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Wednesday, October 27, 2021  1:10 p.m.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Commissioner Turner, your acting chair for today. And at this time, I'd like to call this meeting to order. This is our meeting for Wednesday, October 27th, 28th, and 29th. And at this time, I'd like to call for roll call, please.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Yes, Madam Chair.
Commissioner Vazquez.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Presente.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons.

(NO response)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

(NO response)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: And Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TURNER: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: And that is beautiful. I'd like to
welcome you all to our next three days of excitement for
our meeting that we're going to have. And just in a nod
to our Commissioner Yee that loves fun facts, I looked up
for him and learned that today is National Civics Day.
So I'd like to say happy National Civics Day to you all.
And to all of our Californians, thank you for being
civically engaged with us through this process. And so
today on -- over the next few days, we have our work cut
out for us, but we are here and prepared and excited to
get into it.

A couple of announcements before we begin. Just
wanting to remind our Californians everywhere that we,
indeed, will take public comment at the end of our
session. However, we do have an amazing tool available
on our website that will allow you to interact with us
and give us real time feedback and comment on what you're
experiencing with us on today. So we want to thank you
in advance for your direction, thank you for your input,
it is of utmost value. We cannot do our work without
you, so we say thank you. We are ever listening and ever
refining what we're working on.

And so we -- I just want to encourage you to
continue to tell us, not just what you dislike about the
lines and the maps, I'd really like to encourage you to
tell us what you love, what you'd like to see. You all
have seen and you understand the criteria that we are required to follow, but please note beyond that it is our utmost desire to, ultimately, present maps that will benefit Californians everywhere. We want to work to ensure that these are maps that you all will say yes, I had a hand in that and that is exactly what I want to see.

So to the commissioners, Commissioners, we have our work cut out for sure. Time is not our friend, Commissioners. Time is not our friend, it's not on our side. So we are going to be concise as we can as we move forward over these next couple of days. And so I just ask that you listen intently at what is being shared and make sure that you're additive and not repetitive. What did she say? We're going to be additive and not repetitive today so that we can get through our sessions.

This session we're going to review visualizations and we're going to start out just a review of our agenda. We're going start out -- we have Toni with us that's going to do an overview, I believe, of our district viewer. We do have, I want to notify you, a closed session that we will be going into; we won't be long. We're hoping to go into closed session about 1:30 or so. So 2:30 we will take a break and be back with you, at which time we're going to do visualizations. We'll start
in the Bay Area with our assembly districts. We'll do the Bay Area and Central Coast.

And, Commissioners, so that you'll know what to expect today, we're going to start out with having staff that will give us a ten-minute or less overview of the area that we will be discussing. After their overview -- and thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, you had talked to us about doing not just data but knowledge -- and so, Commissioners, we're going to have an opportunity to discuss what we've heard, so we can begin to create shared knowledge about the area. And after that, we will then give direction -- we'll hear from the line drawers and our mappers, rather, and then we will give some further instruction to them and we'll move to the next area.

So that kind of is our plan and format over these next couple of days. We'll go through our assembly districts in all of the areas. We'll do Bay Area, Central Coast, followed by the inland areas, Northern California, Central California, then Los Angeles, then Southern California. We will go through assembly districts, we'll follow with congressional districts, and then senate districts. So we have a plan in place. And so at this time, let's get to it.

So we will start -- let's see, Toni? Oh, up, up,
up. Yeah, I think that's right. Toni, are you ready to
give us an overview?

MS. ANTONOVA: Hi, Commissioner Turner. I -- yeah,
I can get us started.

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful.

MS. ANTONOVA: Thanks so much. Let me just share my
screen. Great. Well, I am excited to give an update
from the data management team. Our wonderful data
analyst, Paul, has put together a interactive map that
allows everyone to essentially interact with the
visualizations that have been created for this meeting.
You can find it on the usual data tab where we put all of
our information. There'll be a new button there that
will take you to the map page. It's a very exciting
little app. You can pretty much go to any place in
California, look at everything on a granular level if you
want, or a bit more high-level, and it shows all of the
district visualizations that we have for these meetings.

