vote; the Valley Industry and Commerce Association; and the WARD Economic Development Corp.

- The Commission’s staff also received written comments, input and suggestions from more than 20,000 individuals and groups that contain information about their communities, shared interests, backgrounds, histories, and suggested guidelines for district boundaries, as well as recommendations to the Commission on the overall process of redistricting.
- The Commission held 23 public input hearings around the state before it issued a set of draft maps on June 10, 2011. Following a five-day public review period, the Commission held 11 more public input hearings around the state to collect reactions and comments about the initial draft maps.
- Beginning in June 2011, the Commission’s meetings were held at the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento. The Commission held six meetings in June and 16 meetings during July at this location, and continued to receive extensive public input via written submissions, e-mail, and live public comment. At each of its meetings the Commission allowed for public participation and comment. During the June and July meetings more than 276 people appeared and offered public comments to the Commission, various groups regularly attended and monitored the deliberations, and individuals and groups continued to offer written comments, maps, and suggestions.
- All of the Commission’s public meetings were live-streamed, captured on video, and placed on the Commission’s website for public viewing at any time. Stenographers were present at the Commission business meetings and meetings where instructions were provided to Q2 Data and Research, LLC, the company retained to implement the Commission’s directions and to draw the draft districts and final maps. Transcripts of meetings were also placed on the Commission’s website. Finally, all of the completed documents prepared by the Commission and its staff, along with all documents presented to the Commission by the public and suitable for posting were posted to the Commission’s website for public review.

Based on this extensive process, the Commission successfully met its mandate to hold open and transparent proceedings so that the public could participate thoroughly in the line drawing and redistricting process.

II. CRITERIA USED IN DRAWING MAPS

Article XXI of the California Constitution also establishes the legal framework for drawing new political districts in California every ten years. This framework establishes a number of map-drawing criteria in descending order of priority, starting with the United States Constitution, then the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. §§ 1973–1973(aa)(6)) (the “Voting Rights Act”), and then a set of traditional redistricting criteria.

As explained below, the Commission carefully adhered to these criteria throughout the line-drawing process. As a result, the Commission’s maps provide an opportunity to achieve effective and fair representation—precisely what the voters intended when they enacted Propositions 11 and 20. (See, e.g., Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2(d)(4).)

A. The Framework: Article XXI of the California Constitution

Article XXI, section 1, provides that in the year following the year in which the national Census is taken, the Commission “shall adjust the boundary lines of the congressional, State Senatorial, Assembly and Board of Equalization districts (also known as ‘redistricting’) in conformance with the standards and process set forth in Section 2.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 1.)

Section 2 of Article XXI, in turn, provides that the Commission shall “(1) conduct an open and transparent process enabling full public consideration of and comment on the drawing of district lines; (2) draw district lines according to the redistricting criteria specified in this article; and (3) conduct themselves with integrity and fairness.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (b).)

Section 2 of Article XXI also establishes six specific criteria that the Commission must consider in drawing the new district maps. Specifically, subdivision (d) provides as follows:

The commission shall establish single-member districts for the Senate, Assembly, Congress, and State Board of Equalization pursuant to a mapping process using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:

- (1) Districts shall comply with the United States Constitution. Congressional districts shall achieve population equality as nearly as is practicable, and Senatorial, Assembly, and State Board of Equalization districts shall have reasonably equal population with other districts for the same office, except where deviation is required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act or allowable by law.
- (2) Districts shall comply with the federal Voting Rights Act
- (3) Districts shall be geographically contiguous.
- (4) The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, local neighborhood, or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes their division to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions. A community of interest is a contiguous population which shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Examples of such shared interests are those common to an urban area, a rural area, an industrial area, or an agricultural area, and those common to areas in which the people share similar living standards, use the same transportation facilities, have similar work opportunities, or have access to the same media of communication relevant to the election process. Communities of

interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.

(5) To the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population.

(6) To the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, each Senate district shall be comprised of two whole, complete, and adjacent Assembly districts, and each Board of Equalization district shall be comprised of 10 whole, complete, and adjacent Senate districts.

(Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d).)

Article XXI further states that the “place of residence of any incumbent or political candidate shall not be considered in the creation of a map. Districts shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (e).)

Finally, Article XXI provides that “[d]istricts for the Congress, Senate, Assembly, and State Board of Equalization shall be numbered consecutively commencing at the northern boundary of the State and ending at the southern boundary.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (f).)

B. The Six Redistricting Criteria Set Forth in Article XXI, Subdivision (d), of the California Constitution

Each of the six enumerated criteria that the Commission considered in drawing the new political maps, as well as the specific decisions that the Commission made in light of these criteria, require further elaboration, described below.

1. Criterion One: The United States Constitution

The Commission’s highest ranking criterion is to comply with the United States Constitution. (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(1).) This priority reflects the federal Constitution’s Supremacy Clause: “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.” (U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2.)

One aspect of federal constitutional compliance in the redistricting context is “population equality,” also known as adherence to the principle of “one person, one vote.” (See Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(1) [“Congressional districts shall achieve population equality as nearly as is practicable, and Senatorial, Assembly, and State Board of Equalization districts shall have reasonably equal population with other districts for the same office, except where deviation is required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act or allowable by law.”].) Another consideration for purposes of redistricting, although not mentioned specifically in Article XXI, is

compliance with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

i. Population Equality

The United States Constitution requires that any redistricting plan must achieve population equality among electoral districts. (See U.S. Const., art. I, § 2 [“The House of Representatives . . . shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers.”]; see also *Reynolds v. Sims* (1964) 377 U.S. 533, 568 (*Reynolds*) [“[T]he Equal Protection Clause [of the Fourteenth Amendment] requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis.”].)

As the United States Supreme Court has explained, an individual’s right to vote for state or federal legislators may be unconstitutionally impaired when the weight of that vote is diluted, as compared with the votes of citizens living in other parts of the state (see, e.g., *Reynolds, supra*, 377 U.S. at p. 568), or of the United States (see, e.g., *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler* (1969) 394 U.S. 526, 530–531 (*Kirkpatrick*)).

Notably, different bases and standards govern population equality for U.S. congressional districts, on the one hand, and state legislative districts (Assembly and Senate) and districts for state entities such as the Board of Equalization, on the other.

a. U.S. Congressional Districts

With respect to congressional districts, the U.S. Supreme Court has imposed a *strict* standard of population equality. Indeed the “fundamental goal for the House of Representatives . . . requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality.” (*Kirkpatrick, supra*, 394 U.S. at pp. 530–531 [rejecting reapportionment plan where the average variation from the population ideal among districts was 1.6%]; see also *Karcher v. Daggett* (1983) 462 U.S. 725, 739–743 (*Karcher*) [rejecting reapportionment plan where the average variation from the population ideal among districts was .1384%].)

Nonetheless, recognizing that “[p]recise mathematical equality . . . may be difficult to achieve in an imperfect world,” the U.S. Supreme Court has explained that the population equality “standard is enforced only to the extent of requiring that districts be apportioned to achieve population equality *as nearly as is practicable*.” (*Karcher, supra*, 462 U.S. at p. 730, italics added, internal quotation marks and citation omitted.) The “as nearly as practicable” standard is mirrored in Article XXI of the California Constitution, which states that “Congressional districts shall achieve population equality as nearly as is practicable.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(1).)

Although the U.S. Supreme Court has theoretically recognized the practical need to deviate from strict population equality in congressional redistricting, the circumstances under which a state is permitted to do so are limited. Any deviation, no matter how small, must either be unavoidable or necessary to achieve a nondiscriminatory legislative policy. (See *Karcher*,

supra, 462 U.S. at pp. 740–741; see also *Kirkpatrick, supra*, 394 U.S. at p. 530 [rejecting contention “that there is a fixed numerical or percentage population variance small enough to be considered *de minimis* and to satisfy without question the [population equality] standard”].) Whether a nondiscriminatory legislative policy justifies a deviation depends on case-specific circumstances such as “the size of the deviations, the importance of the State’s interests, the consistency with which the plan as a whole reflects those interests, and the availability of alternatives that might substantially vindicate those interests yet approximate population equality more closely.” (See *Karcher, supra*, 462 U.S. at pp. 740–741.)

In strict compliance with these standards, the Commission’s congressional district maps achieved a total deviation of +/- 1 person. Specifically, 20 of the 53 congressional districts achieved the ideal population of 702,905 persons. Twelve of the 53 districts achieved a population of 702,906 persons, or one person more than the ideal. Twenty-one of the 53 districts achieved a population of 702,904 persons, or one person less than the ideal.

b. State Legislative and Board of Equalization Districts

With respect to population equality in state districts, the U.S. Supreme Court has afforded states “[s]omewhat more flexibility” than what is permitted in Congressional redistricting. (*Reynolds, supra*, 377 U.S. at p. 578.) Unlike the population-equality requirement for congressional districts, which is based on Article I, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the population-equality requirement for state legislative districts is derived from the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. (See *id.* at p. 568.)

“[A]s a general matter, . . . an apportionment plan with a maximum population deviation under 10% falls within [a] category of minor deviations” insufficient to “make out a prima facie case of invidious discrimination under the Fourteenth Amendment.” (*Brown v. Thompson* (1983) 462 U.S. 835, 842, quoting *Gaffney v. Cummings* (1973) 412 U.S. 735, 745.) Yet drawing state legislative districts that fall within a 10% maximum deviation does not provide a “safe harbor” from any constitutional challenge. (See *Larios v. Cox* (N.D.Ga. 2004) 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (*Larios*), *affd.* (2004) 542 U.S. 947 [affirming district court decision holding that state redistricting plan with total deviation under 10% nonetheless violated population equality requirement].)

Because there is no safe harbor, any degree of population deviation among state legislative districts must be supported by consistently applied and legitimate state interests. (See *Reynolds, supra*, 377 U.S. at p. 579 [“So long as the divergences from a strict population are based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy, some deviations from the equal-population principle are constitutionally permissible with respect to the apportionment of seats in either or both of the two houses of a bicameral state legislature.”].) A state must justify deviations as “further[ing] legitimate state interests such as making districts compact and contiguous, respecting political subdivisions, maintaining the cores of prior districts, and avoiding incumbent pairings.” (*Larios, supra*, 300 F.Supp.2d at pp. 1337–1338.) Moreover, a state must apply the justifications for deviation in a nondiscriminatory and consistent manner. (See *id.* at pp. 1341–1342 [holding that a redistricting scheme was “baldly unconstitutional” where the “deviations were created to protect incumbents in a wholly inconsistent and discriminatory way”].)

The state may, of course, adopt more stringent population equality requirements than those permitted by the California constitution. (See, e.g., *Kelo v. City of New London, Conn.* (2005) 545 U.S. 469, 489.) As discussed in *Legislature v. Reinecke* (1973) 10 Cal.3d 396 (*Reinecke*), the special masters responsible for the 1970s redistricting decided that legislative districts should be “reasonably equal” in population, which they construed to mean:

districts should be within 1 percent of the ideal except in unusual circumstances, and in no event should a deviation greater than 2 percent be permitted. Although a greater percentage variation has been permitted in the reapportionment plans of other states[,] the populations of districts in such states were relatively small. Legislative districts in California are large, so that even a 1 percent or 2 percent variance in population affects a large number of persons.

(*Id.* at p. 411.) The California Supreme Court in *Reinecke* acknowledged that some objectors had criticized the masters for “adopt[ing] too rigorous standards of population equality” (*id.* at p. 402), but the Court ultimately adopted the masters’ plans.

Article XXI of the California Constitution was first enacted in 1980. As originally enacted, it mirrored the special masters’ standard from the 1970s and required that “the population of all districts of a particular type shall be *reasonably equal*.” (*Wilson v. Eu* (1992) 1 Cal.4th 707, 753 (*Wilson*), italics added.) The Attorney General had interpreted that language “as incorporating the more restrictive population requirements contained in [*Reinecke*] that the ‘population of senate and assembly districts should be within 1 percent of the ideal except in unusual circumstances, and in no event should a deviation greater than 2 percent be permitted.’” (*Ibid.*, quoting *Reinecke, supra*, 10 Cal.3d at p. 411.) Accordingly, the special masters in the 1990s expressly complied with that stricter deviation limit, while acknowledging that they had selected a maximum deviation that may have been even more stringent than the California Constitution required. (*Wilson, supra*, 1 Cal.4th at p. 753.) The California Supreme Court approved the masters’ plans without explicitly ruling on the maximum deviation permitted under the California Constitution. (See *id.* at p. 719.)

Proposition 11 and Proposition 20 amended the population-equality language in California’s Constitution to state that “Senatorial, Assembly, and State Board of Equalization districts shall have *reasonably equal population* with other districts for the same office, *except where deviation is required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act or allowable by law*.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § (2), subd. (d)(1), amended by initiative, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 3, 2010), italics added.)

No court has interpreted the population-equality language in Propositions 11 or 20. Accordingly, no court has decided whether, or how, the addition of the phrase “except where deviation is required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act or allowable by law” to “reasonably equal population,” may alter the total deviation allowed under the California Constitution.

In light of the greater flexibility for population deviation in state legislative districts, but mindful of the uncertainty with respect to California’s own constitutional standard, the Commission decided that its maps should strive for a total population deviation of zero; the

Commission would allow no more than a 2.0% total deviation except where further deviation would be required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act or allowable by law.

Ultimately the maps were drawn to successfully maintain the population size of each district within +/- 1.0% of the ideal.

The ideal size of an Assembly district is 465,674 persons. Fifty-nine of the 80 Assembly districts achieved a deviation within 0.75% of the ideal, and the remaining 21 Assembly districts deviate less than 1.0% from the ideal. The Commission's Assembly districts achieved an overall average deviation of within 0.506% of the ideal.

The ideal size of a Senate district in California is 931,349. Twenty-nine of the 40 Senate districts have a deviation from the ideal of less than 0.50%, and the remaining 11 Senate districts deviate less than 1.0% from the ideal. Senate districts achieved an overall average deviation from the ideal of 0.449%.

The ideal size of a Board of Equalization district is 9,313,489. The Commission's four Board of Equalization districts achieved a deviation of within 1.0% of the ideal, with a range of -1.0% to +0.812% deviation from the ideal, and an average deviation of 0.630%.

ii. Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that "no state shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." (U.S. Const., 14th Amend., § 1.) As interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Equal Protection Clause prohibits a state from using race as the *sole* or *predominant* factor in constructing districts, unless doing so satisfies the Court's "strict scrutiny" standard because it is necessary to achieve a compelling state interest. (See, e.g., *Bush v. Vera* (1996) 517 U.S. 952, 958–959 (*Vera*) (plur. opn. of O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Kennedy, J.).)

However, the Equal Protection Clause does not preclude *any* consideration of race in redistricting. Indeed, the U.S. Supreme Court has acknowledged that "[r]edistricting legislatures will . . . almost always be aware of racial demographics." (*Miller v. Johnson* (1995) 515 U.S. 900, 916 (*Miller*).) As long as race is *not* the sole or predominant factor used to draw a particular district in a particular way, then a court will analyze a Fourteenth Amendment challenge to a district using a deferential "rational basis" review. (See *Vera, supra*, 517 U.S. at pp. 958–959 (plur. opn. of O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Kennedy, J.); see generally *Nordlinger v. Hahn* (1992) 505 U.S. 1, 11 ["In general, the Equal Protection Clause is satisfied so long as there is a plausible policy reason for the classification, the legislative facts on which the classification is apparently based rationally may have been considered by the governmental decisionmaker, and the relationship of the classification to its goal is not so attenuated as to render the distinction arbitrary or irrational."], citations omitted.)

In other words, "[s]trict scrutiny does not apply merely because redistricting is performed with consciousness of race." (*Vera, supra*, 517 U.S. at pp. 958–959.) "Nor does [strict scrutiny] apply to all cases of intentional creation of majority-minority districts," as required by the Voting Rights Act, discussed *infra* at pp. 13–16. (*Ibid.*) Instead, strict scrutiny applies only where race is

the sole or “*predominant* factor motivating the legislature’s [redistricting] decision.” (*Ibid.*) A court evaluates whether race was the predominant factor motivating a redistricting decision by deciding whether “the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles, including but not limited to compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions or communities defined by actual shared interests, to racial considerations.” (*Miller, supra*, 515 U.S. at p. 916.)

Courts have on occasion considered the shape of the challenged district in determining whether the redistricting body subordinated traditional principles to racial considerations. (*Shaw v. Reno* (1993) 509 U.S. 630, 647 [“We believe that reapportionment is one area in which appearances do matter. A reapportionment plan that includes in one district individuals who belong to the same race, but who are otherwise widely separated by geographical and political boundaries, and who may have little in common with one another but the color of their skin, bears an uncomfortable resemblance to political apartheid.”].) Although shape is neither necessary nor sufficient to establish a constitutional violation, an oddly shaped district “may be persuasive circumstantial evidence that race for its own sake, and not other districting principles, was the legislature’s dominant and controlling rationale in drawing its district lines.” (*Miller, supra*, 515 U.S. at p. 913; see also *Bush, supra*, 517 U.S. at p. 962 [holding that strict scrutiny applied where “the State substantially neglected traditional districting criteria such as compactness, it was committed from the outset to creating majority-minority districts, and it manipulated district lines to exploit unprecedentedly detailed racial data”].)

The U.S. Supreme Court has reserved ruling explicitly on the question of whether a state’s compliance with Sections 2 or 5 of the Voting Rights Act may serve as a “compelling governmental interest” that would justify drawing districts based predominantly on race. (E.g., *Bush, supra*, 517 U.S. at p. 977 [“As we have done in each of our previous cases . . . we assume without deciding that compliance with the [Voting Rights Act] can be a compelling state interest.”].) Nevertheless, a majority of the current U.S. Supreme Court Justices have written or joined in separate opinions indicating that compliance with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act would likely be a compelling state interest.¹

Note that even if compliance with the Voting Rights Act is found to be a compelling governmental interest for purposes of strict scrutiny, the proposed district must still be “narrowly tailored” to achieve compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Consequently, if the redistricting body has a “strong basis in evidence” for concluding that the “creation of a majority-minority district is reasonably necessary to comply with § 2, and the districting that is based on race

¹ (*League of United Latin American Citizens v. Perry* (2006) 548 U.S. 399, 518 (*LULAC*) [“I would hold that compliance with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act can be [a compelling state] interest.”] (conc. & dis. opn. of Scalia, J., joined by Thomas and Alito, JJ., and Roberts, C.J.); *id.* at p. 47, fn. 12 [“Justice BREYER has authorized me to state that he agrees with Justice SCALIA that compliance with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act is also a compelling state interest.] (conc. and dis. opn. of Stevens, J., joined by Breyer, J.); see also *id.* at p. 475 [noting that a “State must justify its [race-predominant] districting decision by establishing that it was narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest, such as compliance with § 2 of the Voting Rights Act”] (conc. & dis. opn. of Stevens, J., joined by Breyer, J.); *Vera, supra*, 517 U.S. at p. 1033 [adopting the “perfectly obvious assumption that a State has a compelling interest in comply with § 2 of the Voting Rights Act”] (dis. opn. of Stevens, J., joined by Ginsburg and Breyer, JJ.).)

substantially addresses the § 2 violation, it satisfies strict scrutiny.” (*Vera, supra*, 517 U.S. at p. 977, citations omitted.)

