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 As originally enacted, it mirrored the special masters' standard from the 1970s and required that "the population of all districts of a particular type shall be *reasonably equal*."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 unprecedently 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 *Growe 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 looks 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