Before I get into the app, I just want to point out
that you can download the shapefiles by clicking on this
link here. And if you have any feedback on the
visualizations, members of the public are welcome to fill
out this form and let us know. So the app is pretty
intuitive, but I'll take us through some of the main
features.
There are visualizations for each of the different district levels. There's assembly districts, senate districts, and congressional here. You can see that you can make each of the visualizations visible by clicking on the little check mark next to the name. We've also uploaded the county lines and -- as well as the county name. So if you want to toggle this on and off, you're welcome to do it clicking the check mark as well. And if you zoom in by essentially using your mouse or clicking this plus button here, you will see that we've also added incorporated places and CDPs. And you can toggle those lines on and off as well. It's a bit bright here, but if I zoom into one of the cities, you might be able to see what I'm talking about a little bit more. Yeah, you can see the different boundaries toggling it on and off.

And, yeah, essentially this lets you kind of look at the different visualizations at whatever angle you prefer. You can zoom in to the street level and you'll see more information popping up as you do. I'm using my mouse right now, but again you can use these buttons. If you zoom in very closely, you'll even see street names and you know, some level of buildings and things like that. It's not quite as detailed as Google Maps, but it gets pretty close. If you want to easily get back to the home default view, you can click this home button and
it'll bring you back to the wider California view.

Another thing I wanted to point out is that each of the polygons that form a district visualization are labeled with the name. These were -- these are the names and titles that the line drawers have given this specific district. You can, you know, refer to these visualizations with this label. And if the labels are a bit cluttered and you want to view the map without them, you're welcome to hide the actual label by clicking on these three buttons right here, and toggling that feature on and off as well.

We've added another option that's maybe useful, if you're viewing all of the districts at the same time. But it basically changes the transparency of the actual lines. This isn't that useful if you're just viewing them one at a time, but if you toggle them all on, you might want the lines to be a little less transparent -- or more transparent I should say. Let's see. Finally, you're welcome to move around these different app features on the page, set it up how you find it most convenient. And if you prefer, you can go full screen.

I think that's pretty much it for everything I wanted to show. There is an address search bar. You can look for cities or towns, specific addresses here, if you'd like. But everything else, I think, is pretty
intuitive and straightforward. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Toni. It's interesting.

I mentioned to Toni one time, one-on-one, she presents so
matter of factly. But this is actually a brilliant tool
and I'm hopeful that people will use it. And so we get
to this by going to our website. It's under data and
then it's under visualizations -- California
visualizations. We have layers, we have zoom
opportunity, we have search functions.

This is beautiful, Toni. Thank you so much. We
appreciate it.

Any Commissioners, you have any questions about this
tool?

(No audible response)

CHAIR TURNER: You are absolutely correct. It is
very intuitive, so I'm hoping and would love to invite
Californians to play around with this tool as we go into
closed session that is for pending litigation exception.
And we -- so far, we'll maintain this schedule, we're a
little bit ahead. So we're going to go into closed
session and we are hoping to be back no later than right
after our break period at 2:45. Thank you, all.

Yep, question?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, question for Toni. So I
take it the currently displayed districts are the
visualizations that -- I shouldn't say districts -- the visualizations are that we'll be discussing today.

What's the intention for when those get updated and as the visualizations evolve? Thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Toni, do you have a -- who has that answer?

MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah, we'll be working with the line drawers to see how to best present the next batch of visualizations. And it -- they'll likely be an entirely separate map once the drafts come out. But for visualizations, we may put more layers here on this panel for people to click through. We'll be deciding that a bit later, depending on what the shapefiles look like.

I realized I forgot to point out that each of the districts does have some metadata available and you can see that when you actually click on the district itself. You'll see the name as before, but you'll also see citizens, the population, and different statistics there that were provided in the shapefile itself.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So just to follow up. So as the members of the public may comment on visualizations then, will it always be clear which generation of visualizations they're commenting on?