In light of these principles, the Commission’s map-drawing process relied on race-neutral, traditional redistricting criteria as its primary focus in crafting district lines, even in areas where the Voting Rights Act required the creation of a majority-minority district. While the Commission was aware of and sensitive to the Census data and demographics of the areas under review—in particular with respect to areas in which the Voting Rights Act arguably may have required the drawing of a majority-minority district—race was never the sole or predominant criterion used to draw any of the district lines. The Commission made a substantial effort to focus on the shared interests and community relationships that belonged together for fair and effective representation of all of the people of the state of California when drawing district lines.

2. Criterion Two: The Federal Voting Rights Act

The Commission’s second criterion in order of priority is that “[d]istricts shall comply with the federal Voting Rights Act. (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(2).) Compliance with the federal Voting Rights Act has two relevant components: Section 2 and Section 5.

In addition, the Voters First Act requires that at least one of the legal counsel hired by the Commission has experience and expertise in implementation and enforcement of the federal Voting Rights Act. (Gov. Code, § 8253(a)(5).) Accordingly, the Commission retained the law firm of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP to serve as its Voting Rights Act counsel and to help ensure compliance with Section 2 and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

i. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

Congress enacted Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in an effort to combat minority vote dilution. Section 2 provides that no “standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied . . . in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right . . . to vote on account of race or color” or membership in a language minority group. (42 U.S.C. §§ 1973(a), 1973b(f)(2).)

a. Legal Standard

“A violation [of Section 2] is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes . . . are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) of this section in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.” (42 U.S.C. § 1973(b).)

In 1982, Congress clarified that Section 2 plaintiffs need not prove that “a contested electoral mechanism was intentionally adopted or maintained by state officials for a discriminatory purpose.” (*Thornburg v. Gingles* (1986) 478 U.S. 30, 35 (*Gingles*).) Rather, a “violation [can] be proved by showing discriminatory effect alone.” (*Ibid.*) Accordingly, a Section 2 violation occurs where “a contested electoral practice or structure results in members of a protected group having less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.” (*Id.* at p. 63.) Importantly,

the U.S. Supreme Court has invoked Section 2 to strike down legislative redistricting plans that result in minority vote dilution as defined by Section 2. (See *LULAC*, *supra*, 548 U.S. at pp. 423–443.)

A single-member redistricting scheme can run afoul of Section 2 either through “cracking” or “packing” minority voters. “Cracking” occurs when a redistricting plan fragments “a minority group that is large enough to constitute the majority in a single-member district . . . among various districts so that it is a majority in none.” (*Voinovich v. Quilter* (1993) 507 U.S. 146, 153 (*Voinovich*)). “If the majority in each district votes as a bloc against the minority[-preferred] candidate, the fragmented minority group will be unable to muster sufficient votes in any district to carry its candidate to victory.” (*Ibid.*; see also *LULAC*, *supra*, 548 U.S. at pp. 427–443 [redistricting program violated Section 2 by reducing Latino citizen voting-age population from 54.7% to 46% in challenged district].)

“Packing,” on the other hand, occurs when a redistricting plan results in excessive concentration of minority voters within a district, thereby depriving minority voters of influence in surrounding districts. (*Voinovich*, *supra*, 507 U.S. at p. 153; see, e.g., *Bone Shirt v. Hazeltine* (8th Cir. 2006) 461 F.3d 1011, 1016–1019 [finding a Section 2 violation where Native Americans comprised eighty-six percent of the voting-age population in a district].)

The Supreme Court has established a number of elements that a plaintiff must prove to establish that a redistricting plan violates Section 2. Initially, a Section 2 plaintiff must satisfy the three so-called “*Gingles* preconditions” articulated by the Court in *Thornburg v. Gingles*. (See *Grove v. Emison* (1993) 507 U.S. 25, 37–42.) The *Gingles* preconditions are as follows:

“First, the minority group must be able to demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district.”

“Second, the minority group must be able to show that it is politically cohesive.”

“Third, the minority must be able to demonstrate that the white majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.”

(*Gingles*, *supra*, 478 U.S. at pp. 50–51.)²

With respect to the first *Gingles* precondition—a sufficiently large and geographically compact minority group—a minority group is sufficiently large only where “the minority

² The “majority” does not actually have to be white (as opposed to some other racial group), or even comprised of a single racial group, in order to satisfy the third *Gingles* precondition. (See *Gomez v. City of Watsonville* (9th Cir. 1988) 863 F.2d 1407, 1417 [“Although the court did not separately find that Anglo bloc voting occurs, it is clear that the non-Hispanic majority in Watsonville usually votes sufficiently as a bloc to defeat the minority votes plus any crossover votes.”]; *Meek v. Metropolitan Dade County, Fla.* (S.D. Fla. 1992) 805 F.Supp. 967, 976 & fn.14 [“In order to prove the third prong in *Gingles*, Black Plaintiffs must be able to demonstrate that the Non-Black majority votes sufficiently as a bloc Non-Blacks refer to Hispanics and Non-Hispanic Whites.”], *affd.* in part & *revd.* in part on other grounds (11th Cir. 1993) 985 F.2d 1471.)

population in the potential election district is greater than 50 percent.” (*Bartlett v. Strickland* (2009) 129 S.Ct. 1231, 1246 (*Bartlett*) (plur. opn. of Kennedy, J., joined by Roberts, C.J. and Alito, J.)) Although the Supreme Court has not expressly defined the proper measure of “minority population,” the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has endorsed the use of citizen voting age population (“CVAP”) statistics, rather than total population or voting-age population statistics, to satisfy the first *Gingles* precondition. (*Romero v. City of Pomona* (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 1418, 1426 [“The district court was correct in holding that eligible minority voter population, rather than total minority population, is the appropriate measure of geographical compactness.”], abrogated on other grounds, *Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp.* (9th Cir. 1990) 914 F.2d 1136, 1141 [en banc]; see also *LULAC*, *supra*, 548 U.S. at p. 429 [observing, in dicta, that CVAP “fits the language of § 2 because only eligible voters affect a group’s opportunity to elect candidates”].)³

In addition, proof that the minority population in a hypothetical election district is large enough to form a “cross-over” district does *not* satisfy the first *Gingles* precondition. (See *Bartlett*, *supra*, 129 S.Ct. at pp. 1242–1243.) A district in which minority voters make up less than a majority, but can elect a candidate of the minority group’s choice where white voters “cross over” to support the minority’s preferred candidate is referred to as a “cross-over district.” (*Ibid.*) Notably, the fact that influence or cross-over districts cannot be used as a basis for asserting a Section 2 violation does not mean that these district types are prohibited. To the contrary, the Supreme Court has acknowledged that state legislative bodies may legitimately consider the use of cross-over districts to enhance or protect minority voting interests. (See *id.* at p. 1248 [“Our holding that § 2 does not require crossover districts does not consider the permissibility of such districts as a matter of legislative choice or discretion. Assuming a majority-minority district with a substantial minority population, a legislative determination, based on proper factors, to create two crossover districts may serve to diminish the significance and influence of race by encouraging minority and majority voters to work together toward a common goal. The option to draw such districts gives legislatures a choice that can lead to less racial isolation, not more.”].)

Further, the *Gingles* “compactness” inquiry focuses on the compactness of the *minority population*, not the shape of the district itself. (*LULAC*, *supra*, 548 U.S. at p. 433.) “[W]hile no precise rule has emerged governing [*Gingles*] compactness, the inquiry should take into account

³ The decennial Census does not collect or report actual data to establish citizenship. However, the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (“ACS”) provides a rolling estimate of citizen voting age population or CVAP in a given geographic area over a 5-year period. The U.S. Bureau of the Census has issued disclaimers cautioning users about the inherent unreliability of this data, and explains that it cannot be used as an estimate of a specific population at a specific point in time. Nevertheless, because of the requirements of the Voting Rights Act, the Commission needed to use the most readily available and commonly used data in order to make its determinations about whether the Voting Rights Act required the drawing of certain districts. The Commission’s mapping consultant used CVAP data from California’s Statewide Database (which is based on the ACS CVAP data, but adjusted for census block estimates) to provide estimates to the Commission and its counsel of CVAP in any given area. While this CVAP data is not an exact number, the Commission, with expert guidance from its mapping consultant, exercised its judgment and relied on the CVAP data from the Statewide Database as the best available estimate of CVAP in a given area (the Commission also considered other population data reported in the 2010 Census, including Voting-Age Population and Total Population).

traditional districting principles such as maintaining communities of interest and traditional boundaries.” (*Ibid.*, citations omitted.) A district that “reaches out to grab small and apparently isolated minority communities” is not reasonably compact. (*Vera, supra*, 517 U.S. at p. 979.) Nonetheless, a minority population may be “geographically compact” for *Gingles* purposes even if it is not strictly contiguous. That is, two non-contiguous minority populations “in reasonably close proximity” could form a “geographically compact” minority group if they “share similar interests” with each other. (*LULAC, supra*, 548 U.S. at p. 435.)⁴

The second and third *Gingles* preconditions are often referred to collectively as “racially polarized voting” and are considered together. Courts first assess whether a politically cohesive minority group exists, i.e., “a significant number of minority group members usually vote for the same candidates.” (*Gingles, supra*, 478 U.S. at p. 56.) Then, courts look for legally significant majority bloc voting, i.e., a pattern in which the majority’s “bloc vote . . . normally will defeat the combined strength of minority support plus [majority] ‘crossover votes.’” (*Id.* at p. 55.) This analysis typically requires expert testimony. (See, e.g., *id.* at pp. 53–74 [considering expert testimony regarding minority group’s lack of success in past elections].)

A plaintiff who establishes all three *Gingles* preconditions has not yet established that a challenged district violates Section 2. Instead, once the *Gingles* preconditions have been shown, a court must then consider whether, “based on the ‘totality of the circumstances,’ minorities have been denied an ‘equal opportunity’ to ‘participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.’” (*Abrams v. Johnson* (1997) 521 U.S. 74, 90, quoting 42 U.S.C. § 1973(b).)⁵

⁴ “Because *Gingles* advances a functional evaluation of whether the minority population is large enough to form a district in the first instance, the Circuits have been flexible in assessing the showing made for this precondition.” (*Sanchez v. City of Colorado* (10th Cir. 1996) 97 F.3d 1303, 1311; see *Houston v. Lafayette County, Miss.* (5th Cir. 1995) 56 F.3d 606, 611.)

⁵ Courts look to the following non-exhaustive list of factors (the so-called “Senate Report Factors,” based on the Senate Report accompanying the 1982 amendments to Section 2) to determine whether, based on the totality of circumstances, a Section 2 violation exists:

- (1) “[W]hether the number of districts in which the minority group forms an effective majority is roughly proportional to its share of the population in the relevant area.” (*LULAC, supra*, 548 U.S. at p. 426.) “[T]he proper geographic scope for assessing proportionality [is] statewide.” (*Id.* at p. 437.)
- (2) “[T]he extent of any history of official discrimination in the state or political subdivision that touched the right of the members of the minority group to register, to vote, or otherwise participate in the democratic process.” (*Gingles, supra*, 478 U.S. at pp. 36–37, quoting Sen.Rep. No. 97-417, 2d Sess. (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News, pp. 206–207.)
- (3) “[T]he extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized.” (*Id.* at p. 37.)
- (4) “[T]he extent to which the state or political subdivision has used unusually large election districts, majority vote requirements, anti-single shot provisions, or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group.” (*Ibid.*)
- (5) “[I]f there is a candidate slating process, whether the members of the minority group have been denied access to the process.” (*Ibid.*)
- (6) “[T]he extent to which members of the minority group in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process.” (*Ibid.*)

b. The Commission’s Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

With the legal framework of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in mind, the Commission worked to identify areas of the state where, at least potentially, a geographically compact concentration of a single minority group could form a majority (50% or greater CVAP) in a Congressional, Senate, or Assembly district. In each of those areas, the Commission discussed with legal counsel whether Section 2 required the drawing of a majority-minority district. To assist counsel in forming its legal judgment about potential Section 2 required districts, the Commission hired Dr. Matt Barreto (Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington) to help evaluate the evidence about racially polarized voting in counties where the Commission had identified significant minority concentrations.

Areas Other than Los Angeles County.

The Commission’s counsel worked with Dr. Barreto to evaluate evidence of racially polarized voting in Fresno, Kings, Orange, San Diego, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. After evaluating that evidence, counsel reported to the Commission that there was strong evidence of racially polarized voting with respect to Latinos and non-Latinos in Fresno, Orange, San Diego, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. In the judgment of the Commission’s Voting Rights Act counsel, there were sufficient indicia that the *Gingles* preconditions had been satisfied with respect to certain geographically compact Latino populations within those counties, and there was sufficient evidence concerning the totality of the circumstances, that there would likely be a Section 2 violation if majority-minority districts were not drawn. Counsel further reported that the available evidence regarding racially polarized voting in Kings County elections was inconclusive.

Based on this advice, which the Commission evaluated in detail and then accepted, the Commission chose to draw the following majority-Latino districts, employing both racial/ethnic data and traditional redistricting criteria to the extent practicable:

Type	No.	Area	LCVAP %
AD	31	Fresno	50.81%
AD	69	Orange	52.60%
AD	80	San Diego	50.76%

(7) “[W]hether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals.” (*Ibid.*)
(8) “[T]he extent to which members of the minority group have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction.” (*Ibid.*)
(9) “[W]hether there is a significant lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group.” (*Ibid.*)
(10) “[W]hether the policy underlying the state or political subdivision’s use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.” (*Ibid.*)
(11) The extent to which there is evidence of “the lingering effects of past discrimination.” (*Id.* at p. 48, fn.15.)

Type	No.	Area	LCVAP %
AD	52	San Bernardino	50.56%
AD	47	San Bernardino	52.32%
SD	20	San Bernardino	51.39%
CD	35	San Bernardino	51.94%

Los Angeles County

The Commission paid particular attention to Section 2 issues within Los Angeles County, which, with approximately 9.8 million people, is California’s most populous county and among its most racially and ethnically diverse regions. The Commission held several meetings in the Los Angeles area and heard input from hundreds of people. Many groups and individuals also submitted maps, written reports, and written commentary about how district lines should be drawn. The Commission evaluated the application of the legal framework discussed above to several minority populations, including Latinos, African Americans and Asian Americans. Each population is discussed in turn.

Latinos in Los Angeles County

The Commission was advised by counsel that if the Commission did not draw several Latino-majority districts in Los Angeles County, Latinos might potentially have a viable claim that the Commission’s maps violate Section 2. The Commission evaluated counsel’s advice thoroughly, and took it into account when drawing the Los Angeles area districts, as discussed below.

The Latino CVAP population, as a whole, in Los Angeles County numbers approximately 1.8 million. Regarding the first *Gingles* precondition, the Commission’s counsel advised that there are a number of areas in Los Angeles County where Latinos comprise a sufficiently large and geographically compact group such that they could constitute a majority in a single-member district.

The Commission’s counsel, working with Dr. Barreto, also advised the Commission that there was strong evidence that polarized voting exists in Los Angeles County between Latinos and non-Latinos. In particular, the Commission received a summary from Dr. Barreto covering more than a dozen studies reflecting election analyses covering a multi-year period which concluded that there is a significant body of evidence that Latinos vote in a politically cohesive manner for their preferred candidates, while non-Latinos vote in significant numbers for different candidates. The evidence is especially strong at the level of primary elections and where there are contested seats (as opposed to elections involving long-term incumbents).

Based in part on the public testimony and on submissions by individuals and groups, the Commission’s counsel also advised that there was sufficient evidence that the “totality of the circumstances” weighed in favor of a Section 2 claim in Los Angeles on behalf of Latinos, and

that the Commission could avoid potential liability under Section 2 by drawing several majority-Latino districts. Among other things, the Commission considered (a) the testimony of Arturo Vargas, Executive Director of NALEO, dated June 28, 2011, which addressed barriers to Latino participation and representation in California, including educational and income disparities, vote dilution, gerrymandering, and voter intimidation, and (b) the expert witness report of Albert M. Camarillo, professor of history at Stanford University, which provided abundant support for the conclusion that a history of discrimination exists against Latinos in California and Los Angeles in particular. The Commission was not presented with any contradictory evidence on these points.

Accordingly, the Commission's counsel advised that in light of the requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the available evidence, the Commission should create several majority-Latino districts in Los Angeles County.

The Commission focused its efforts on trying to group cities, neighborhoods, and communities together based on shared interests and commonalities, including social, economic, cultural, and geographic factors. The Commission obtained this information by evaluating public input and available Census data, and by considering their own personal knowledge of the area. As a result of this process several majority-Latino districts were drawn in the Los Angeles area, and the Commission concluded that it had met its obligation to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act concerning the Latino population. These districts included Assembly Districts 39, 48, 51, 53, 57, 58, 59, and 63; Senate Districts 24, 32, and 33; and Congressional Districts 29, 32, 34, 38, 40, and 44. Detailed descriptions and information about these districts are included with the discussion of other districts later in this report, and in the accompanying data, appendices, and maps.

African Americans in Los Angeles County

The Commission also considered whether Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act required the creation of majority-minority districts for African Americans in Los Angeles County. A preliminary analysis showed that African Americans could form a majority CVAP in a reasonably compact geographic area in at least one Assembly district and one Congressional district. Consequently, the Commission sought information from its counsel and its racially polarized voting consultant about the application of the remaining *Gingles* preconditions and the totality of the circumstances requirement.

Evidence summarized by Dr. Barreto demonstrated that there was racially polarized voting between Latinos and African Americans in portions of Los Angeles where these communities are adjacent. Dr. Barreto did not conduct further studies to determine whether there was polarized voting between African Americans and other populations, based in part on the strong input from voices in the communities where African Americans reside, as discussed below.

Many public speakers and organized groups provided substantial testimony about the history of African American participation in politics in Los Angeles. According to this input, African Americans have enjoyed substantial electoral success by forming coalitions with a variety of groups over a period of many years. For example, the African American Redistricting

Collaborative (“AARC”) observed that African Americans have enjoyed substantial electoral success in South Los Angeles by forming coalitions with other groups. (See Report on AARC’s Redistricting Proposal (May 26, 2011) pp. 2–3, & fn.6.) Indeed, African American-preferred candidates have been elected in four Assembly districts, two California Senate districts, and three congressional districts in South Los Angeles. (*Ibid.*) These candidates have succeeded even despite the fact that African Americans make up less than 30% of the total voting population in some districts. (*Ibid.*) In short, African Americans in Los Angeles County have enjoyed a history of “electoral effectiveness” despite the lack of majority-Black districts. (*Id.* at p. 3.)

The May 26, 2011, submission of the Inland Empire African American Redistricting Coalition made similar points. Likewise, the Black Farmers and Agriculturalist Association observed that “[n]one of the [seats in the State Senate and Congress that are currently held by African Americans] exceeded 30% Black population when drawn in 2001. . . . *Black people have persistently won seats in jurisdictions with less than 20% Black populations.*” (William Boyer, Testimony for California Citizens Redistricting Commission (May 24, 2011) p. 4, italics added.)

There was also a concern raised in public input that concentrating a large percentage of African Americans in a single majority district would actually be detrimental to the ability of African Americans to fairly participate in the electoral process. Some members of the public suggested that the intentional creation of such a majority-Black district could give rise to a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act based on intentional discrimination, or to a “packing” claim.

Based on this substantial input and the dearth of public input to the contrary, the Commission’s counsel advised the Commission that a court considering the totality of circumstances could likely conclude that Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act did not require the creation of a majority-Black district in Los Angeles County. Consequently, the Commission did not create a majority-African American district. The Commission did, however, rely on public testimony and submissions to create districts that took into account significant African American population concentrations, but also relied heavily on non-racial redistricting criteria, which maintained the integrity of cities, local neighborhoods, and local communities of interest and linked together populations with common social and economic interests.

Asian Americans in Los Angeles County

The Commission identified one area of Los Angeles County in which Asian Americans could form a geographically compact majority of the citizen voting age population at the Assembly district level. The Commission heard significant public testimony evidencing a history of racial tension in the area and a lack of political power among the local Asian American community.

For example, according to the submission of the Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (“CAPAFR”), multiple cities in this area have faced enforcement actions from the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) for failing to comply with Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act. (See CAPAFR’s Statewide Plan for California Assembly Districts and Proposed Regional Plan for California Senate District (May 23, 2011) at Tab 2, pp. 7–8.) With respect to the San Gabriel Valley area of Los Angeles in particular, the CAPAFR submission explained

that Asian Americans in the San Gabriel Valley have faced barriers to political participation; local jurisdictions' failures to provide language assistance mandated by Section 203 necessitated enforcement actions by the DOJ against the city of Rosemead in 2005 and the city of Walnut in 2007, each of which resulted in a consent decree. (*Id.* at Tab 2, p. 8.)

In addition, the Commission's counsel directed Dr. Barreto to evaluate evidence of racially polarized voting in the San Gabriel Valley area of Los Angeles County. Based on the evidence evaluated by Dr. Barreto concerning the existence of racially polarized voting with respect to Asian Americans, the Commission's counsel advised that there were sufficient indicia that all three *Gingles* preconditions had been satisfied as to a geographically compact Asian American population in this area, and in consideration of the totality of the circumstances factors, a court could likely find a Section 2 violation if a majority-minority Assembly district were not drawn. The Commission evaluated and considered this advice and also relied on community-of-interest testimony and public input to develop a district with a majority-Asian American population, i.e., Assembly District No. 49.

ii. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act requires California to obtain pre-clearance of its newly drawn congressional, Assembly, Senate, and Board of Equalization redistricting plans from either the Attorney General of the United States or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia before those plans can go into effect. (42 U.S.C. § 1973c.)

Unlike Section 2, Section 5 applies only to changes made in certain counties; specifically, those which imposed a test or device as a prerequisite to voting and in which fewer than half of the residents of voting age were registered to vote, or voted in the presidential elections of 1964, 1968, or 1972. (See 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(b); *Wilson, supra*, 1 Cal.4th at p. 746.) Pursuant to this formula, Section 5 applies to Kings, Merced, Monterey, and Yuba Counties (the "Covered Counties"), and California must submit any statewide voting-related change that affects these counties for pre-clearance to the DOJ or to a federal district court in Washington, D.C. (See, e.g., *Lopez v. Monterey County* (1999) 525 U.S. 266, 287.)

A redistricting scheme that is enacted with the "purpose" of diminishing the ability of racial or language minority groups to elect their preferred candidate violates Section 5. (42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b) ["Any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice or procedure with respect to voting that has the purpose of . . . diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race or color, or [membership in a language minority] to elect their preferred candidates of choice denies or abridges the right to vote within the meaning of . . . this section."].) Congress has broadly defined the "term 'purpose' . . . [to] include any discriminatory purpose." (*Id.* at § 1973c(c).) Upon receiving a redistricting plan for pre-clearance, the DOJ conducts a holistic review of the proposed changes to the Covered Counties and the process used to adopt these changes to determine whether any direct or circumstantial evidence of a discriminatory purpose exists. (See Department of Justice Guidance Concerning Redistricting Under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act (Feb. 9, 2011) 76 Fed. Reg. 7,471 ("DOJ Guidance").)

Even where a redistricting scheme was not enacted with a discriminatory purpose, it will run afoul of Section 5 if it has the “effect” of diminishing the ability of racial or language minority groups to elect their preferred candidate. (42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b) [“Any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice or procedure with respect to voting that . . . will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race or color, or [membership in a language minority] to elect their preferred candidates of choice denies or abridges the right to vote within the meaning of . . . this section.”].) A redistricting scheme “has the ‘effect’ of denying or abridging the right to vote if it leads to a retrogression in the position of racial or language minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise.” (*Riley v. Kennedy* (2008) 553 U.S. 406, 412, internal quotations and alterations omitted.) In determining whether a submitted change is retrogressive, the DOJ will compare the submitted change to the last legally enforceable redistricting plan in force or effect. (See *id.* at p. 421.)

The most recent United States Supreme Court case addressing Section 5 adopted a holistic method for evaluating retrogression. (See *Georgia v. Ashcroft* (2003) 539 U.S. 461, 479–485 (*Ashcroft*)). In doing so, the Court formulated a list of factors to guide the analysis of state-wide redistricting plans, including the number of majority-minority districts appearing in the plan; the number of influence or coalition districts appearing in the plan; the ability of minority groups to elect candidates of choice pursuant to the plan; the minority groups’ ability to influence the political process pursuant to the plan; the political party preferences of minority groups; voter registration rates of minority groups; the ability of representatives of minority communities to obtain leadership positions once elected; whether the representatives elected by minority groups at all levels support the proposed redistricting plan; the merits of alternative proposed redistricting plans; Census data from the time the benchmark plan was created; current Census data; and testimony from individual intervenors. (*Ibid.*)

In 2006, Congress amended the language of Section 5 in part because it believed that the *Ashcroft* decision had “misconstrued Congress’ original intent in enacting the Voting Rights Act of 1965.” (Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (2006) Pub. L. No. 109-246 § 2(b)(6).) Accordingly, Congress refocused the retrogression analysis on “protect[ing] the ability of [racial or language minorities] to elect their preferred candidates of choice.” (See 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(d).) Because the U.S. Supreme Court has not yet construed Section 5 retrogression in light of the 2006 amendment, there is still some uncertainty regarding whether and to what extent the *Georgia v. Ashcroft* factors remain probative in evaluating retrogression. (See *ibid.*) There is also uncertainty about the standards to be applied in evaluating electoral changes covered by Section 5 and the appropriate interpretation of the 2006 amendments. (See, e.g., Persily, *The Promise and Pitfalls of the Voting Rights Act* (2007) 117 Yale L.J. 174, 234–245.)

In light of Section 5, and plausible interpretations of the 2006 Amendments on the retrogression standard, the Commission drew districts that maintained minority voting strength to the extent possible and did not diminish the ability of any minority group to elect their preferred candidates, while also maintaining consistency with the public input concerning appropriate groupings of cities, counties, local neighborhoods, and local communities of interest. The Commission paid close attention to racial and ethnic minority demographics within districts containing all or part of the Covered Counties. In the Commission’s view, in consultation with

its Voting Rights Act counsel, the districts that contain all or part of the Covered Counties are non-retrogressive and do not diminish the ability of protected groups to elect the candidates of their choice.

The districts that include Covered Counties and were therefore subject to the provisions of Section 5 were: Assembly Districts 3 (Yuba), 21 (Merced), 29 (Monterey), 30 (Monterey), and 32 (Kings); Senate Districts 4 (Yuba), 12 (Merced, Monterey), 14 (Kings), and 17 (Monterey); Congressional Districts 3 (Yuba), 16 (Merced), 20 (Monterey), and 21 (Kings); and Board of Equalization Districts 1 (Kings, Merced, Yuba) and 2 (Monterey).

3. Criterion Three: Geographic Contiguity

The Commission's third criterion is that "[d]istricts shall be geographically contiguous." (Cal. Const. art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(3).)

The California Supreme Court has endorsed a "functional" approach to contiguity as it appeared in prior iterations of the Constitution. (See *Wilson, supra*, 1 Cal.4th at p. 725 [approving the special masters' "concept of functional contiguity and compactness"].) Although there is no judicial decision interpreting the term "contiguous" under Propositions 11 or 20, the Commission has relied on commonly accepted interpretations of contiguity that focus on ensuring that areas within a district are connected to each other.

All of the Commission's districts are geographically contiguous and comply with the Voters First Act. Historically, several islands that lie off the California coastline (e.g., Santa Catalina Island, the Farallon Islands, and the Channel Islands) have formed portions of California counties—these islands traditionally have been maintained in congressional, legislative, or Board of Equalization districts that contain all or part of such counties. The islands satisfy contiguity requirements by being contiguous by water travel. In similar areas, such as the city of Coronado in San Diego County, the Commission employed a functional approach to contiguity, relying on forms of water travel, such as regularly scheduled ferryboats, to maintain contiguity within a district.

4. Criterion Four: Geographic Integrity

The Commission's fourth criterion provides: "[t]he geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, local neighborhood, or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes their division to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions." (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(4).) The Commission relied on Census geographic data to determine the boundaries of cities, counties, and the city and county of San Francisco. In addition, the Commission relied on appropriate municipal data such as planning department boundaries or neighborhood council boundaries to help determine the boundaries of neighborhoods in major cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco.

A local "community of interest" is defined under the Constitution as "a contiguous population which shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Examples of such shared interests are those common to an urban area, a rural area, an industrial area, or an agricultural area, and those common to areas in which the people share similar living standards, use the same

transportation facilities, have similar work opportunities, or have access to the same media of communication relevant to the election process.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(4).)

Section 2(d)(4) also clarifies that “[c]ommunities of interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents or political candidates.” (See Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(4); accord *id.*, § 2, subd. (e) [“Districts shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.”].)

As discussed above, the Commission’s map-drawing process included extensive public hearings and other opportunities for public input. The Commission took this input into account and its maps minimized the division of counties, cities, local neighborhoods, and local communities of interest to the extent possible. The Commission accomplished the goal of minimizing fragmentation of geographic areas by using a district-by-district approach in which the Commission deliberated over the best approach to minimize the splitting of cities, counties, neighborhoods, and local communities of interest. When those same-level criteria were in conflict and could not be simultaneously satisfied, the Commission chose the configuration that best reflected the shared interests of the community.

5. Criterion Five: Geographic Compactness

The Commission’s fifth criterion in order of priority states that “[t]o the extent practicable, and where this does not conflict with the criteria above, districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(5).) While compactness is not mathematically or geographically defined under the Act, at a minimum, it indicates that nearby areas of population should not be bypassed for more distant population, to the extent practicable and unless required by a higher-ordered criterion.

The Commission’s districts are geographically compact under the definition of compactness within the Act, both to the extent practicable and in light of higher-ranked other criteria such as compliance with the United States Constitution, the federal Voting Rights Act, geographic contiguity, and maintaining the geographic integrity of cities, counties, local neighborhoods, and local communities of interest.

6. Criterion Six: Nesting

The Commission’s first draft maps issued on June 10, 2011, reflected an attempt to achieve nearly full compliance with the nesting criterion. (See Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (d)(6).) Almost all Senate districts were made up of two whole Assembly Districts, and each Board of Equalization District was made up of ten whole Senate districts. However, the Commission determined that its June 10, 2011 draft maps might not achieve full compliance with the Voting Rights Act through nesting and that many nested districts exacerbated the division of counties and cities. Accordingly, the Commission determined that in most instances it was not practicable, in light of higher-ordered criteria, to achieve strict compliance with the nesting criterion.

The Commission’s final maps attempted to nest two whole Assembly districts within a single Senate district, where practicable, and ten whole Senate districts within a single Board of

Equalization District, where practicable. In most instances, however, the Commission achieved only partial nesting in order to comply with higher-ranked criteria, such as minimizing the division of cities and counties within Senate and Board of Equalization districts. Nevertheless, the Commission achieved significant partial nesting, or “blended” Senate districts made up of two Assembly districts with substantial portions put together in one Senate district. This allowed the Commission to best comply with the higher-ranked criteria and repair unavoidable splits that occurred in the Assembly districts.

Specifically, three of the Commission’s Senate districts were between 65% and 69.9% nested. Fifteen of the Senate districts were between 70% and 79% nested. Ten of the Senate districts were between 80% and 89.9% nested. Nine of the Senate districts were between 90% and 99.9% nested. And three of the Senate districts were 100% nested.

7. *No Consideration of Incumbent Status*

Article XXI states that the “place of residence of any incumbent or political candidate shall not be considered in the creation of a map. Districts shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.” (Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2, subd. (e).)

In strict compliance with this requirement, the Commission gave no consideration to incumbent status, partisan registration, or residences of candidates or incumbents when drawing districts.

8. *Numbering of Districts*

Article IV, section 2 of the California Constitution provides that California’s 40 Senators are elected to four-year terms, half of which begin every two years. (Cal. Const., art. IV, § 2, subd. (a).) Under this system, 20 of California’s Senate seats are up for election every two years. The next Senate election—in 2012—will apply to all of the odd-numbered Senate districts, while even-numbered Senate districts are up for election in 2014.

Because all of the odd-numbered Senate district seats will be up for election in 2012, the Commission took note of the following practical issue: following the release of the new maps, some Californians who had voted in Senate elections in 2008 and would have been eligible to vote again in 2012, because they had been in an odd-numbered district, might have to wait until 2014 to vote, because they would subsequently be in an even-numbered district after the decennial redistricting. This issue is commonly known as “deferral.” Conversely, other Californians who had voted in Senate elections in 2010 and would have been eligible to vote again in 2014, because they had been in an even-numbered district, might be able to vote two years earlier in 2012, because they would subsequently be in an odd-numbered district. This is commonly known as “acceleration.”

Consequently, in light of these issues, the Commission chose a numbering alternative for Senate districts that best maintained continuity in terms of the placement of voters in odd and even districts. In other words, if a voter was in an odd-numbered Senate district during the last decade, the Commission chose the numbering alternative that maximized the likelihood that this

same voter would remain in an odd-numbered Senate district for the next decade, thereby minimizing deferral.

For each Senate district that it drew, the Commission determined the percentage of the population in that district that had been in an odd-numbered district during the last decade. The Commission selected the 20 Senate districts with the highest percentage of voters who had been in odd-numbered districts during the last decade. These 20 districts were selected as the odd-numbered districts. The remaining 20 districts became the even-numbered districts.

Next, the Commission took the 20 odd-numbered districts and started with the northernmost district along the Oregon Border. This was given the number SD 1. The Commission then moved south, based on the northernmost point in each remaining odd-numbered district, and numbered each district consecutively: SD 3, 5, 7, 9, etc.

Finally, the Commission took the northernmost even-numbered district along the Oregon border and gave it the number SD 2. The Commission then moved south, based on the northernmost point in each remaining even-numbered district, and numbered each district consecutively: SD 2, 4, 6, 8, etc.

The Commission did seriously consider alternative numbering systems for Senate districts, such as a simple north-to-south consecutive numbering scheme, but made the determination that an approach that minimized deferrals would result in the most fair and effective representation for voters throughout the state.

III. DETAILS ABOUT THE DISTRICTS

Set forth below is a discussion of each of the statewide maps for Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization, and California's congressional delegation. We begin with an overview of the regional issues and include a discussion of the major issues and decisions made for each district.

Details about each district are provided in the data Appendices attached to this report. In addition, interactive maps with street-level detail are available on the Statewide Database website or by downloading Equivalency, Shape or .kmz files that work with the free Google Earth program. Links for both are available at <http://www.wedrawthelines.ca.gov>. The official version of the final maps and accompanying data have been delivered to the Secretary of State.

A. Regional Overview

California is the most populous state in the nation and the third largest by landmass. It is a state of great geographic and ethnic diversity, and appreciation of this diversity was one of the key selection criteria for Commissioners. This state is home to both the highest and lowest points in the Continental United States—Mt. Whitney and Death Valley—as well as sunny beaches, wind-whipped coasts, redwood forests, rugged mountains, high and low deserts, internationally renowned metropolitan centers, and an agricultural heartland that feeds the nation and the world. With its reputation as a land of opportunity, the state has attracted a steady stream of immigrants and now boasts a polyglot of languages and ethnicities. Since the Gold Rush, California has

exceeded the population growth rate of the country. In 2010, for the first time, even though immigration to the state continues, people born in California now exceed the number of people who have migrated here to live.

2010 was the first year where California's population growth matched the national average of 10%, but the growth has been far from even throughout the state. Coastal areas grew more slowly than inland areas. For example, Los Angeles County grew at only a 3% rate, leading to a relative loss of electoral districts. In addition to the geographic shift of districts, there were significant differences in the growth of the different racial groups residing in California. 2009 marked the first year where no racial group had a majority. According to the 2010 Census, the Asian American population grew at the fastest rate of 31%. Latinos as a group had the largest increase in the number of people, and with a growth rate of 28% are expected to eventually become the single largest ethnic group in the state. In contrast, African Americans had the lowest increase at 2%.

The Commission had to consider all of these demographic shifts in the decennial process of redistricting. To realize its mission of creating fair representation for Californians, the Commission also considered natural topography, ecological zones, and industrial/economic interests that define communities, as well as transportation corridors that either link or serve as barriers to access.