MS. ANTONOVA: Yes, yes. We'll be adding the dates on each of the visualization titles. And so if and when
we add more, the public will be able to toggle between
them and see which meeting they're related to.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: And, Toni, as I'm seeing it on the
assembly district that you have displayed currently, VAD
Central North 10/27, and so for our public, this is 10 --
October 27th visualization. So that date will always be
updated based on the day that visualization came out,
okay?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Hey, Toni. Super ticky,
techie question here. Maybe this is user error, but the
box that -- I'm looking at it off the website. The box
that shows, you know, where you could type in a keyword
or you could check off assembly districts, counties, all
that kind of stuff, is there a way to minimize that box?
Because I see that on what you're showing, it looks like
you can move it around. I tried doing it, but I don't
know. Maybe it's the way I have the thing open. Is
there like a trick to it?

MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah. I -- are you referring to this
box --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. ANTONOVA: -- that I'm moving right now?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.
MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah. You can either X out of it directly and then find it again in this button right here --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it.

MS. ANTONOVA: -- that I'm hovering over, or you can just click that button and that'll toggle it on and off.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: User error. Thank you.

MS. ANTONOVA: No, I'm glad you asked. That's actually a feature we were looking to put in because this does block the map quite a bit.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: And seeing no other hands, at this time we're going to go into our closed session. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you and welcome back. Just want to report that we are coming back from closed session where there was no action taken. And at this time, to start our session, I'd actually like to invite Mr. Becker, our VRA counsel, to talk to us about VRA.

MR. BECKER: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

What I'm going to do is I'm going to share some maps with you. Dr. Gall, our racially polarized voting expert, has analyzed over 700 elections in the state of California over the last ten years at the assembly, state
senate, and the congressional level. Throughout the
state, especially where we've identified the first
Gingles pre-condition, in other words, that a minority
group was large enough and geographically compact enough
to form a majority in a particular district, to see
whether or not the second and third Gingles pre-
conditions -- just a reminder, that is the second Gingles
pre-condition is the minority group voting cohesively for
particular candidates of choice. And then the third
Gingles pre-condition, which is are the rest of the
voters in that area voting in a way that they would
defeat the minority voters' candidates of choice. So
we've done that and I'm going to share my screen, if I
can find this map. There we go. Hopefully, you all can
see this. I'm going to start with this map.
Can one of you nod or something if you're seeing
this map?
(No audible response)
MR. BECKER: Excellent, thank you.
So this is a map of assembly racially polarized
voting and the Gingles pre-conditions in assembly
district races over the course of the last decade, using
the existing districts. And the dark lines are county
boundaries and the -- what the darkest shaded areas
indicate are where all three Gingle pre-conditions have
been met. Anything that is less shaded, all three were
not met. So the -- those pre-conditions would not
necessarily require Voting Rights Act consideration in
those areas. The minority groups there might not require
a district to be drawn under the terms of the Voting
Rights Act.

So we'll just quickly point out this is -- these
follow existing assembly district lines. This is
Imperial County, most of Riverside, the populated areas,
heavily populated areas, of San Bernardino. There's this
portion of South San Diego that consistently shows up.
This portion of eastern Los Angeles County, which
includes where my cursor is, an area where we'd also see
-- most of this is a Latino -- are Latino minorities, but
where my cursor is right now, or the arrow is, is an area
where there is an Asian population that -- where all
three pre-conditions are met. And then this goes up from
Lancaster and Palmdale in northern L.A. County up through
Kern and the Central Valley. And I'll just leave that
there for a second.

Note -- and you'll see this as a theme -- all three
Gingles pre-conditions are not met in the Bay area.
These are largely Asian populations. And what this means
is that our analysis indicates, Dr. Gall's analysis
indicates, that the crossover voting -- the non-Asian
voting in these areas is very consistent with the Asian
voting patterns, that people are not voting along purely
racial lines in the Bay area, which again I would note
means that a Voting Rights Act district might not need to
be drawn, but is a reflection of the progress that's been
made, largely thanks to the Voting Rights Act. All
right. So that is -- that's the assembly district map.