For Northern California and the mountainous Sierra foothills regions, the Commission responded to public testimony asking us to separate more sparsely populated, rural regions from densely populated, urban areas. The 19 counties north of Sacramento span approximately a third of California's land, yet make up fewer than 5% of its residents, for a population density of 35 persons/square mile. In comparison, San Francisco has a population density of over 17,000 persons/square mile.

The San Francisco Bay Area is characterized by the topography of its Bay, which creates natural water boundaries, a peninsula, and inland areas that shaped the districts there. In general, the Commission avoided crossing bridges unless absolutely necessary to achieve population equality.

For the San Joaquin Valley and Central Coast regions, the Commission responded to public testimony asking us to respect the mountain range in between the two regions, with only one exception (the Senate district drawn to comply with the Section 5 benchmarks for Merced and Monterey Counties, which connected inland Merced County with the eastern part of Monterey County and San Benito County). The Tehachapi Mountains in the south also separate the Central Valley from Los Angeles County, and the Commission was able to honor this major boundary between regions. There was conflicting testimony about separating the communities of the Central Valley floor with that of the foothills and Sierras to the east, so the Commission further struck a balance maintaining the separations and connections between the Valley floor and these communities. Issues of water use, agriculture and urban economies, transportation routes, and environmental concerns framed much of the public testimony.

Southern California's six counties boast over half of the state's residents in the southern quarter of California. The Inland Empire region experienced one of the highest rates of

population growth within the state, including Riverside County, which increased by 41% and is home to two of the newest cities in the state, Eastvale and Jurupa Valley. This was a marked contrast with the Los Angeles metropolitan area which grew more slowly. However, Los Angeles County is still the state's largest county and continues to be home to a tremendous diversity of Californians, where:

- The Asian American population grew from 1,137,500 to 1,345,149 for an increase of 18.3%
- The African American population declined from 930,957 to 856,874, a reduction of -8%
- The Hispanic Population increased from 4,242,213 to 4,687,889, an increase of more than 10%

As discussed above, this area presented several specific issues under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

B. The Assembly Districts

The 80 Assembly districts have an ideal population of 465,674, and in consideration of population equality, the Commission chose to limit the population deviation range to +/-1.0% (reflecting a total population deviation of 2.0%). With these districts, the Commission was able to respect many local communities of interest and group similar communities; however, it was more difficult to keep densely populated counties, cities, neighborhoods, and larger communities of interest whole due to the district size and correspondingly smaller number allowable in the population deviation percentage. A total of ten counties and 35 cities smaller than an Assembly district were split. The highest positive deviation was 0.999% and the lowest negative deviation was -0.982%, with an average deviation of 0.506%.

AD 1 consists of the whole counties of Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, eastern Butte and eastern Placer counties. This district includes the north mountain watershed, northeastern desert and the North Lake Tahoe basin. This district is characterized by agriculture, timber, mountain tourism and country living and also includes several Native American communities. Butte County was split to achieve population equality, and the mountainous portion of Placer County is included.

AD 2 consists of the north coast, including the whole counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino and northern Sonoma County to achieve population equality, which are separated from inland areas by the coastal mountain range. This district is characterized by fishing/marine, wine industry and coastal tourism interests and includes several Native American communities. The largest city in the district, the Sonoma County seat of Santa Rosa, was split to achieve population equality and in an attempt to keep part of it within the north coastal district, with which it has many economic interests.

AD 3 consists of the whole counties of Tehama, Glenn, Yuba, Sutter, northern Colusa, and western Butte counties. This district includes a Covered County (Yuba) and complies with

the Section 5 requirements. The district is characterized by inland agriculture crops such as rice and almonds and includes a large Sikh community, as well as Hmong farming communities. Colusa and Butte counties were split to achieve population equality and to group similar agricultural interests. The Yuba City-Marysville area, which sits on the Yuba-Sutter border, is kept whole.

AD 4 includes the whole counties of Lake and Napa, all of Yolo County except West Sacramento, southern Colusa County, and small portions of Sonoma County, including the city of Rohnert Park and the city of Dixon in Solano County to achieve population equality. Its primary shared economic interest is agriculture, both valley agricultural bases, such as wheat, corn, tomatoes, alfalfa and various tree crops, and the wine-growing regions of Napa, Lake, and Sonoma counties. It is unified north and south through the I-5 transportation corridor. Public testimony also expressed close working relationships between several cities located in the district such as between Woodland and Davis, and Davis and Dixon.

AD 5 includes the whole counties of Madera, Mariposa, Mono, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Alpine, Amador, western El Dorado County and a small portion of Placer County. This is a foothill district that keeps together communities from South Lake Tahoe through the foothills and Sierra Nevada Mountains including the El Dorado National Forest, Stanislaus National Forest, Mt. Whitney, and Mammoth Lakes. It reflects shared interests reflected in public testimony around issues such as weather, watershed, fire and recreation united around the transportation corridor of Highway 49 which runs north and south along the Sierra foothills. El Dorado County is split above Folsom Lake to distinguish the communities in the foothills from the greater Sacramento area.

AD 6 consists of the foothill suburbs of Sacramento including parts of Sacramento, El Dorado, and Placer Counties. It includes the communities that surround Folsom Lake with its shared recreational interests around the Folsom Dam.

AD 7 includes the main part of the city of Sacramento and all of West Sacramento in Yolo County and parts of Sacramento County, including the Sacramento International Airport. Its primary economic and social community of interest is urban Sacramento, and includes communities that are tied to both the private and government employment sectors.

AD 8 includes the undivided cities of Rancho Cordova and Citrus Heights as well as the eastern portion of Sacramento County. The district has common social and economic interests shared by residents of smaller cities and suburbs, as well as regional development.

AD 9 consists of the southern part of Sacramento County including the city of Elk Grove. It extends into San Joaquin County to include the city of Lodi which public testimony identified as having a community of interest with the city of Galt in Sacramento County. This district also joins a community of interest made up of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders with shared economic and social ties based on income status, housing, language, and immigration status, including a large Hmong immigrant community.

AD 10 consists of the entire county of Marin and extends north to include communities in southern Sonoma County including part of Santa Rosa to achieve population equality. It keeps

whole the sister cities of Petaluma, Cotati, and Sebastopol. This district is characterized by suburban and rural areas including a significant dairy industry.

AD 11 includes key Solano County suburban cities along the I-80 transportation corridor such as Vacaville and Fairfield. Portions of Sacramento County are included, as are smaller delta communities in south Solano County, with their counterparts in northern Contra Costa County. Contra Costa's anchor cities include Antioch, which shares a community of interest with Brentwood, Oakley and Discovery Bay. Pittsburg is split to achieve population equality along Highway 4, keeping the less urban portion of the city in this district.

AD 12 includes the eastern section of Stanislaus County and the southern and eastern portions of San Joaquin County. Eastern Stanislaus County includes the remainder of the city of Modesto split which was not included in the Merced County Section 5 district (AD 21). The district also includes the additional Stanislaus County communities east of Highway 99 (Salida, Riverbank, and Turlock) as well as southern San Joaquin County cities (Manteca, Lathrop, and Ripon) and a majority of eastern San Joaquin County (Lockeford, Linden, and Farmington). This district shares commonalities of smaller urban cities with agricultural and open areas, as well as serving as gateway transportation routes to the Foothills and Sierras via State Routes 4 and 120.

AD 13 includes the majority of San Joaquin County. This district consists of the cities of Stockton and Tracy and a non-contiguous, one-person split of the city of Lodi. This district maintains the integrity of San Joaquin County while minimizing city splits without crossing the mountains to the west or into the foothill districts to the east. San Joaquin County's two largest cities, Stockton and Tracy, are in this district, as are several smaller cities that share common interests in agriculture. This district also keeps the link between the Stockton Port and the deep water channel with the deltas to the west as a main water transportation route.

AD 14 consists of southern Solano County's urban areas of Vallejo and Benicia, along with the northern Contra Costa County cities connected via the Carquinez and Benicia-Martinez bridges. This district contains the industrial part of Pittsburg, along with Bay Point, Concord, Mt. Diablo State Park, and surrounding environs to the county line.

AD 15 includes coastal, western Contra Costa County's anchor city of Richmond along with smaller towns of San Pablo and El Cerrito. The district continues south on the I-80 corridor to pick up Berkeley, Emeryville, and some of northern Oakland including Piedmont. As with many East Bay districts, these communities are connected to regional park interests—including Tilden and the Point Pinole Regional shoreline.

AD 16 includes the Contra Costa County "Lamorinda" cities of Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda on the Highway 24 corridor, east of the Berkeley/Oakland hills. It continues southeast in Alameda County along the 680 corridor encompassing Danville, San Ramon, and the Tri-Valley area of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore. The district extends fully east and south to the Alameda County line.

AD 17 consists of the eastern half of the city and county of San Francisco. This district includes the core neighborhoods containing the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender ("LGBT")

community, as well as several lower-income, immigrant and working-class neighborhoods, such as Chinatown, Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, and Bayview-Hunters Point.

AD 18 consists of bayside portions of Alameda County including the majority of the city of Oakland, with the regional Port of Oakland and Oakland International Airport, the island of Alameda, and San Leandro. In addition to containing highly urbanized neighborhoods, these communities are connected to regional park interests including Redwood and Chabot Parks.

AD 19 consists of the western half of the city and county of San Francisco, the Farallon Islands, the cities of Daly City and Colma, and part of South San Francisco. It keeps intact a mostly Filipino-American community in Daly City, Colma, Broadmoor, and part of South San Francisco that shares cultural traditions and community centers, as well as similar socioeconomic characteristics with other Asian Americans in western San Francisco, such as higher rates of home ownership and limited English proficiency.

AD 20 includes the majority of the “Eden” area of Alameda County: Castro Valley and smaller unincorporated communities such as Ashland, Cherryland, and San Lorenzo. Hayward and Union City are in their entirety, along with the northernmost portion of Fremont. As with many East Bay districts, these communities are connected to regional park interests including Sunol Wilderness and Ohlone Regional Wilderness. Alameda County is split to achieve population equality.

AD 21 includes all of Merced County and the western portion of Stanislaus County, west of Highway 99. Cities included within Stanislaus County are all of Patterson and Ceres, which include similar farmworker communities, and part of Modesto to meet the requirements for Merced County under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.⁶

AD 22 consists of a portion of South San Francisco and keeps most of northern San Mateo County together, including the northern coast communities from Pacifica to Moss Beach and the peninsula cities from Brisbane to Redwood City. The district shares common economic interests linked to smaller cities and suburbs, as well as interests in coastal and environmental preservation.

⁶ The boundaries of AD 21 were drawn partly to avoid retrogression in comparison to the benchmark district containing Merced County. One issue that the Commission evaluated was the elimination of a north protruding “finger” that had been created as a result of the 2001 redistricting and reached north to include a small portion of the city of Stockton in San Joaquin County. The Commission did not find support in the public testimony or its deliberations for including the “Stockton finger” in the Merced area district. However, there was a concern that elimination of the Stockton finger resulted in a district that had a slight percentage decline in the total Asian American population as compared to the benchmark district, from approximately 11% of the voting age population (VAP) to approximately 6%. The Commission was unable to conclude that the reduction in Asian American VAP would have an impact on the ability of Asian Americans in the Merced area to effectively participate in the electoral process on a basis equal to other voters in the County. Legal counsel advised the Commission that AD 21 complies with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and does not diminish the ability of any racial or language minority to elect candidates of their choice.

AD 23 contains the eastern section of Fresno County not included in AD 31, as well as a small section of Tulare County to achieve population equity. In an effort to maintain compact districts, AD 23 was built around the remainder of the split in the city of Fresno including the northern parts of the city of Fresno and the eastern communities in Fresno County including Clovis and those in the foothills and southern Sierra. This district allowed the remainder of Fresno County to be intact in an eastern foothill and Sierra district. Also included in this district are the national forests communities of Shaver Lake and Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park and stops at the Inyo and Mono County lines.

AD 24 captures southern San Mateo County, includes its coast, and pairs it with northern Santa Clara County. The district includes the community of interest around Stanford University—Menlo Park, Palo Alto, East Palo Alto, Atherton, and Woodside—as well as the sister cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale and a small portion of Cupertino to achieve population equality. Many of these communities are either home to high technology firms or to their many employees. This district also includes many open space preserves and shared interests in environmental protection with the coastal communities from Granada to the Ano Nuevo State Reserve.

AD 25 contains portions of Alameda County and Santa Clara County. Included in the district are the cities of Newark, Milpitas, and Santa Clara, as well as portions of Fremont and San Jose, which were divided to satisfy population equality requirements for the district. The district maintains a variety of cities and local communities of interests, including communities linked by common social and economic interests in the areas of Fremont, Milpitas, and the Berryessa neighborhood of San Jose. The district is also marked by common interests arising from the high technology economy of the region.

AD 26 includes almost all of Tulare County and Inyo County whole, with cities along the Highway 99 corridor of Visalia, Tulare and Pixley, as well as communities in eastern Tulare County (Orange Cove, Orosi, Cutler, and Porterville). This district also includes a small section of Northern Kern County for contiguity of the southern Sequoia National Forest communities along Highway 178 around Lake Isabella. This district is a balance of smaller communities in the San Joaquin Valley cities along Highway 99, such as Tulare and Visalia, along with those communities east of Highway 99, moving into the foothills and Sierras. Also included in the district are the less densely populated communities in Inyo County along US Route 395.

AD 27 contains about half of the Santa Clara County city of San Jose, including its downtown neighborhoods. Because of its size, the city of San Jose is divided among multiple Assembly districts in order to satisfy population equality requirements. The district maintains a variety of local neighborhoods and local communities of interest, such as the Alum Rock (Eastside) area and the Evergreen neighborhood, which were identified as significant areas for Latino and Asian American communities linked by social and economic interests, lower-income status, and recent immigration.

AD 28 contains portions of Santa Clara County, including the cities of Campbell, Los Gatos, and Saratoga, as well as a number of unincorporated areas of the county. The district also contains most of the city of Cupertino and a portion of the city of San Jose, which were divided to satisfy population equality requirements. The district includes urban areas, suburban cities,

and, in the western and southern areas of the district, a number of parks and open space preserves.

AD 29 contains major portions of Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, as well as a small portion of Santa Clara County. The cities include Santa Cruz, Seaside, Monterey, Marina, Pacific Grove, Scotts Valley, Capitola, and Carmel-by-the-Sea. A small portion of San Jose was included in the district to achieve population equality. The district is one of two assembly districts containing a portion of Monterey County, which is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. This district is in compliance with Section 5's requirements. The district contains a range of smaller cities and unincorporated areas, as well as several state and county parks. The Monterey Bay coastline (part of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary) is fully contained within the district.

AD 30 contains San Benito County, as well as portions of Monterey County, Santa Clara County, and Santa Cruz County. Cities included in the district are Salinas, Watsonville, Gilroy, Morgan Hill, Hollister, Soledad, Greenfield, King City, Gonzales, and San Juan Bautista. The district contains a portion of Monterey County, which is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. This district is in compliance with Section 5's requirements. The district contains several small cities and communities that share common social and economic interests, including core agricultural interests.

AD 31 includes the western portion of Fresno County and a portion of the city of Fresno. Other cities included in this district are Sanger, Reedley, Orange Cove, Selma, Fowler, and the western portion of Fresno County. Outside of the city of Fresno, this district maintains the predominately agricultural areas in Fresno County along the Interstate 5 corridor and west of U.S. Route 99. The only split is the city of Fresno, which was divided to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

AD 32 includes all of Kings County, which is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. This district complies with Section 5. The district also includes a portion of Kern County. The city of Bakersfield was split to comply with Section 5. The other communities in Kern County are those in the western portion of the county along the I-5 corridor (Lost Hills and Buttonwillow), northern Kern County along the Highway 99 corridor (Shafter and McFarland), and south of Bakersfield including Arvin, Weedpatch, and Lamont, which have common agricultural interests. This district's boundaries are similar to the prior benchmark district. A slight change was made to the portion of Kern County around the city of Bakersfield by circling a portion of Bakersfield to the south and west to reach the city of Arvin.

AD 33 consists of the sparsely populated areas of San Bernardino County from the northern boundary. The district includes the cities of Adelanto, Apple Valley, Barstow, Big Bear, Hesperia, Needles, and unincorporated areas of Victorville, Crestline, Lake Arrowhead and Running Springs. This district is characterized by the high desert communities of interest and San Bernardino National Forest, which include communities of Crestline to Big Bear that share the common lifestyle of the mountain forest area of the county and similar interests in wildlife and emergency services concerns regarding wildfire danger.

AD 34 includes the remainder of Kern County outside of AD 32. This includes the northwestern section of the city of Bakersfield as well as the far western Kern County cities of Taft and Maricopa as well as the southern County communities of Bear Valley Springs, Tehachapi, and into the foothills with Ridgecrest and China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station. This district keeps the integrity of the southernmost geographical boundary of the San Joaquin Valley without crossing the coastal range to the west or the Tehachapi Mountains into Los Angeles County to the South. These boundaries were important geographic barriers for communities in the Valley floor and the foothills, as well as those along the western coast that preferred to be placed in districts distinct from the Central Valley communities to the east.

AD 35 is anchored by the Monterey County line in the north and flows south with the Pacific Ocean on the west and the coast mountain range on the east. It includes all of San Luis Obispo County and parts of Santa Barbara County, including Vandenberg Air Force Base, Mission Hills, and Lompoc to achieve population equality. It incorporates the cities of Paso Robles, Atascadero, San Luis Obispo, Santa Maria, and Lompoc. It keeps the US-101 transportation corridor intact throughout the district.

AD 36 encompasses the Antelope Valley; the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale are most prominent, connected along the 14 freeway. The district extends into Kern County to the north in order to achieve population equality. Los Angeles County communities include Quartz Hill, Acton, Little Rock, Baker, Lake Los Angeles, and Wrightwood. Prominent communities in Kern County include Rosamond, Mojave, Reefer City, North Edwards, Boron, and California City. The Edwards Air Force Base is a major military installation and employment center in the region. Natural habitats include the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve, Saddleback Butte State Park, and Ritter Ranch.

AD 37 includes parts of Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. It incorporates the cities of Buellton and Solvang on the west and flows towards the southeast to capture the coast cities of Goleta, Santa Barbara and Carpinteria. In Ventura County, it includes the cities of Ojai and San Buenaventura as well as Santa Paula, Fillmore, and the community of Piru in the Santa Clara Valley, which is a major agricultural area in the county. It also includes a split of Oxnard to achieve population equality. Most of the northern portion of the district is covered by the Los Padres National Forest (recreation, watershed and wilderness) which is part of the coastal mountain range.