This is the senate district map. Senate districts
are very large in California, which I've been a broken
record on. There are nearly a million people right now
in each senate district. And this is the map that I
think might be in some ways, most relevant and I will
harken back to this quite often. So this is a map where
-- this is largely how the districts are drawn. You'll
see all the way through Southern California, including
Imperial, San Diego, Riverside, Bernardino, much of L.A.
County, good portions of Orange County, up into Kern
County and through the Central Valley. And then there's
also this portion where we have seen, in the senate
districts, in particular, because of how they're drawn,
pretty significant racially polarized voting in a section
of Monterey and San Benito Counties. And I think it's
fair to say there is substantial racially polarized
voting there to satisfy the third Gingles pre-condition.
There are a few areas here where all three are not met.
I'll move to the congressional maps. Similarly, this will remind you of how the districts are drawn, but we see the same patterns throughout Southern California, western Riverside County where a lot of the population concentrations are, as well as western San Bernardino County, into L.A. County and in the northern part of Orange County, and then through the Central Valley, as well, coming down into Kern County and this area right here is right around Bakersfield.

Now, areas where there's -- these -- this next map I'm showing you, it is not the only areas where racially polarized voting and the three Gingles pre-conditions are met, but it's where we're seeing it very consistently, without any doubt. So here we've got all of Imperial County, we've got southern part of San Diego, we've got these large population concentrations in western Riverside and San Bernardino, and in east Los Angeles and northern Orange Counties, and then throughout the Central Valley. And then I'll point out, again, looking back at the senate map, I would also include this area here where we're seeing pretty significant racially polarized voting in San Benito and Monterey.

I don't know that I have anything else to add to that, although I'm happy to answer any questions. And as we start probably heading into the next set of
visualization.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Becker. I don't see any hands. It was very helpful. And so we'll move then to the next part. And as a reminder, we're going to go through each of the areas' assembly visualizations, followed later by congressional and senate. And we will go in the area -- Bay Area, Central Coast. So there's three different parts commissioners are going to attempt to do in this session. We're going to, first of all, allow staff to start with the high-level review of our communities of interest testimony. We'll follow then with a brief high-level discussion, what did we learn from that, what do we know about that area. And then we will give instructions to the mappers before we move to the next area of assembly visualizations.

So, Tamina, we'll start with you for our Bay Area and Central Coast.

And the order that we're going in, if you all have printed out your packets, may be in a little bit of a different order, but we do have page numbers for you to follow along.

MS. MACDONALD: We will read off -- oh, thank you so much for that question. And we will read off the page numbers, and we're going to be starting with page number 11, please, of your assembly district package, please.
CHAIR TURNER: Right before you do, we're going to start with staff though.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay? Thank you. So yep. Sorry, Tamina, I skipped ahead. I was anxious to hear from you.

But, Marcy, who's going to report out from your team?

MS. KAPLAN: Ashleigh.

CHAIR TURNER: Ashleigh? Okay. Ashleigh, we're ready.

MS. HOWICK: Okay. Good afternoon, Commissioners and everyone else tuning in. I am Ashleigh, and for those who do not know, I am the Northern California field lead. So today I will be going -- or giving an overview of some of the input we have received, starting from the North Coast and then going down into the Bay Area and then into the Central Coast. So I will start with giving a report on the amount of input we have received coming from those areas. These are also known as outreach zones A, C, and E.

So from the visualization feedback form, we have 647; from the Draw My CA community website, we have 521; from live meetings, we have 465; emails 270; letters 101; the CRC website 13; and from reports we have 5. And so with those numbers I will note that while we have done
our best to account for it, it is possible the records that span into multiple outreach zones to be counted more than once.

And then moving on -- so just before I continue, I want to say the following is an overview of high-level trends derived from submissions to the Commission. The overview is meant to provide commissioners with some examples of public input I received.

So starting in the North Coast, a major trend here that we've seen is to keep the coastal counties from Del Norte down to Marin together. The vast majority of input coming from the Humboldt area is to not put it with the inland areas and to keep it with the coast going south. Also, a lot of comments saying that the 101 corridor is essential to this area. We have seen a lot of concerns coming from the Humboldt people of not being able to protect their environmental concerns or some of their more marginalized communities there, if they are a district inland.

We have seen a handful of comments to not put Del Norte, West Sonoma, Marin or Solano, because they feel that they are too urban down there and it would make them feel under-represented. We -- from this area, we've also seen a lot of input to keep Marin and Sonoma together, and more to not put Marin with San Francisco. We also
got a group email with sixty-five plus signers stating to keep Del Norte to Marin together, mentioning there are no transportation corridors linking the coast to the inland areas. And just because there was some overlap with some of the visualizations, Dave Alcoso (ph.) said to put Solano with Yolo County, so I wanted to include that.

And then moving down into the Bay Area, so I'm going to start just with San Francisco. We've had many COIs in this area just discussing the importance of recognizing the different neighborhoods there and not splitting those neighborhoods up, including but certainly not limited to, SoMa, which is south of Market district, Chinatown and Castro.

And then down to the peninsula, we've seen some comments stating to put Brisbane, South San Francisco, Colma, and San Bruno together. And then I'm going to move across, over to the East Bay Area around Oakland. So we've gotten a lot of COIs or requests to keep together the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Piedmont, and Emeryville. Many of those also expand to include Albany Alameda, and El Cerrito. And then we've gotten some more recent comments coming from the people of Albany to leave things the way that they are.

And then going into the West Contra Costa/Richmond area, we've gotten a lot of comments to leave Richmond
with San Pablo. Many are commenting on the importance of
the Richmond school district in the area. And then some
of these COIs are also suggesting to include Richmond
area with the -- with Martinez, Benicia, Rodeo, Hercules,
Crockett, parts or all of Vallejo and parts or all of
Pittsburg.

And then out of East Contra Costa, we've seen a lot
of COI from the Delta communities that they want to all
be together, including, but again not limited to,
Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Knightsen, so that area
there.

And then moving to -- I'm going to move to the East
Bay but still the Hayward area. We've seen comments
coming from Hayward and surrounding areas to put Hayward,
with Castro Valley, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Ashland,
Fairview, Cherryland, Eden, and Glad Tidings. There are
a lot of unincorporated areas around there that say that
they would rather be with Hayward rather than Oakland.
And then just from some of the visualization feedbacks,
people from this area are saying that they are not
connected with Pleasanton in any way.

And then going into the East Bay tri-valley region,
most of the COI here is stating to keep Dublin,
Livermore, and Pleasanton together. Many of these COIs
also expand to include San Ramon and Danville, stating
that this makes up a tri-valley region. Also there are some that are also requesting to include unincorporated areas around Livermore that focus on wine. And then some are also saying to add San Ramon in with this tri-valley region.

And then moving down to the South Bay, we've seen quite a few inputs stating to keep Cupertino, Santa Clara, and Sunnyvale together. And then from this, many expand to include Milpitas or Fremont, while others expand to say they don't want to be with Fremont, Union City, or Newark. We've also seen recommendations of keeping Los Altos, Monte Sereno, Saratoga, and Campbell together. And then just some examples of other COIs that have been mentioned from the South Bay include -- there's a little bit of overlap here -- but Saratoga, Los Altos, Palo Alto, Moutain View, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale, and then Berryessa, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Evergreen, and Silver Creek. And then another one -- again, sorry, there's overlap by Palo Alto, Mountain View, Los Altos Hills, and Los Altos.

Okay. And then I -- from there, I'm moving down into the central coast. So most of our input coming from this area, they want to stress that they are different and they are distinct from the bay area, and they are also distinct from the central valley. So they are
requesting that we be more cautious to not combine the urban city areas of the Bay area with the more rural and agricultural-based communities. We have seen a bit of input stating that, if needed, rural San Mateo County can be included with Santa Cruz County, but requests to not include the urban areas east of the ridgeline in San Mateo County.

And then from the agricultural communities there, we've gotten quite a bit of COI input, and so I'm going to list some of the cities that are commonly mentioned to keep together that share similar lifestyles, cultures, and language. So those cities include Gilroy, Salinas, Hollister, Watsonville, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, and King City. And while not as commonly mentioned, there is some mention of including Morgan Hill with this group. We've also seen input from San Luis Obispo saying that their county has more in common -- or yeah, it has more in common with Santa Barbara County than they do Monterey County.