AD 38 includes the far northern portion of the San Fernando Valley and Santa Clarita Valley. The district extends from the Simi Valley at the west to Castaic Lake and Agua Dulce to the north. The major east-west thoroughfare is the Ronald Reagan Freeway (Highway 118); the major north-south thoroughfare is the Golden State Freeway (I-5). Major cities and communities include the city of Santa Clarita, and the communities of Twin Lakes, Porter Ranch, Val Verde, Stevenson Ranch, Saugus, Valencia, Newhall, Elayon, Canyon Country, Humphreys, and Agua Dulce. There is significant open space area in this district and the commercial clusters are prominent in Santa Clarita as the regional hub as well as the Simi Valley.

AD 39 includes the entire city of San Fernando and the northeast portion of the San Fernando Valley, within the city of Los Angeles. The Foothill Freeway (I-210) is a significant transportation corridor to the region, as well as Foothill Boulevard. This district includes the

communities of Sylmar, Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Stonehurst, Shadow Hills, Sun Valley, Pacoima, Arleta, Sunland, Tujunga, and a portion of North Hollywood and the NoHo Arts District. This district also includes areas of the Angeles National Forest, Hansen Flood Control Basin, and the Whiteman Airport.

AD 40 consists of the cities of Redlands, Highland, Loma Linda, and portions of San Bernardino and Rancho Cucamonga to achieve population equality. The district is characterized by similar communities of interest and common economic business relationships with surrounding communities of the city of San Bernardino. The district shape results from consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act district in central San Bernardino to the southwest. Rancho Cucamonga shares a common bond with its county, but was split to achieve population equality.

AD 41 includes the Los Angeles city of Pasadena as a hub for the adjacent cities and communities of Altadena, South Pasadena, Monrovia, San Dimas, La Verne, and Claremont, and the San Bernardino communities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, and San Antonio Heights. Mt. Baldy is whole in this district. The I-210 Freeway passes through all portions of this district, and provides a connection for these cities for commerce, entertainment, and recreation. The district also connects foothill cities with common interest in the Angeles National Forest lands and public users of the foothill and mountain areas. Highway 2 traverses the northern part of this district. The cities of Monrovia and Rancho Cucamonga are split in this district to achieve population equality.

AD 42 consists of the cities of the western Coachella Valley, including La Quinta, Indian Wells, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and other Riverside County cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, San Jacinto, and a portion of Hemet. Hemet is the only city split in this district to achieve population equality. The district crosses into San Bernardino County and includes Twentynine Palms, and unincorporated areas of Yucca Valley, Morongo Valley, Joshua Tree and Yucaipa. This district is densely populated at city centers, but more sparsely populated in other areas. This district is characterized by the interests of the western Coachella Valley, and includes tourism, a retirement community with needs for health care access, and bedroom communities. This district also recognizes the agricultural ties of San Jacinto and Hemet.

AD 43 is bounded on the east by the Los Angeles County foothill communities of La Crescenta and La Canada, crosses Verdugo Hills west into Burbank and includes Glendale, bounded on the west to include Griffith Park. Bob Hope Airport is in this district. The interests represented in this district include the Angeles National Forest foothills with fire, watershed and other environmental concerns. Additional shared interests include public fire, educational, and safety services, use of the Bob Hope Airport, and recreational and environmental concerns. The city of Los Angeles is split in this district to achieve population equality.

AD 44 incorporates approximately half of Ventura County and a small portion of Los Angeles County. Southwest Oxnard is connected with El Rio, which shares common agricultural, economic, shopping and transportation interests and includes a Mixteco indigenous farmworker community. The district includes the cities of Port Hueneme, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, Oak Park and Westlake Village. It also includes the Port of Hueneme and the

Point Mugu Naval Air Station. It maintains the US-101 corridor, which contains major shopping areas as well as transportation through the district. There is one city split of Oxnard to achieve population equality.

AD 45 includes the western portion of the San Fernando Valley within the city of Los Angeles. Prominent communities include Bell Canyon (which is located in Ventura County, but is only accessible through the Valley), Chatsworth, West Hills, Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Woodland Hills, the Warner Center, Canoga Park, Winnetka, Tarzana, Encino, Reseda, and Northridge. Cal State University Northridge and Encino Hospital are major employers. This district also includes many open-space areas such as Lake Balboa and the Sepulveda Basin Recreation area. A significant portion of the southern boundary is distinguished by the Mulholland Drive Scenic Corridor.

AD 46 includes the eastern portion of the San Fernando Valley within the city of Los Angeles. Prominent communities include North Hills, Panorama City, Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks, Valley Village, Studio City, North Hollywood, Toluca Lake, Universal Studios, and the Hollywood Hills. This district includes shared interests around the entertainment industry. There is considerable open space south of Ventura Boulevard, leading towards the southern boundary at Mulholland Drive, adjacent to the Beverly Glen, Coldwater Canyon and Laurel Canyon north-south corridors. The Ventura Freeway (Highway 101) traverses the district east and west.

AD 47 consists of the San Bernardino County cities of Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Rialto, a portion of the city of San Bernardino, and unincorporated county areas such as Muscoy and Bloomington. The city of San Bernardino is the only city split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This district contains communities with similar socioeconomic characteristics, shared school districts, police services, common watershed, and a growing African American community.

AD 48 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Azusa, Glendora, Baldwin Park, Covina, West Covina, Charter Oak, and Irwindale. These are communities with many blue-collar neighborhoods. Two main transportation corridors (I-210 and I-10 freeways) connect the cities for commercial needs. There are also residents of these communities who testified about their connection to the Angeles National Forest for recreation purposes. The northern cities in this district have an interest in the fire, watershed and recreational concerns of the foothills. The cities of El Monte, Industry, Monrovia and West Covina are split in this district to achieve population equality and due an adjacent district drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

AD 49 includes Los Angeles County cities and communities of Arcadia, San Marino, San Gabriel, Temple City, Monterey Park, El Monte, South El Monte, Montebello, Rosemead, South San Gabriel, Temple City, and Alhambra. El Monte airport is in this district. Some of the main transportation corridors, which support commerce across the district, are the I-10 Freeway, Las Tunas/Main, and Huntington Drive. The district shares commercial, cultural, educational connections among the Asian American residents of these cities, as well as common concerns of recent immigrant populations, including language access, social services, and protection from financial predatory schemes. The cities of El Monte, Montebello, and South El Monte are split in

this district to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

AD 50 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Agoura Hills, Beverly Hills, Hollywood, Malibu, Santa Monica, and West Hollywood. This district is characterized by 40 miles of Pacific coastline and the Santa Monica Mountains, which represent one of the largest protected areas of the Mediterranean-type ecosystem. These mountains include the Leo Carrillo, Malibu Creek and Topanga State Parks. They also include the Stone Canyon and Franklin Canyon Reservoirs. This district also includes Santa Monica College, the Santa Monica Municipal Airport, and the heavily commercial and residential Wilshire corridor. The city of Los Angeles was split at various locations to achieve population equality.

AD 51 includes the historical community of East Los Angeles, a census designated place which is kept whole, and the neighborhoods of Glassell Park, El Sereno, Echo Park, Eagle Rock, Elysian Park, Mt. Washington, Atwater Village, and Silver Lake, which was split to achieve population equality. Common social and economic interests, such as lower-income and middle-income status, as well as housing and transportation interests link Echo Park, Elysian Park, and El Sereno, to the Glassell Park and Eagle Rock areas.

AD 52 consists of the Pomona Valley, including an unincorporated part of Fontana, located primarily in San Bernardino County. This district contains the city of Pomona, which is part of Los Angeles County, but separated geographically by Kellogg Hill. This district is characterized by common social activities in the community consisting of local children's sports organizations, hospital services, and common socioeconomic characteristics and was also drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

AD 53 includes downtown Los Angeles and a portion of Huntington Park, which is split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Also included are designated neighborhoods of Boyle Heights, Koreatown, Pico Union and West Lake. Many neighborhoods in this district include large populations of recent immigrants with similar linguistic and social needs. In addition, the district includes anchor social and cultural institutions such as LA Live and the Staples Center.

AD 54 includes the Los Angeles County communities of Century City, Culver City, Westwood, Mar Vista, Palms, Baldwin Hills, Windsor Hills, Ladera Heights, View Park, Crenshaw, Leimert Park, Mid City, and West Los Angeles. This district is prominently characterized by a very high residential density, the campus of UCLA in Westwood, the Veterans Hospital and Administration complex, West Los Angeles Community College, and the PXP oil fields. Several historically significant African American neighborhoods, and several prominent Jewish communities, such as Cheviot Hills, Rancho Park, Beverlywood, and South Robertson are also included. This district is ethnically and socioeconomically diverse. The city of Inglewood and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality. The Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area as well as the Baldwin Hills State Park and Scenic Overlook are also included within this district.

AD 55 includes the northern portion of Orange County, eastern Los Angeles County and southern San Bernardino County known as the Four Corners Area. Communities in this district

include Brea, Chino Hills, La Habra, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Rowland Heights and Walnut, and portions of the cities of Industry and West Covina to achieve population equality. This district includes common social and economic interests of Asian American communities in Diamond Bar, Walnut, Chino Hills, and Rowland Heights, where each share common areas of worship and entertainment centers. The Four Corners area shares a transportation policy committee and a wildlife conservation association.

AD 56 consists of Imperial County and the Riverside County cities in the eastern Coachella Valley, including Desert Hot Springs, Cathedral City, Coachella, Indio, Blythe and unincorporated areas of Riverside County including Mecca, Thermal and Palo Verde Valley. This district is the low desert region of California and is characterized by the common agricultural interests of east Coachella valley and Imperial County, and common interests surround the Salton Sea as portions of it are located in both Riverside and Imperial Counties.

AD 57 contains communities along the Los Angeles County-Orange County border. It includes Whittier, West Whittier, South Whittier, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Santa Fe Springs, La Puente, Avocado Heights, and portions of the cities of Industry, Norwalk and South El Monte, which were divided to achieve population equality. The district reflects shared concerns about education, safety, and economic interests, along with transportation interests among cities that share the 605 Freeway as a major corridor on the western boundary of the district.

AD 58 consists of the Los Angeles County cities of Downey, Commerce, Pico Rivera, Bell Gardens, Bellflower along the I-5 corridor running southeast to northeast and part of Montebello and Norwalk along the same corridor. On the southern end of the district are the cities of Artesia and Cerritos along the 605 and I-5 exchange. Montebello and Norwalk are split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The northern portion of the district has a shared industrial and commercial character and a long-established Latino community. The southern portion of the district contains a vibrant Asian and South-Asian community with many shared cultural and economic interests.

AD 59 includes the south and central portion of the city of Los Angeles. The district is characterized by shared interests common to highly urbanized areas, including low-income status, interests in affordable housing and economic development, and the growth of recent immigrant communities. Prominent in this district is the University of Southern California, Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, California Science Center, and the California State African American Museum at Exposition Park. The district includes the Los Angeles Sports Coliseum, Los Angeles Sports Arena and the communities of Florence-Graham and Walnut Park.

AD 60 consists of the Riverside County communities of Corona, Norco, Eastvale, Riverside and the newly designated city of Jurupa Valley. The city of Riverside is split along the river to achieve population equality and because of an adjacent majority-Latino district on the San Bernardino County border that was drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Right Act. This district is characterized by common interests of the communities of western Riverside County, animal-keeping interests of Jurupa Valley and Norco; and shared interests between Eastvale, Norco, and Corona. Corona and Norco share a common school district. Eastvale and

Norco share common watershed interests in the Santa Ana River and fire and public safety issues common to both communities.

AD 61 consists of the Riverside County cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley, and Perris. Other unincorporated areas of the district include Mead Valley, and March Air Reserve Base. The city of Riverside is split at the river to achieve population equality, and because of an adjacent majority-Latino district on the San Bernardino County border that was drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Right Act. This district recognizes the geographic separation of Moreno Valley at the Beaumont Pass. This district is characterized by common interests of a joint powers agreement over March Air Reserve Base, common transportation corridors, and multiple community college extensions in the district.

AD 62 includes the Los Angeles County communities of Inglewood, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox, Marina Del Rey, Playa Vista, Playa Del Rey, Westchester and Westmont. This district is characterized by a very high residential density. The district includes the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), Loyola-Marymount University, the Bellona wetlands, the Chevron Oil Fields, Hyperion Water Treatment Plant, and Dockweiler State Beach. Cities and communities surrounding LAX work together in addressing jet noise mitigation issues and managing airport traffic. Several communities along the flight path east have had long-standing relationships with the Federal Administration Agency and the Los Angeles World Airports to address such issues. The city of Gardena, Inglewood and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality.

AD 63 consists of the Los Angeles County cities of Maywood, Bell, Paramount, Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens and a portion of Long Beach. Long Beach is split to achieve population equality and because of an adjacent majority-Latino district that was drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Right Act. This district is characterized by common school districts, lower socioeconomic characteristics, and Interstate 710 transportation corridor.

AD 64 consists of several Los Angeles cities and communities, including the cities of Compton and Carson. The district also includes the city of Los Angeles communities of Watts, Willowbrook, and Wilmington. This district includes Compton College, the Compton-Woodley Airport, South Bay Pavilion, Cal State-Dominguez Hills, the King-Drew Medical Center and a significant portion of the Alameda corridor. The district is characterized by shared interests common to highly urbanized areas, including low-income status, interests in affordable housing and economic development, and the growth of recent immigrant communities.

AD 65 includes the western portion of Orange County. Cities in this district include Buena Park, Cypress, Fullerton, La Palma, Stanton, and portions of the cities of Garden Grove, and Anaheim to achieve population equality. Common interests in this district include school districts, city services, and the Korean Business Association. In this district, the Commission was able to respect the Orange County border with Los Angeles.

AD 66 includes the Los Angeles County South Bay cities and communities of Gardena, Hermosa Beach, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, West Carson, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes Estates, and Rolling Hills Estates. This district is characterized by having some of the most prominent beaches in Southern California, relatively

affluent communities, and several large historically Japanese American neighborhoods. The city of Gardena and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality. A major thoroughfare is the Pacific Coast Highway (Highway 1). This area includes the South Coast Botanical Gardens (L.A. County Arboretum).

AD 67 consists of the Riverside County cities of Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, Murrieta, Menifee, and a portion of Hemet. Hemet is the only city split in this district to achieve necessary population equality. The district also includes other unincorporated areas of Riverside County including Wildomar, Lake Mathews, Good Hope, Nuevo, and Winchester. This district is characterized by greater geographic distances among the few densely populated areas. The district includes agricultural interests of the San Jacinto Valley, recreational interests of Lake Mathews, Lake Elsinore and Diamond Valley Lake, and includes the major transportation corridors of I-15 and I-215.

AD 68 consists of the Orange County cities and communities of Villa Park, Tustin, North Tustin, Lake Forest, and portions of Orange, Anaheim, and Irvine, which were split to achieve population equality and to take into account an adjacent district drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This district is characterized by common planned living communities, common transportation corridors including toll roads, common interests over former El Toro Marine Base, watershed, and the most rural areas of Orange County.

AD 69 includes the central portion of Orange County and includes portions of Santa Ana, Anaheim, Garden Grove, and Orange which keeps a primarily Latino community whole. This community shares similar socioeconomic characteristics including lower income, lower levels of educational attainment, and lower levels of English proficiency. The district maintains a majority-Latino population consistent with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

AD 70 includes the Los Angeles County communities of the city of Long Beach, Signal Hill, and the Los Angeles community of San Pedro. This district is characterized by the sea ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Over 60% of all foreign goods shipped to the United State are unloaded in these two ports. The large cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles were necessarily split to achieve population equality. The district includes Cal State-Long Beach, the Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park, Machado Lake, Los Angeles Harbor College, Tosco Oil Refinery, and the southernmost portion of the Alameda corridor.

AD 71 consists of the eastern portion of San Diego County from the U.S.-Mexico border to the southern portion of Riverside County, covering the cities and communities of east county, along with the foothills and mountain regions that define the county border on the east. The district is also characterized by agriculture, as well as open space, national and state parks, and recreational activities.

AD 72 includes the western portion of Orange County. Cities in this district include Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Fountain Valley, Westminster, and portions of Garden Grove, Huntington Beach and Santa Ana to achieve population equality. This district is characterized by shared school districts, social and economic interests of Little Saigon, and a common water district. The Commission was able to respect the western Orange County boundary with Los Angeles in this district.

AD 73 includes southern portions of Orange County. Cities in this district include Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, and the sister cities of Dana Point, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano. This district contains other recognized communities including Coto De Caza, Las Flores and Ladera Ranch. This district is characterized by geographic separation of the Santa Ana Mountains to the east and the beach communities to the south. South Orange County cities share common socioeconomic interests, regional land use planning, and water quality concerns. This district respects the Orange County border with San Diego and the eastern Riverside County border.

AD 74 is a coastal Orange County district. Cities in this district include Costa Mesa, Laguna Beach, Laguna Woods, Newport Beach, and portions of Huntington Beach and Irvine to achieve population equality. Common interests in this district include common recreational and environmental interests, transportation routes, and school districts.

AD 75 is in north central San Diego County and consists of rapidly growing established communities along the I-15 Corridor, including the communities of Temecula and portions of Murrieta in southern Riverside County. The district is geographically mixed with flatlands, rolling hills, and small mountain ranges. The region is characterized by its agriculture, open space, and mixed urban and rural communities, with a growing Latino-immigrant community. The Commission received testimony from “inland” cities who share educational and public safety services.

AD 76 is in the north coastal region of San Diego County and includes Camp Pendleton to the north. It also includes the San Onofre Nuclear Plant and established beach communities along Highway 5, including the inland city of Vista. The district is characterized by its state-managed coastal beaches, intense beach recreation, and sensitive environmental coastal estuaries. It includes moderate- to high-income communities.

AD 77 is in central San Diego County and contains a large portion of the city of San Diego, which is divided because of its size and to achieve population equality. San Pasqual forms the northern corner of the district with Mission Trails Regional Park forming the southern edge. The district is highly urbanized with regional parks and lakes, Miramar Marine Corps Air Station, and Highways I-15, 52, and 56 that connect county-wide cities and communities. The region shares an interest in summer wildfire prevention. The district is characterized by its moderate- to high-income communities, with a diverse mix of ethnic communities, including a significant number of Asian American and Pacific Islander communities.

AD 78 is in the southern coastal region of San Diego County from the city of Solana Beach to the city of Imperial Beach and is a highly urbanized district that includes the central hub of San Diego County’s commercial, business, industrial, naval and military operations, port and airport operations, tourist attractions, recreational beaches, and Balboa Regional Park. The district is characterized by its wide-range of income levels and diverse communities of interests. The city of San Diego is split in this district to achieve population equality.

AD 79 is in the southern central portion of San Diego County from the neighborhood of South Clairemont and Mission Trails Regional Park and Highway 8 on the north to nearly all of the city of Chula Vista to the south. It is a highly urbanized district with established communities

on the north and a rapidly growing city of Chula Vista to the south. The district is characterized by its highly diverse ethnic communities, with low- to moderate-income levels. Although the cities of Chula Vista, National City, and San Diego are split in this district to achieve population equality and in consideration of an adjacent district drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, the Commission considered testimony in an effort to honor local neighborhoods and communities to the extent possible.

AD 80 is in the most southern portion of San Diego County hugging the international border with Mexico. It is a highly dense region with some of the oldest communities in the central city of San Diego, including the neighborhoods of Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, and Barrio Logan to the north to San Ysidro to the south. The district is characterized by its large, concentrated Latino community and other immigrant ethnic groups located along Highway 5 and Highway 805 and its intense international border-crossing activities and associated international trade and commerce. The Commission received testimony from communities of Asian Pacific Islander and African immigrants who share needs for social services, education, health services and employment opportunities. The cities of Chula Vista, National City and San Diego are split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

C. The Senate Districts

Each of the 40 Senate districts has an ideal population of 931,349, and represents the largest state legislative districts in the nation. In consideration of population equality, the Commission chose to limit the population deviation to +/-1.0%. Per the California Constitution, the Commission strived to nest two Assembly districts where practicable. However, higher-ranking criteria made this difficult in practice. Compliance with the Voting Rights Act often resulted in Assembly districts that could not be nested, and that in turn affected adjacent districts, creating ripple effects across the state. In addition, the Act's fourth criterion, which required the Commission to minimize the fragmentation of counties, cities, neighborhoods, and local communities of interest, resulted in many Senate districts that were "blended" or mostly nested, as the Commission took advantage of opportunities to repair unavoidable splits that occurred in the Assembly districts. A total of 11 counties and 20 cities with populations smaller than a Senate district were split.

While the size of the Senate districts allowed the Commission to recognize broadly shared interests, these interests did not always overlap exactly with the interests of smaller communities recognized in the related Assembly districts. There are a number of cases where there were a variety of different interests in the Senate districts, which contain close to a million people. For example, there were several situations where more than two Assembly districts had common interests or geographical characteristics that were common to a single Senate district. In these cases, the Commission directed our line-drawing consultants to blend several Assembly districts to better recognize geographical concerns and public testimony about communities of interest. The highest positive deviation for a Senate district was 0.995% and the lowest negative deviation was -0.991%, with an average deviation of 0.449%.

SD 1 is based on nesting AD 1 and AD 6 and includes the whole counties of Siskiyou, Shasta, Modoc, Lassen, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Alpine and the mountainous portions of Placer and El Dorado counties as well as a portion of Sacramento County, including Roseville, which

was split and included to achieve population equality. It is connected in large part by Highway 395 north and south, and Highway 50 and Interstate 80 east and west. Its shared economic interests include timber and recreation. This district blends other areas to keep the Lake Tahoe basin and Truckee area whole while keeping Butte County intact in SD 4.

SD 2 is based on nesting AD 2 and AD 10 and includes the counties of the California coast north of the Golden Gate Bridge. These include Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma and Marin. Trinity and Lake Counties are also included. Sonoma County is split to achieve population equality, with the county seat Santa Rosa remaining whole in this district with most of its county. This district shares the Highway 101 transportation corridor. It also shares issues of coastal environmental, economic and recreational interests, as well as interests around fishing, timber and wine growing.

SD 3 is based on nesting AD 4 and AD 11 and includes the counties of Yolo, Solano, Napa, and portions of Sonoma County not included in SD 1. Yolo County is split with West Sacramento included in SD 6 (Sacramento). The District also includes a portion of Contra Costa County, including the cities of Martinez and Pleasant Hill, which were included to achieve population equality and are connected through the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. This District is united by the I-80 and I-5 transportation corridors. It includes shared interests concerning water and Sacramento River Delta issues, the I-80 corridor, and significant agricultural interests.

SD 4 is based on nesting AD 3 and AD 8 and includes the counties of Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, and Sutter. It also contains a portion of northeast Sacramento County, including Roseville which was added to achieve population equality. The blending of Assembly districts in this Senate district allows the mostly agricultural and northern Central Valley communities to be reunited in a district without crossing into the mountains to the east. This district shares the I-5 transportation corridor and reflects interests in a Central Valley district that is primarily agricultural and rural. SD 4 also includes a Covered County (Yuba) and is in compliance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

SD 5 is based on nesting AD 12 and AD 13 and includes all of San Joaquin County and portions of Stanislaus and Sacramento Counties. The split in Sacramento County is a result of the southern city of Galt being included in this district, while the split in Stanislaus County reflects most of the city of Modesto being added to achieve population equality, along with the whole city of Riverbank and whole communities of Del Rio and Salida. The blending in this district allows for the city of Lodi to be reunited with San Joaquin County along with its sister city of Galt. Both of these cities share a common school district and other services between cities and across counties. This district is, also a result of the partial-district nesting between the Section 5 Merced County AD 21 and the Monterey County AD 30 for Section 5 Senate districts to the south. This district maintains the integrity of Valley floor communities and links Galt with Lodi, and the remainder of Stanislaus County with southern San Joaquin County.

SD 6 is based on nesting AD 7 and 8 and includes much of the County of Sacramento including the cities of Sacramento and Elk Grove, and the Yolo County city of West Sacramento, which lies directly across the Sacramento River from Sacramento. It includes the Sacramento International Airport. This district blend allows for the reunification of the core of the city of Sacramento and links it with communities to its south along the I-5 and Highway 99 corridors.

Besides the shared economic interests based on the urban issues of Sacramento and state government, it also keeps whole the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities located in south Sacramento, Vineland and Elk Grove, which share social, cultural, and economic interests common to recent immigrant populations. Sacramento County is split as it exceeds the size of a Senate district.

SD 7 is based on nesting AD 14 and AD 16 and contains the majority of Contra Costa County, including the Highway 4 and I-680 corridors. This district blend allows for the reunification of communities along the Highway 4 corridor and joins them with the “LaMorinda” (Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda), San Ramon Valley, and Tri-Valley communities. The northern portion of the district joins many delta communities, while the central and southern portions link key Alameda & Contra Costa suburban communities with job centers. This district includes many regional parks and wilderness areas, and respects the natural geography of the East Bay Hills boundary.

SD 8 is based on nesting AD 23 and AD 5 to form a foothill district along the southern portion of the San Joaquin Valley. The blend of Assembly districts in this area is a reflection of the attempt to form a foothill district with the balance of the two Section 5 Senate districts to the west of this district. This includes the whole counties of Amador, Calaveras, Inyo, Mono, Mariposa, and Tuolumne, with portions of Fresno, Madera, Sacramento, Stanislaus, and Tulare Counties. The city of Fresno in Fresno County and the city of Rancho Cordova in Sacramento County are split to achieve population equality. This district maintains the integrity of a southern foothill and mountain district to link the common interest issues of open space, water, the distinctions between “hills” and the “flatlands”, and the less densely populated areas that share a more rural and remote way of life. County splits are a result of (1) separating the Valley portion of Madera County with the foothill area, and (2) including the San Joaquin Valley floor cities and communities of Tulare and Visalia (Tulare County), Fresno and Clovis (Fresno County), Turlock (Stanislaus County), and Rancho Cordova (Sacramento County) to achieve population equality.

SD 9 is based on an almost perfect nesting of AD 15 and AD 18 and unites cities in Contra Costa and Alameda counties along the 880 corridor, a major urban thoroughfare for commuter traffic and for commercial freight through the Port of Oakland and Oakland International Airport. Anchor communities include Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland, and San Leandro. By nesting, this district reunites Oakland, connects regional park interests, and respects the Bay Bridge boundary and that of the East Bay Hills.

SD 10 is based on nesting AD 20 and AD 25 and includes most of the “Eden” area in Alameda County, as well as Castro Valley and smaller unincorporated communities immediately adjacent. It also contains Hayward, and unites the Tri-Cities of Union City, Newark, and Fremont, which are kept whole. This district includes a portion of northern Santa Clara County, namely Santa Clara, Milpitas, and parts of San Jose, including the San Jose International Airport to achieve population equality. The Berryessa neighborhood of San Jose is whole within this district.

SD 11 is based on nesting AD 17 and 19 and includes all of the city and county of San Francisco, Broadmoor, Colma, Daly City, as well as part of South San Francisco, keeping a

largely suburban Filipino-American community whole in these cities that shares cultural traditions and community centers, as well as similar socioeconomic characteristics with other Asian Americans in western San Francisco, such as higher rates of home ownership and limited English proficiency.

SD 12 is based on nesting AD 21 and AD 30 and includes the whole counties of Merced and San Benito, parts of the counties of Fresno, Madera, Monterey, and Stanislaus, and a portion of the city of Modesto in Stanislaus County to comply with Voting Rights Act Section 5 requirements for Merced and Monterey Counties. Although this is the one district that crosses the coastal mountain range between the San Joaquin Valley and the west, this district is able to maintain a predominately agricultural base on both sides of the mountains, thus linking the two areas together in a common interest. Nesting Assembly districts within the San Joaquin Valley was not possible because Merced and Monterey Counties were combined to meet the requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Many of the cities in this district run along the main transportation routes of I-5 and Highway 99.

SD 13 is based on an almost complete nesting of AD 22 and AD 24 and consists of the remainder of San Mateo County south of SD 11 and northern Santa Clara County, including the sister cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale. This district keeps the San Mateo coastline from Pacifica to the Año Nuevo State Reserve and peninsula cities from South San Francisco to Sunnyvale together. South San Francisco is the only city split to achieve population equality.

SD 14 is based on nesting AD 31 and AD 32 and includes all of Kings County and parts of Fresno, Kern, and Tulare Counties, as well as portions of the cities of Bakersfield and Fresno to satisfy the Voting Rights Act Section 5 requirements for Kings County. Along I-5 and Highway 99, this district contains the cities of Porterville, Hanford, Delano, Wasco, Corcoran, Lemoore, Sanger, Reedley, Selma, and Dinuba. Because of the need to comply with the requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act for Kings County and the adjacent Section 5 Merced County Senate district to the north, this district was not able to be fully nested.

SD 15 is based on nesting AD 27 and AD 28 and contains a major portion of Santa Clara County, and includes the cities of Campbell, Cupertino, Los Gatos, Saratoga, and most of the city of San Jose, which was divided to satisfy population equality requirements. The district includes the downtown area of San Jose, multiple neighborhoods and local communities of interest, such as the Alum Rock and Evergreen neighborhoods, as well as smaller cities and unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County. The southern area of the district contains several county parks and open space preserves. Shared interests within the district revolve around common demographic characteristics based on income and housing, as well as reliance on technology-based economies. This district reunites the majority of San Jose with its downtown area.

SD 16 is based on nesting AD 26 and AD 34 and includes portions of Kern, Tulare, and San Bernardino Counties with the only city split being that of Bakersfield. Additional cities in this district include Visalia, Tulare, Taft, Exeter, Ridgecrest, Needles, Barstow and Twentynine Palms. Although this district covers a large geographic area, the vast majority of cities share a commonality of having small populations in more remote areas. Because of two adjacent Section 5 districts to the north and because of the need to nest across the coastal range for SD 12, an odd

number of Assembly districts in the San Joaquin Valley required an extension into San Bernardino County to achieve population equality, and this district was not able to be fully nested. The resulting Senate district links the Southern Central Valley with communities to the south, across the mountain ranges.

SD 17 is based on nesting AD 29 and AD 35 and contains Santa Cruz and San Luis Obispo Counties in their entirety, as well as portions of Monterey and Santa Clara Counties. The cities include Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Gilroy, San Luis Obispo, Morgan Hill, Seaside, Paso Robles, Atascadero, Monterey, and several more smaller cities. A small portion of San Jose was included in this district to achieve population equality. The district is one of two Senate districts containing part of Monterey County and was drawn in part to comply with Voting Rights Act Section 5 requirements. The district links the western portion of Monterey County with areas to the south in a primarily coastal district. Strongly shared interests within the district include regional agricultural economies, coastal and open space preservation, and environmental protection. The Monterey Bay coastline is fully contained within the district. Additionally the southern portion of the district includes a major portion of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, which extends to Cambria in San Luis Obispo County. Similar to the adjacent Section 5 district, it was not able to be fully nested due to the need to meet the Voting Rights Act requirements.

SD 18 is based on nesting AD 39 and AD 46 and includes the city of San Fernando and the northeast portion of the San Fernando Valley within the city of Los Angeles. This district reunites Los Angeles neighborhoods such as Northridge and Granada Hills into an Eastern San Fernando Valley district. Communities include Van Nuys, Granada Hills, Sylmar, Arleta, Pacoima, North Hills, Northridge, Panorama City, Lakeview Terrace, Sherman Oaks, Valley Glen, Valley Village, Studio Village, Sun Valley, Toluca Lake, North Hollywood, and Universal City. Major transportation corridors include the Ventura Freeway (S-101), Hollywood Freeway (S-170), San Diego Freeway (I-405), Golden Gate Freeway (I-5) and Foothill Freeway (I-210), as well as Ventura Boulevard, the main east-west commercial strip. Resources include the Hansen Dam Flood Control Basin, Whiteman Airport, Van Nuys Airport, and the Los Angeles Valley College. The southern boundary aligns closely with the Mulholland Scenic Corridor.

SD 19 is based on nesting AD 37 and AD 44 and incorporates Santa Barbara County and a portion of Ventura County. It extends from Santa Maria in the northwest along the 101 corridor and captures Buellton, Solvang, Goleta, Santa Barbara, San Buenaventura, the Santa Clara Valley (Santa Paula, Fillmore, Piru) and Oxnard, Port Hueneme and Camarillo on the southeastern border. It maintains the US-101 transportation corridor throughout the district, as well as the agricultural nexus between the Santa Clara Valley, Oxnard plains, and the Santa Maria area. Due to the resultant odd number of Assembly districts from SD 12, this district's blend reunites the western portion of Ventura County with much of the rest of the county below the Conejo Grade.

SD 20 is the perfect nesting of two Section 2 Assembly districts, AD 47 and AD 52, and consists of the cities of Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Rialto, a portion of San Bernardino and unincorporated areas such as Muscoy and Bloomington in San Bernardino County and Pomona Valley, which includes the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County which is geographically separated from the rest of the county at Kellogg Hill. The city of San Bernardino is the only city

split, which was done to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

SD 21 is based on nesting AD 33 and AD 36 and includes the Antelope Valley and part of the high desert in northern Los Angeles County, extending eastward into San Bernardino County to include the Apple Valley. Major cities in the region include Lancaster, Palmdale, Victorville, Hesperia, and the northeast region of the city of Santa Clarita, which was split to achieve population equality in the region. Other significant population centers include Canyon Country, Saugus, Quartz Hill, Acton, Little Rock, Baker, Lake Los Angeles, Adelanto, and Mountain View Acres. The region is tied by transportation links north-south by the Antelope Valley Freeway (Hwy. 14), as well as east-west by the Pear Blossom Highway (Hwy. 138). Significant open space areas include the Castaic Lake State Recreation area, Pyramid Lake, Antelope Valley Poppy Reserve, Ritter Ranch Park, Big Rock Wash Wildlife Sanctuary, Alpine Butte, Saddleback Butte State Park, El Mirage Off-Vehicle Recreation area, and portions of the Angeles National Forest. This district reunites the majority of the Santa Clarita Valley with that of the Lancaster Valley and Victor Valley communities, forming a largely transitional and high desert Senate district.

SD 22 is based on nesting AD 48 and AD 49 and contains the Los Angeles County cities of Arcadia, San Gabriel, Temple City, Alhambra, Rosemead, Monterey Park, El Monte, and South El Monte, Covina, West Covina, and La Puente. These cities have common economic status with a range from working class to higher income in each city, and comparable housing stock. This district nests communities along the 10 Freeway and reunites El Monte and South El Monte, which were split to draw AD 49 to keep local communities of interest together and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The cities of Industry and West Covina are split in this district to achieve population equality.

SD 23 is based on nesting AD 40 and AD 42 and consists of portions of San Bernardino and Riverside counties, and a small portion of Los Angeles County to keep the border community of Wrightwood intact. The district also includes Rancho Cucamonga, Phelan, the Big Bear mountain communities, most of the San Bernardino Valley in San Bernardino County, with the Beaumont/Banning area to Cabazon, south to the San Jacinto Valley, plus the whole of Murrieta in Riverside County to achieve population equality. The shape of this district was largely determined by the adjacent district drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which shares part of the city of San Bernardino. Due to the high desert SD 21 to the north, this district was not able to be fully nested. The blend in this district maintains the contiguity of the eastern San Bernardino National Forest and its communities to the south tied by Interstate 10 and Interstate 215.

SD 24 is based on nesting AD 51 and AD 53 and includes the Los Angeles neighborhoods of Silver Lake, Glassell Park, Echo Park and then moving south and east, Thai Town, Koreatown and Pico Union. Chinatown is kept whole as is Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles at its southern boundary. Like parts of the Assembly district that were blended into this district, SD 24 has concentrations of new immigrants in the Pico Union and Koreatown portions of the district.

SD 25 is based on nesting AD 41 and AD 43 and connects the Los Angeles County foothills from La Crescenta on the west to San Antonio Heights on the east with the Angeles National Forest. The I-210 corridor connects these cities for commerce and entertainment. It includes the whole cities and communities of Glendale, Altadena, South Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Monrovia, Duarte, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont, Upland and most of Burbank to achieve population equality. The district includes the Bob Hope Airport and the communities of interest surrounding and using Griffith Park. This district links Pasadena to communities such as Burbank, La Canada-Flintridge, and La Crescenta-Montrose, and keeps the foothill city of Glendora intact. The district also maintains the close relationship of Pasadena and Altadena, including their school district, as well as the relation of adjacent cities to Pasadena as a hub for entertainment, business, and professional services.

SD 26 is based on nesting AD 50 and AD 66 and consists of Los Angeles County coastal communities from Santa Monica to the South Bay Peninsula of Rancho Palos Verdes, and includes portions of West LA. This district includes the whole cities and communities of Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, Century City, El Segundo, Torrance, Hermosa Beach, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Marina Del Rey, Palos Verdes Estates, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Rancho Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates; and the Los Angeles communities of Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Mid-Wilshire, Hollywood, Hollywood Hills, and West Los Angeles. This district is characterized by having a relatively affluent socioeconomic urbanized area, as well as vast open space regions and some of the major beaches of Southern California. It includes the LAX Airport, Bellona Creek Wetlands, and a grouping of beach cities with inland affluent adjacent communities. The cities of Torrance and Los Angeles were split to maintain a primarily coastal district and to achieve population equality.