And then out of Santa Barbara County, we've seen quite a few requests to keep Santa Maria, Lompoc, and Guadalupe together. Some of this input is expanding to include this COI with the Oxnard area out of Ventura County. And then back from Santa Barbara County, we've had some input from this area to maintain a portion of
Santa Barbara County with San Luis Obispo County, but others are also commenting just leave Santa Barbara whole.

And then from Ventura County, we saw a very strong response from the visualizations to not put Simi Valley with Malibu. And some are saying Simi Valley and Moorpark have more in common with Santa Clarita, and some are saying Santa Clarita Valley belongs with the Antelope Valley. We also saw a lot of COI input coming from -- or stating that a COI would be Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Fillmore, and El Rio. And people from this are stating about this COI, some of them also said that they do not want to be included with Simi Valley, Moorpark, or Thousand Oaks.

So that concludes my little summary of some of the high level trends in that area. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. Thank you, Ashleigh, I found it very helpful. Appreciate just your summary of the area. That gives us a great reminder about what's going on.

And now, I'd like to open it up to the commissioners to see if you all have any reactions or any thoughts about what was shared. Is it in alignment with what you've heard?

Commissioner Ahmad?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Can go ahead and jump in. From Northern California, it's pretty consistent with what I've read from emails, live in-person testimony through the COI tool in regards to keeping the coastal communities together and the difference between the coastal communities and those communities more inland, particularly I recall folks calling in talking about how long it would take to drive across a potential district, given the terrain of that area. So that part was pretty consistent with what I took.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. It would be interesting, I think, at some point, to determine what is an acceptable drive for each of these areas, based on terrain, based on traffic, based on just geography, in general. Everyone seems to think their area is a little bit too long and I just wonder what that would look like. Any other comments?

(No audible response)


Okay.

Well, then with that, Tamina, I think perhaps they are waiting with bated breath for your presentation.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much, Chair Turner. And thank you, Commissioners, for having us again. I
just thought I'll walk you through what we were thinking of doing and we can see if that works and you know, pivot if it doesn't. So as you obviously know, we now are on one map and one plan for this assembly visualization. And of course all of these visualized district-sized pieces are going from one mapper region into the other.

So we thought we might start with Tamina giving you a general overview of the area that she's mapped for you today and so she'll go through it pretty quick. She's not going to read off all of the demographics or statistics for each district because you have those available on your handout in various ways here on a spreadsheet, and then also on each visualization. And then once she's given you an overview kind of outlining what's in each district, just to remind you, we can perhaps go back and then you can start giving some direction. If the direction goes into Kennedy's area -- so basically, goes to the east -- and then from the east then going south along, you know, Nevada border and so forth, then Tamina will point that out. And Kennedy, of course, is sitting right next to me, and as soon as we see that there's too much happening in Kennedy's area, then perhaps we can switch over. Kennedy can give you the overview and then we can have both of them there when you're giving direction and then they can both tell you
what the implications might be because I think that's
where we're at. We're at a point now in the process
where there's more of a conversation possible because we
have this one plan. And so when you're given direction,
for example, where you say well, I would like to see this
particular area perhaps going east rather than south,
then, you know, the respective mapper can give you some
feedback about what that would mean and then you can give
direction accordingly. So shall we try that? Does that
sound okay?

CHAIR TURNER: Let's do it. It sounds beautiful.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much. And with that, I
will read off the pages on which you will find the
visualization. And just wanted to say I'm sorry they're
not in order, but we weren't sure which way you wanted to
go. And when we put them together, we thought we might
do a little wave from, you know, north to east, northeast
to southwest and whatnot, and now we're basically just
going by mapper region and we'll see how that goes the
next time. We can --

CHAIR TURNER: This is going to keep us awake. This
is a perfect order.

MS. MACDONALD: Fantastic. So with that, we would
like to start with your assembly visualization package,
and please turn to page 11 for your first visualization
of a district.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Good afternoon, Commission. We're going to be starting in the northwest corner of the state and our first visualization district is N. Coast for assembly. This district contains Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino and Lake Counties. It also includes Sonoma County. I'm going to zoom in so you can see where the line is here. Not including Cloverdale, Geyserville, Healdsburg, Windsor, this line down the freeway; all of these cities are intact and splitting a small part of Santa Rosa in the southeast. Rohnert Park is intact in the south, as is Cotati.