SD 27 is based on nesting AD 38 and AD 45 and incorporates and maintains the eastern portion of Ventura County, which includes the cities of Simi Valley, Moorpark, Thousand Oaks, Agoura Hills, and Westlake Village. It also includes the coastal area extending from Leo Carrillo State Beach to Malibu and on to Topanga Canyon. Additionally, it captures the communities of Calabasas, West Hills and a portion of Santa Clarita in Los Angeles County. It maintains the coastal mountain range and watershed. This district reunites the cities in Eastern Ventura County above the Conejo Grade and combines them with communities in the greater Santa Monica Mountain area and the western San Fernando Valley along the Highway 101 and 118 corridors. The cities of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality.

SD 28 is based on nesting AD 56 and AD 67 and consists of the entire eastern portion of Riverside County and portions of west Riverside County along the southern border. This district includes the cities of Temecula, Rancho Mirage, Palm Springs, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore, La Quinta, Indio, Indian Wells, Desert Hot Springs, Coachella, Cathedral City, Canyon Lake, and Blythe. This district was blended to keep Coachella Valley whole and respect the nesting of other Assembly districts in Riverside County.

SD 29 is based on nesting AD 55 and AD 65 and includes the northern portion of Orange County, eastern Los Angeles County, and southern San Bernardino County, including much of the Four Corners area that shares economic interests and transportation concerns around the Pomona Freeway. This district includes the whole cities and communities of Brea, Chino Hills, Cypress, Diamond Bar, Fullerton, La Habra, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Rowland Heights, Stanton,

and Walnut, as well as portions of the cities of Industry, West Covina, Buena Park and Anaheim to achieve population equality. Many of the northern Orange County cities share services and are tied to its other county neighbors by Chino Hill State Park. This district is characterized by common social and economic interests of Asian Pacific Islander communities of Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, and Walnut where each share common areas of worship, and entertainment centers. The Four Corners area shares a transportation policy committee, and a common wildlife conservation association.

SD 30 is based on nesting AD 54 and AD 59 and includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Culver City, Century City, Ladera Heights, Baldwin Hills, Blair Hills, Mar Vista, Palms, Mid City, Crenshaw, Lafayette Park, View Park-Windsor Hills, Leimert Park, Westmont, South Park, Exposition Park, a portion of Hancock Park, downtown Los Angeles, and South Central Los Angeles. This district is characterized by a very high residential density, the campus of the University of Southern California, many historic African American neighborhoods, and relatively high ethnic diversity and socioeconomic variation. The cities of Inglewood and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality. This district was blended to allow for a coastal Senate district to the west and was influenced by several majority-minority districts drawn to the east. The district also includes the Exposition light rail transit line.

SD 31 is the perfect nesting of AD 60 and AD 61 and keeps the city of Riverside intact with the communities of Corona, Moreno Valley, Norco, Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Riverside, and Perris. This district maintains the community of interest around the March Air Reserve Base as well as the shared animal-keeping interests in Norco and Corona. This district recognizes the geographic separation of Moreno Valley at the Beaumont Pass. This district is characterized by common interests of a joint powers agreement over March Air Reserve Base, common transportation corridors, and multiple community colleges have their extensions in the district. Corona and Norco share a common school district. Eastvale and Norco share common watershed interests in the Santa Ana River and common fire and public safety issues.

SD 32 is based on nesting AD 57 and AD 58 and includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Pico Rivera, Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, La Habra Heights, Bell Flower, Montebello, West Whittier, South Whittier, Whittier, La Mirada, and Hawaiian Gardens, as well as the Orange County city of Buena Park, which is included for population equality. The district reflects shared economic interests, school districts, and public safety issues. The district also contains a strong community of interest that includes Cerritos, Artesia, and a portion of Buena Park, and has a large Asian, Indian, and Pacific Islander community that shares common linguistic, cultural and economic interests. In this district, the city of Lakewood is split to achieve population equality.

SD 33 is based on nesting AD 63 and AD 70 and includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Commerce, Cudahy, Bell, Bell Garden, Lynwood, Maywood, Signal Hill, Paramount, South Gate, Vernon, Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and most of Long Beach with portions of the cities of Lakewood and Los Angeles to achieve population equality. To the north this district includes part of the group of Southeast cities of Los Angeles County: Vernon, Huntington Park, Bell, South Gate, Cudahy, Lynwood, and Paramount. These Southeast cities are grouped together because of their socioeconomic commonalities and because many unincorporated areas share similar civic and economic issues. Many of the residents in this

region are first-generation immigrants with similar linguistic and educational characteristics. This district is characterized by high residential density and many historic neighborhoods, heavy industry, and common environmental problems linked to transportation corridors. The majority of Long Beach is kept with its port, Long Beach City College, and downtown Long Beach.

SD 34 is based on nesting AD 69 and AD 72 and includes western Orange County and a portion of eastern Los Angeles County. Cities in this district include Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Fountain Valley, Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and portions of the cities of Anaheim, Huntington Beach, Orange and Long Beach to achieve population equality. This district also includes other distinct communities of Rossmore, Sunset Beach and Midway City. This district includes several different communities, pairing a primarily north coastal Orange County area with Little Saigon and most of the community in Santa Ana and central Anaheim that share similar socioeconomic characteristics.

SD 35 is based on nesting AD 62 and AD 64 and includes the Los Angeles County communities of Carson, Compton, West Compton, Gardena, Harbor City, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lennox, West Carson, Watts, Willowbrook, and Wilmington. This district is characterized by a very high residential density, the Port of Los Angeles and the 110 Freeway which runs north-south through the entire district. Traffic and pollution concerns related to the Port are significant interests within the district. San Pedro and Harbor City are with the Port. The cities of Inglewood, Long Beach, Los Angeles and Torrance were split to achieve population equality.

SD 36 is based on an almost complete nesting of AD 73 and AD 76 and consists of the southern coastal region of Orange County from Laguna Niguel to the established coastal beach communities along San Diego County's Interstate 5, including Camp Pendleton and San Onofre Nuclear Plant. Cities in this district include Rancho Santa Margarita, Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Aliso Viejo, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, and Encinitas. The district is characterized by its state-managed coastal beaches, intense beach recreation, and sensitive environmental coastal estuaries. It includes similar socioeconomic communities.

SD 37 is based on an almost complete nesting of AD 68 and AD 74 and includes the central and southern portions of Orange County. This district unites Irvine and links it with cities and communities with similar socioeconomic characteristics, including Villa Park, Tustin, North Tustin, Lake Forest, Laguna Woods, Laguna Beach, Newport Beach, Costa Mesa, and portions of the cities of Orange, Anaheim and Huntington Beach, which are divided to achieve population equality. This district is characterized by common planned-living communities, common transportation corridors including toll roads, common interests over the former El Toro Marine Base, and watersheds to the east. This district further respects the shared interests of the coastal cities.

SD 38 is based on nesting AD 71 and AD 75 and consists of the northeastern portion of San Diego County. It includes agriculture lands, and open space national and state park recreational activities. This district was drawn to create a central-eastern San Diego County district that separates San Diego County from Riverside County, the coast from inland areas, and mountainous areas from the border district. It includes cities and communities along the

urbanized Highway I-15 corridor to the less urbanized and rural communities along the foothills and mountain ranges to the east. The district is characterized by low-, moderate-, and high-income levels. The city of San Diego is divided because it exceeds the size of a Senate district.

SD 39 is based on nesting AD 77 and AD 78 and consists of nearly the entire city of San Diego, including the coastal areas of Del Mar to Coronado, as well as the core of San Diego. The district is highly urbanized, with regional parks, lakes, and open space preserves, and contains the central economic hub of San Diego County. The district is characterized by its government center, commercial, business, high-tech research industries, three major universities, naval and military operations, port and airport operations, tourist attractions, recreational beaches, and environmentally sensitive coastal areas. It includes a highly diverse region of ethnic enclaves, a large LGBT community, and a wide range of income levels.

SD 40 is based on nesting AD 79 and AD 80 and consists of a two-county district stretching from all of Imperial County to lower San Diego County, along its shared international border with Mexico. Its geography ranges from the far desert regions on the east, including the Salton Sea basin, to the federally protected San Diego/Tijuana estuary on the Pacific Ocean. It ranges from the sparsely populated region of Imperial County to the highly urbanized communities in San Diego and connects educational, health, and social services delivery systems to low-income communities along the southern edge of the district. The district is characterized by its large concentration of Latino border communities and its intense international border crossing activities and associated international trade and commerce. The district also shares interests in meeting the environmental needs of the Salton Sea and addressing agricultural water issues within the district.

D. The Board of Equalization Districts

The four Board of Equalization (“BOE”) districts have an ideal population of 9,313,489—a population larger than 42 of the other states in the union. In consideration of population equality, the Commission chose to limit the population deviation to +/-1.0%. The function of the BOE is to collect sales and use taxes and other fees that provide funding for counties, cities, and special districts. Given this, the Commission recognized that the relevant shared interests included business and economic interests; however, staff representatives from the BOE testified that field operations are independent of the electoral districts, and that any taxpayer can go to any field office for help. In addition, tax revenues are distributed to counties independent of electoral districts.

The Commission’s BOE districts reflect a balancing of multiple requirements and interests, including compliance with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and maintaining, to the extent practicable, county, city, neighborhood, and community of interest boundaries. Given the large district size and population deviation criteria the Commission applied for legislative districts, the Commission was able to keep 57 of California’s 58 counties whole, and Los Angeles County was necessarily divided because its population exceeds the size of a BOE district. We also kept 478 of California’s 480 cities whole in addition to mostly nesting ten Senate districts. The highest positive deviation was 0.812% and the lowest negative deviation was -1.000%, with an average deviation of 0.630%.

BOE 1 is based on nesting SD 1, SD 4, SD 5, SD 6, SD 8, SD 12, SD 14, SD 16, SD 18, and SD 21 and consists of 28 whole inland counties from the Oregon border south, including Yuba, Merced, and Kings Counties. It also includes portions of Los Angeles County, including the Antelope, Santa Clarita, and East San Fernando Valleys, and most of San Bernardino County, including Victor and Pomona Valleys, Big Bear Mountain and, other sparsely populated areas that are included to achieve population equality. Yuba, Merced, and Kings Counties are subject to the requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and the district fully complies with Section 5.

BOE 2 is based on nesting SD 2, SD 3, SD 7, SD 9, SD 10, SD 11, SD 13, SD 15, SD 17, and SD 19, and is a coastal district composed of 23 whole counties from Del Norte to Santa Barbara, including Monterey County. Monterey County is subject to the preclearance requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and the district fully complies with Section 5.

BOE 3 is based on nesting SD 19, SD 22, SD 24, SD 25, SD 26, SD 27, SD 30, SD 32, SD 33, and SD 35 and consists of all of Ventura County, most of Los Angeles County, and Chino Hills from San Bernardino County. The Commission was unable to include all of Los Angeles County in this district, because the County's population exceeds the ideal population for a BOE district.

BOE 4 is based on nesting SD 23, SD 28, SD 29, SD 31, SD 34, SD 36, SD 37, SD 38, SD 39, and SD 40, and is a Southern California district composed of Imperial, Orange, Riverside, and San Diego counties and portions of San Bernardino County, including Fontana, Rialto, Colton, Grand Terrace, Bloomington, the San Bernardino Valley, and Morongo Valley to Twentynine Palms areas. San Bernardino County is divided in order to satisfy population equality requirements.

E. The Congressional Districts

The 53 congressional districts apportioned to the State of California have an ideal population of 702,905, and the Commission adhered to federal constitutional mandates by requiring a district population deviation of no more than +/- one person. This year marked the first time in California's history that the state has not been apportioned additional seats due to population growth. These districts also posed some of the Commission's biggest challenges, and, because of strict population equality requirements, resulted in many more splits of counties, cities, neighborhoods, and communities of interests than the other districts. A total of 11 counties and 41 cities smaller than a congressional district were split. Because these districts elect members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Commission considered federal legislative concerns as part of the lens for defining relevant shared interests, including issues that are subject to federal regulation, such as environmental protection, air quality management, and immigration. The Commission also considered issues subject to federal funding, including education, transportation, and health care. The highest positive deviation was +1 person and the lowest negative deviation was -1 person with an average deviation of 0.000%.

CD 1 is a largely rural mountain district consisting of the whole counties of Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Plumas, Butte, Sierra, and Nevada. It also includes a portion of

Glenn County, which was split to achieve population equality. This district reflects a community of interest featuring a rural mountain lifestyle, as well as watershed, timber and recreational economic similarities. It is united by transportation corridors along I-5 and Highway 395.

CD 2 is formed by uniting the northern California coastal counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Marin, as well as portions of Sonoma County, which is split to achieve population equality. It also includes Trinity County, which shares timber and recreational and watershed interests with the coastal counties. The coastal counties share economic communities of interests including fishing, environmental concerns, timber and recreational opportunities. They are also unified by the Highway 101 corridor.

CD 3 includes the whole counties of Sutter, Yuba and Colusa, and large parts of Yolo (less West Sacramento), Solano, and Lake Counties. Its primary economic community of interest is agriculture. Economically, it is also united by development along the I-80 corridor to the southwest and the transportation corridor along I-5 to the north. Significant communities of interest concerning the provision of public services exist between a number of cities within the district. CD 3 also includes the Section 5 County of Yuba and complies with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

CD 4 includes the whole counties of Placer, Alpine, Nevada, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, and Tuolumne. It also includes the foothill portions of El Dorado, Madera, and Fresno counties. A small piece of Nevada County is included to keep the town of Truckee whole. This district also includes the greater area around Lake Tahoe, which was especially important in the congressional district in dealing with federal environmental issues affecting the lake. The primary communities of interest revolve around the foothill nature of the district, along with weather, fire, economic, environmental, and mountain recreation issues. Most of the district also shares the State Route 49 transportation corridor.

CD 5 consists of Napa County and parts of Lake, Solano, Sonoma, and Contra Costa counties. It reflects significant public testimony about uniting to the extent practicable the wine growing regions of Lake, Napa and Sonoma counties, including warehousing and distribution. The southern Solano County cities of Vallejo and Benicia were included to keep them associated with those communities of the Bay Area with which they have similar economic and social concerns rather than the agricultural focus of the more inland parts of Solano County. The Contra Costa County cities of Hercules, Pinole and a majority of Martinez, which are connected via the Carquinez and Benicia-Martinez bridges, were also included to achieve population equality.

CD 6 includes the entire city of Sacramento, as well as the Yolo County city of West Sacramento, and parts of Sacramento County located along the I-80 corridor to the northeast. West Sacramento is an integral part of the Sacramento Region, as home to the Port of Sacramento and much of the Sacramento workforce, connected to Sacramento by three bridges and waterfront development on opposite sides of the Sacramento River. This district includes an Asian American and Pacific Islander community in south Sacramento with shared economic and social ties based on income status, housing, language, and immigration status. The Sacramento International Airport is also in this district.

CD 7 includes most of the remainder of Sacramento County not included in CD 6. This district is unified by its economic association with the city of Sacramento for jobs, as well as shopping. Galt and the rural southwest portions of Sacramento are split to achieve population equality and because of their connections with San Joaquin County.

CD 8 includes the counties of Mono and Inyo, and most of San Bernardino County, including the cities of Adelanto, Apple Valley, Barstow, Hesperia, Big Bear City, Highland, Needles, Twentynine Palms and unincorporated areas of Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, Yucaipa, and Yucca Valley. A lower desert area is combined with a higher desert area into Inyo. The district contains two national parks, Death Valley National Park and Mojave National Preserve.

CD 9 includes most of San Joaquin County and portions of Sacramento and Contra Costa Counties. The city of Antioch in Contra Costa County is split in this district to achieve population equality. This district contains the San Joaquin County cities of Lathrop, Stockton, Lodi, and unincorporated areas in the east and west of the County. The city of Galt in southern Sacramento County is also included due to its ties to Lodi in San Joaquin County. The eastern Contra Costa communities of Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and Discovery Bay are also a part of this district to achieve population equality and to link the delta communities between Contra Costa and San Joaquin County. This district maintains a large portion of the San Joaquin Valley agricultural area, linked with industries associated with water transportation along the deltas from San Joaquin County through the eastern Contra Costa communities along State Route 4.

CD 10 includes all of Stanislaus County and a portion of San Joaquin County. The cities in San Joaquin County included in this district are Tracy, Manteca and Ripon. This district connects the Valley communities of southern San Joaquin County with the entirety of Stanislaus County with no city splits. This district shares both agricultural roots, including the northern most counties in the San Joaquin Valley, as well as more recent trends in commuting activities to the East Bay from the district's larger cities (Tracy, Manteca and Modesto). Additional cities in this district include Ripon, Escalon, Oakdale, Patterson, and Hughson.

CD 11 includes most of Contra Costa County, including the "Lamorinda" (Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda) area, Richmond and surrounding environs, Walnut Creek and comparable suburban communities. This district connects local communities with regional park, wilderness, and state park interests, along with some coastline and delta.

CD 12 includes most of the city and county of San Francisco, except the southwest corner, south of the Sunset neighborhood. This district includes the core LGBT community, as well as several lower-income, immigrant and working-class neighborhoods, such as Chinatown, Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, and Bayview-Hunters Point.

CD 13 includes coastal urban East Bay communities, respecting the Bay Bridge and natural geographic boundary of the East Bay hills. Berkeley, Oakland, Alameda, and San Leandro are included in this district whole along with the Port of Oakland and Oakland International Airport as major commuter, commercial, and environmental traffic corridors. This district connects urban communities with regional park interests, along with maintaining

connections among low-income communities of color (including immigrant communities) with key service-provider networks and cultural resources in the East Bay flatlands.

CD 14 consists of the southwest corner of the city and county of San Francisco, the Farallon Islands, and most of San Mateo County. Menlo Park and Redwood City are also split to achieve population equality, but the lower socioeconomic city of East Palo Alto is kept whole with most of Redwood City, which shares similar demographics.

CD 15 includes much of southern Alameda County starting with the “Eden” area of Castro Valley and the surrounding unincorporated communities. The district unites Hayward, Union City, and part of Fremont, along with the Tri-Valley areas of Dublin, Pleasanton & Livermore. This area is rich in regional parks and wilderness areas and extends to the southern and eastern county lines.