Next, we'll be going to page 31. This is TEHANAPA. This is -- and I apologize ahead of time. You'll see that the names sometimes don't correspond with what is currently, as you'll see when we ripple around and things move, sometimes it changed what the districts look like. So if the names don't describe them, I apologize.

This visualization district contains all of Napa County, takes the northern areas of Yolo County, does not include Winters, does not include -- keeps Davis and UC Davis whole within this district. Takes the wine country regions along the freeway of Sonoma County and includes Vallejo from Solano County whole.

Next is page 16. This visualization is called
Solano and it incorporates most of Solano County, with the exception of Vallejo City. It includes, of Yolo County, the Winters area, as well as some of the areas along the river system and water system here, Freeport down through Isleton. So this includes the delta areas of Sacramento County as well, coming up and taking this area of Elk Grove. We'll hear more about Elk Grove when we go over to Kennedy's area. This is going into the area she will be discussing, but this was a move for population, to gather -- this is about 150,000 more people.

Going to page 17. Oh, sorry, going to page 32. This visualization is called ECC because it incorporates most of east Contra Costa County. This does include Concord along the 4 corridor through Baypoint, through Bethel Island. All of these cities are currently intact, Clayton is with Concord.

Page 34, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. On the page numbers, we're going to have to more time to find these. I just printed mine out this morning and either the page numbers are not consistent with what the mappers have or mappers are not giving us the right page numbers. So we just
need a little more time to find the map that we're
supposed to be looking at. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. And
so we will have the page number called out, we'll verify
if we're all on the same page before we start hearing the
testimony about it.

So currently we are on page --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Let's go to page 32, which is East
Bay.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So just --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I'm sorry, that was my mistake. I
jumped to a second one.

CHAIR TURNER: It's okay. I'm showing 32, VAD East
Bay 10/27?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: That's what I have.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We're ready.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. So this visualization, East
Bay 10/27 starts right below the Hercules city line in
Contra Costa County, comes south through Richmond and the
greater Richmond area, to the county line of Contra Costa
County. Then comes south into Alameda County taking
Albany, Berkeley, and Emeryville, Piedmont, and the
western areas of Oakland. This is the same split you saw
before along the freeway.

CHAIR TURNER: One moment, Tamina.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think one of the confusing things, the colors that your showing on the screen is different than what was printed on the PDFs. Is that -- does anyone else have that?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Oh, you all are printed in --

CHAIR TURNER: I don't know. Mine are black and white.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- in black and white, so it doesn't matter. Okay, that's just a me issue. All right, sorry about that.

CHAIR TURNER: You are right, Sara.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'll sort it out. I'll sort it out.

CHAIR TURNER: Just want to make sure you're paying attention. We caught you, we found it. We -- you won, Sara wins the prize. Okay. We'll get our coloring together, but for now we're going to follow those tags and the shapes and make sure we're looking at the same piece part.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We're moving to page 22.

CHAIR TURNER: Good catch.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We're looking for visualization called RO Dublin.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We're here.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Thank you very much. RO is for
Rodeo where we start with the Rodeo/Crockett/Port Costa area of Contra Costa County, including Hercules. Go east along 4 to the Vine Hill/Martinez area, and then this 680 corridor is kept completely intact from Martinez all the way south to the county line. This area also includes Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga, as well as the unincorporated areas of both Contra Costa County to the west and Alameda County, which was requested to include with Contra Costa County instead of putting it in with Oakland. For population, this district also includes the City of Dublin, which is in Alameda County. There are no splits in this visualization.

We're now going to page 34. The visualization is called East CC. East CC starts in the west with Concord, Clyde, and Clayton, follows the 4 corridor through Bay Point, Pittsburg, Antioch, all the way to the county line at Bethel Island. Incorporates all the way down to the eastern county line and the southern county line of Contra Costa County. This visualization also includes areas of San Joaquin County, which are unincorporated, that flow to the east toward Stockton but does not split any cities.