CD 16 includes all of Merced County and portions of Madera and Fresno counties. The city of Fresno is split in this district to achieve population equality and in light of the Section 5 benchmark for Merced County. The western valley portion of Madera County is included in this district, as well as many of the Highway 99 communities from Merced County into the city of Fresno, such as Livingston, Atwater, Chowchilla, and the city of Madera. Communities in this district share the common links of agriculture, water, and air issues, along with the serving as the main transportation routes connecting northern and southern California. This district complies with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

CD 17 contains significant portions of Alameda County and Santa Clara County. Included in the district are the Alameda County city of Newark and the Santa Clara County cities of Cupertino, Milpitas, Santa Clara, and Sunnyvale. The district also contains portions of the cities of Fremont and San Jose, which are divided to satisfy population equality requirements. The district contains cities and local communities of interest marked by several shared interests, including employment and business based on high technology economies and demographic characteristics linked by income level, housing, and immigration status.

CD 18 contains portions of San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, and Santa Cruz County. Cities and towns such as Campbell, Los Gatos, Mountain View, Palo Alto, and Saratoga are maintained whole within the district; portions of the cities of Menlo Park, Redwood City, and San Jose are also within the district and divided to achieve population equality requirements. The district also contains an unpopulated area of the city of Santa Cruz. Areas within the district share common social and economic characteristics based on income level and reliance on high technology economies, as well as interests in open space and environmental concerns.

CD 19 contains part of Santa Clara County and includes Morgan Hill and San Martin, as well as major portions of San Jose and Gilroy, which are divided to satisfy population equality requirements and in light of the preclearance requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in the adjacent district of CD 20. Shared interests within the district include commonalities based on housing and income, as well as close ties to local technology-based economies. CD 19 contains the downtown area of the city of San Jose and maintains major neighborhoods and local communities of interest such as the Alum Rock and Evergreen neighborhoods within the city.

The eastern and southern portions of the district also contain significant open-space areas and both state and county parks.

CD 20 contains Monterey County and San Benito County, as well as portions of Santa Cruz County and Santa Clara County. The cities include Salinas, Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Hollister Seaside, Monterey, Soledad, and several smaller cities. A small portion of the city of Gilroy was included in this district to achieve population equality and meet requirements under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The city of Santa Cruz is maintained whole, except for an unpopulated area that is contained in CD 18. The district is marked by several shared interests, including reliance on agriculture-based economies, interests in open space and coastal preservation, and regional environmental concerns. The Monterey Bay coastline (part of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary) is fully contained within the district.

CD 21 includes all of Kings County and portions of Kern, Tulare, and Fresno Counties. The city of Bakersfield is split to achieve population equity and to meet Section 5 requirements for Kings County. Cities along I-5 from Fresno County through Kern County are maintained along with many communities east of Highway 99. Communities in this district share the common links of agriculture, water and air issues along with containing a large portion of the main transportation routes connecting northern and southern California. Kings County is subject to the preclearance requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and the district fully complies with Section 5.

CD 22 includes portions of Fresno and Tulare Counties. The only city split is that of Fresno to achieve population equity. This district links the city of Fresno's split with other communities just east of the Highway 99 corridor including Clovis, Dinuba, Visalia, and the city of Tulare. This district borders two Section 5 county districts (Merced and Kings) while maintaining the local communities of interest along the Valley floor and respecting the distinctions between the foothill communities to the east.

CD 23 includes portions of Kern, Tulare, and Los Angeles Counties. This district connects the remaining southern section of the San Joaquin Valley around the Section 5 district to the north, including the western portions of Kern County (the cities of Taft and Maricopa), the city split in Bakersfield, the southern section of the foothill/ Sierras (including the Sequoia National Forest and communities such as California City, Three Rivers, Lake Isabella, and Ridgecrest), and a small section of northern Los Angeles County to achieve population equity. This district also includes the military installations of the China Lake Naval Air Base and Edwards Air Force Base, which was important in the congressional district to those in these communities.

CD 24 includes all of San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara counties plus a portion of Ventura County. It includes the cities of Paso Robles, Atascadero, San Luis Obispo, Santa Maria, Lompoc, Goleta, Santa Barbara, and a small portion of the city of San Buenaventura, capturing the Marina area along the coast. It maintains coastal communities of interest, especially along Highway 1 and Highway 101, as well as the recreational and wilderness areas of the Los Padres National Forest, which is part of the coastal mountain range. The city of San Buenaventura (Ventura) is split to achieve population equality.

CD 25 includes the Santa Clarita Valley, Palmdale, the eastern section of the city of Lancaster, and portions of the high desert in Los Angeles County. Prominent communities include the city of Santa Clarita, Stevenson Ranch, Saugus, Quartz Hill, Val Verde, Canyon Country, Humphreys, Acton, Forest Park, Agua Dulce, Little Rock, and Lake Los Angeles. The district also includes the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve, Pyramid Lake, Castaic Lake State Recreation area, Michael Antonovich Regional Park at Joughin Ranch, Saddleback Butte State Park, and a portion of the Angeles National Forest.

CD 26 includes most of the Ventura County and incorporates the cities and communities of Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Moorpark, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Oak Park, portions of Simi Valley and San Buenaventura and all of the Santa Clara Valley (Santa Paula, Fillmore and Piru). It maintains the major shopping and transportation services along Highway 101 and Highway 23, as well as the agricultural communities of interest of the Santa Clara Valley and the Oxnard Plains. It also includes Port Hueneme and the Point Mugu Naval Air Station. The cities of San Buenaventura (Ventura) and Simi Valley are split to achieve population equality.

CD 27 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, Glendora, Claremont, and San Antonio Heights, which share the foothill concerns of fire control, recreational access, and water issues. The district also includes cities that identify themselves as related to Pasadena for cultural, educational, and commercial interests, such as South Pasadena and San Marino. The cities and communities of San Gabriel, Temple City, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, and South San Gabriel share common economic, housing stock, and public safety issues, as well as major east/west freeway and commercial arteries. The cities of Glendora, Monrovia, Pasadena and Upland are split in this district to achieve population equality and in light of the adjacent district that was drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Right Act.

CD 28 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of La Crescenta, La Canada, Burbank, Griffith Park, Hollywood Hills, and West Hollywood. The interests of the district include many public parks such as Verdugo Mountain, La Tuna Canyon, Runyon Park, and Griffith Park. Shared issues in this district include fire protection, watershed, entertainment industry, and outdoor recreation. The city of Burbank is split in this district, but includes the Bob Hope Airport.

CD 29 includes the entire city of San Fernando and the eastern portion of the San Fernando Valley within the city of Los Angeles. Prominent communities include North Hills, Panorama City, Van Nuys, Arleta, Sylmar, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, Sherman Oaks, Valley Glen, Valley Village, Sun Valley, Studio City, North Hollywood, and the NoHo Arts District. Significant institutions include the Van Nuys City Hall, Van Nuys Airport, Whiteman Airport, Olive View Medical Center, and Los Angeles Valley College. The Golden State Freeway (I-5), Foothill Freeway (I-210) and Ronald Reagan Freeway (S-118) are the major transportation corridors. The northern portion of the district includes a part of the Angeles National Forest.

CD 30 includes the western portion of the San Fernando Valley within the city of Los Angeles. Prominent communities include Bell Canyon (which is located in Ventura County, but is only accessible through the Valley), West Hills, Hidden Hills, Chatsworth, Canoga Park,

Woodland Hills, the Warner Center, Canoga Park, Winnetka, Tarzana, Encino, Reseda, Northridge, and Granada Hills. Cal. State-Northridge and Encino Hospital are major employers. This district also includes many open-space areas such as Lake Balboa and the Sepulveda Basin Recreation area. A significant portion of the southern boundary is aligned with the Mulholland Drive Scenic Corridor.

CD 31 includes a portion of San Bernardino County, including the cities of Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, Redlands, Rialto, Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and San Bernardino. The cities of Fontana, Rialto, Rancho Cucamonga and Upland are split to achieve population equality and, in accordance to submitted public testimony, consistent with communities of interest. The shape of the district is affected by an adjacent district (CD 35 (Pomona Valley)) that was drawn in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

CD 32 is anchored by the Los Angeles County cities of Covina and West Covina, with adjacent cities of Azusa, Monrovia, Duarte, San Dimas, La Verne, El Monte, Baldwin Park, Irwindale, La Puente, and the community of Avocado Heights. The district has a major transportation corridor of the 10 Freeway which connects these cities for commerce and recreation. The district has communities adjacent to the Angeles National Forest and many users of the foothill recreational areas are residents of the cities south of the foothills. Many residents of the district are immigrants who share employment, language access, educational and social needs. The cities of Glendora, Industry and Monrovia are split in this district to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

CD 33 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Agoura Hills, Malibu, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes Estates, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, and the coastal portion of Torrance. Leading communities of the city of Los Angeles within the district include Brentwood, Bel Air, Westwood, West Los Angeles, Greater Mid-Wilshire, Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Marina Del Rey, Venice Beach, Westchester, Harbor City, and the northwest portion of San Pedro. This district encompasses prominent beaches in Southern California and many affluent inland communities in the Los Angeles area. This district is characterized by having a relatively affluent socioeconomic urbanized area, as well as a vast suburban open space region. It also includes the Bellona Creek Wetlands and Dockweiler State Beach. The cities of Torrance and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality. The region is connected north-south primarily by the Pacific Coast Highway.

CD 34 includes the core of downtown Los Angeles, the artist district adjoining downtown, the neighborhoods of Pico Union, Westlake, Boyle Heights, Chinatown in its entirety, and East Los Angeles, a census designated place, in its entirety. The district's northern area includes the Eagle Rock and Glassell Park, neighborhoods whose residents have increasing work and transportation contacts with downtown Los Angeles. The district contains neighborhoods with a shared Latino and immigrant history that spans many generations in Los Angeles.

CD 35 consists of the Pomona Valley and parts of Fontana and Rialto, located primarily in San Bernardino County. This district contains the city of Pomona which is part of Los Angeles County, but separated geographically by Kellogg Hill. This district is characterized by common

social activities in the community consisting of local children's sports organizations, hospital services, and common socioeconomic characteristics. The cities of Fontana and Rialto were split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

CD 36 consists of the entire eastern portion of Riverside County and includes the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Blythe, Calimesa, Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Hemet, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, and San Jacinto. This district is characterized by shared tourism interests, bedroom communities of Coachella Valley, retirement communities, Indian lands, entertainment/economic interests of casinos and low desert geographic integrity is maintained for shared water interests. This district respects the Riverside County border to the north and south.

CD 37 includes the Los Angeles County cities and neighborhoods of Culver City, Century City, West Los Angeles, Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, Rancho Park, Mar Vista, Palms, Pico-Robertson, Blair Hills, Mid-City, West Adams, Ladera Heights, Leimert Park, View Park-Windsor Hills, Baldwin Hills, View Park, and Hyde Park. This district is characterized by very high residential density, the University of Southern California, West Los Angeles Community College, the Kenneth Hahn State Recreation area, Exposition Park, including the Los Angeles Coliseum and Sports Arena, Natural History Museum, California Science Center, and California African American Museum, as well as many historic African American neighborhoods. The cities of Inglewood and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality.

CD 38 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of South El Monte, Cerritos, Artesia, Whittier, Norwalk, Pico Rivera, La Mirada, East La Mirado, Montebello, Santa Fe Springs, La Palma, Hawaiian Gardens and divides the cities of Bellflower and Lakewood to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and to achieve population equality. These cities share the major transportation corridors of the Interstate 5 and Interstate 605 freeways, with their corresponding traffic and environmental concerns. The district is characterized by shared commercial, economic, educational, and public safety issues among these cities. In this district, South El Monte is whole.

CD 39 includes northern Orange County and portions of eastern Los Angeles County and southern San Bernardino County. Cities and communities in this district include Brea, Chino Hills, Diamond Bar, Fullerton, La Habra, La Habra Heights, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Walnut, and portions of cities of Chino, Industry, Buena Park and Anaheim to achieve population equality. This district is characterized by common social and economic interests of Asian Pacific Islander communities of Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, and Walnut where each share common areas of worship, and entertainment centers. The transportation corridor known as the Four Corners area shares a transportation policy committee, and a common wildlife conservation association.

CD 40 consists of the Los Angeles County cities Downey, Paramount, Bell, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood and Vernon. Portions of Bellflower and Los Angeles are split to achieve population equality and in consideration of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This district encompasses a group of cities in Los Angeles commonly referred to as the Southeast or Gateway cities, which share common socioeconomic characteristics. Many of the residents are

low-income, first-generation immigrants whose children attend schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

CD 41 consists of a portion of Riverside County, including the communities of Jurupa Valley, Riverside, and Moreno Valley. This district is characterized by the two most populous cities in Riverside County, including Riverside and Moreno Valley and shared common interests over former March Air Force Reserve Base, community college campus locations, and transpiration interests. This district recognizes the geographic separation of Moreno Valley at the Beaumont Pass. This district also respects the northern Riverside County border giving consideration to the Voting Rights Act Section 2 district to the north in Pomona Valley.

CD 42 consists of a portion of Riverside County, including the cities and communities of Eastvale, Canyon Lake, Corona, Lake Elsinore, Menifee, Murrieta, Norco and a portion of Temecula. Temecula is split to achieve population equality in the district. This district is characterized by common interests of the communities of western Riverside County, animal-keeping interests of Jurupa Valley and Norco; and shared interests between Eastvale, Norco and Corona. Corona and Norco share a common school district. Eastvale, Norco and Eastvale share common watershed interests in the Santa Ana River and fire and public safety issues common to both communities in the area of the Santa Ana River. This district also respects the shared transportation corridor between the cities along Interstate Highway 15.

CD 43 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Westchester, Lawndale, Alondra Park, Lennox, Playa Vista, Playa Del Rey, Harbor Gateway, Torrance, and West Carson. This district is characterized by very high residential density and the transportation corridor of the Harbor Freeway (I-110), which runs north-south through the entire district. The cities of Inglewood, Los Angeles and Torrance were split to achieve population equality. Prominent features include the Los Angeles International Airport, as well as institutions such as Loyola Marymount University, Centinela Hospital, and Los Angeles Metropolitan Medical Center.

CD 44 includes the Los Angeles County cities and communities of Compton, Carson, Lynwood, and South Gate. Prominent communities include Walnut Park, Rancho Dominguez, East Rancho Dominguez, Watts, Willowbrook, Rosewood, Longwood, North Long Beach, Hollydale, Lincoln Village, Hamilton, Sutter, Lindberg, Cherry Manor, Ramona Park, Davenport Park, Douglas Junction, Avalon Village, Terminal Island, and San Pedro. Catalina Island is also included in the district. The cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles were split to achieve population equality.

CD 45 includes the central and southern portions of Orange County. Cities and communities in this district include Villa Park, Tustin, North Tustin, Irvine, Lake Forest, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Rancho Santa Margarita, Coto De Caza, and portions of the cities of Anaheim, Mission Viejo and Orange to achieve population equality. This district respects the natural geographic divide of the Santa Ana Mountains to the east between Orange and Riverside Counties. This district is characterized by the most rural areas of Orange County, planned communities and common interests of former El Toro Marine Base.

CD 46 includes western and central portions of Orange County. Cities in this district include portions of Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Anaheim and Orange to achieve population equality. This community shares similar socioeconomic characteristics of an immigrant population, lower levels of educational attainment, and lower levels of English proficiency.

CD 47 includes the Los Angeles County cities of Long Beach, Signal Hills and the Orange County cities and communities of Cypress, Garden Grove, Los Alamitos, Stanton, Rossmoor, and Westminster. This district is characterized by the Port of Long Beach, one of the world's busiest seaports and the area's largest employer. The cities of Buena Park, Garden Grove, Lakewood, Long Beach and Westminster were split to achieve population equality.

CD 48 includes the coastal portion of Orange County. Cities and communities in this district include Seal Beach, Sunset Beach, Fountain Valley, Midway City, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, Laguna Beach, Laguna Niguel, Aliso Viejo, and portions of the cities of Garden Grove, Santa Ana and Westminster. Splits include a portion of Huntington Beach to achieve population equality. This district is characterized by shared school districts, state-managed coastal beaches, intense beach recreation, and sensitive environmental coastal estuaries. It also includes the officially designated business area of Little Saigon.

CD 49 consists of the southern coastal region of Orange County from Laguna Niguel to all of the established coastal beach communities along San Diego County Highway 5 to the northern edge of the city of San Diego, and includes Camp Pendleton, and the San Onofre Nuclear Plant. The district is characterized by its state-managed coastal beaches, intense beach recreation, and sensitive environmental coastal estuaries. It includes moderate- to very high-income communities. Cities and communities in this district include Las Flores, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Ladera Ranch, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Del Mar, and portions of Mission Viejo and San Diego to achieve population equality. Other distinct communities include Marine Corps Base Pendleton and Rancho Santa Fe.

CD 50 consists of the northeastern portion of San Diego County and includes agriculture lands, and open-space national and state park and recreational activities. It includes cities and communities along the urbanized Highway I-15 corridor, including the city of Temecula in Riverside County, and the southern urbanized communities in south San Diego County, to the less urbanized and rural communities along the foothills and mountain ranges to the east. The district is characterized by low to moderate income levels. The cities of Temecula and El Cajon are split to achieve population equality.

CD 51 consists of a two-county district stretching from all of Imperial County to the southern edge of San Diego County, along the shared international border with Mexico. Its geography ranges from the far desert regions on the east, including the Salton Sea basin, to the San Diego/Tijuana watershed region on the Pacific Ocean. It ranges from the sparsely populated region of Imperial County to the highly urbanized cities and communities in San Diego and connects educational, health, and social services delivery systems to low-income communities along the southern edge of the district. The district is characterized by its large concentration of Latino border communities and major international border-crossing activities and associated international trade and commerce. The district's Imperial County portion also contains a core

economic interest based on development as a regional water recreational and energy resource center. The cities of San Diego and Chula Vista are split to achieve population equality.

CD 52 consists of nearly the entire city of San Diego. The district is highly urbanized with regional parks, lakes, and open-space preserves and is the central social and economic hub of San Diego County. The district is characterized by its government center, commercial, business, high-tech research industries, three major universities, naval and military operations, port and airport operations, tourist attractions, recreational beaches, and environmentally sensitive coastal areas. It includes a highly diverse region of ethnic enclaves, a large LGBT community, and a wide range of income levels.

CD 53 consists of portions of the eastern edge of city of San Diego, the cities of La Mesa, El Cajon, Lemon Grove, and Chula Vista. The district is highly urbanized with regional parks, lakes, and open-space preserves. It is characterized by its highly diverse communities of interests, with large ethnic enclaves, a large LGBT community, a wide range of income levels, and a mix of older established communities to the north and newly developed communities to the south. The cities of El Cajon, Chula Vista, and San Diego are split to achieve population equality.