CHAIR TURNER: Tamina?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: On this map, I see Bethel Island,
Knightsen, Discovery Bay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Where are the San Joaquin areas?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: San Joaquin is everything to the right of this squiggly county line. So these areas over here.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, they're just not named on your map? I got you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Right. They are not part of incorporated cities, so they don't have names that are popping up, but they are part of San Joaquin County.

We'll move to page 21, to a visualization called Oakland. This visualization contains the rest of Oakland, the south and western -- eastern parts of Oakland City, as well as Alameda City, and San Leandro City. There are no splits in this visualization.

CHAIR TURNER: Before you move, let me check in with commissioners.

Is this pace okay, or do we need to slow down? Are you finding it? I'm just hearing pages turning.

Just a tad slower, Tamina, so they can find it, see the cities, and be able to hear your presentation.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: My apologies. I will go slower. We are going to page 20.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Chair Turner?
CHAIR TURNER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I just ask a clarifying question? When you say there's no splits, does that mean no cities were split?
CHAIR TURNER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Just wanted to clarify. Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: And we're on 21?
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We are on page 20, visualization named ALAMEDA.
CHAIR TURNER: We're good.
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: The ALAMEDA visualization starts west in Castro Valley, Ashland, San Lorenzo, Cherryland, and Fairview, the unincorporated areas. Includes Hayward and part of Union City. It includes Pleasanton, Livermore, and Sunol, and all of the area to the county line. Both the eastern county line between Alameda and Mountain House/Tracy is preserved, and the southern county line is also preserved. The city split in this visualization is Union City, right along this area.
And we will be moving to page 29. You're looking for a visualization called FREMONT. This visualization incorporates the City of Fremont and the City of Newark, also part of Union City with the same split that we just
saw from the previous, comes south into Santa Clara County to take the City of Milpitas, some incorporated -- unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County in the light color over here, and then into San Jose City. This is the Berryessa area neighborhood. There's a split in the East Foothills area and this was following the COI of the Berryessa COI.

And we'll move to page 24. The visualization is called ALUMROCK. The north of this visualization has the Alameda County line right where it divides between Alameda County and Santa Clara County. Coming into Santa Clara County, we have areas of San Jose City, including the downtown Alum Rock, and the bottom part, the southern part of East Foothills. The unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County to the east are all included, all up to the county line. And this visualization stops short of coming in -- stops short of the areas of Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy, which are all intact in another visualization. This area down here in purple is also an area of San Jose. This is the furthest most area of San Jose and it is incorporated in this visualization.

We'll go to page 23. This visualization is called GATOSBANK. This visualization includes the City of Burbank, Fruitdale, Campbell, Cambrian Park, Monte Sereno, and Los Gatos. These cities are all intact in
this visualization. This visualization also includes to
the county line of Santa Clara unincorporated areas and
comes south to just above Morgan Hill in Santa Clara
County.

Moving to page 30, to LEXSUNNY. LEXSUNNY starts in
the north with an area of San Jose City, and includes
Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Cupertino, and
Saratoga. All of these cities are intact in this
visualization.

Going to page 26. This is WESTSF. This
visualization includes the western neighborhoods of San
Francisco City and County. There is a split in the Outer
Mission neighborhood, which extends down this way, and a
little bit of Castro/Upper Market on the west, and a few
blocks of Potrero Hills. Actually, no, I apologize.
That's the one. It also incorporates the cities of Daly
City, Broadmoor, Colma, and Brisbane, all of which are
intact in this visualization.

East San Francisco is on page 25, which --

CHAIR TURNER: Tamina, one moment please.

Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: For some of these lower
areas, Colma, Brisbane, et cetera, was there -- do you
happen to recall if there was COI testimony asking for
them to be kept together?
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, there was COI testimony requesting several regions of the university area that be -- were kept together, using San Francisco, and that the driving and commuting areas from Broadmoor or Daly City would be kept with the western -- southwestern areas of San Francisco.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: There are also some COIs from the Asian community, which asked to be kept together in those areas.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Also, just quickly, is South San Francisco cut?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: It is not cut from West San Francisco.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: So East San Francisco, page 25. This visualization has the eastern neighborhoods of San Francisco City and County, from Presidio to North Beach, including Treasure Island, going south to Potrero Hill, and including Bernal Heights and the Outer Mission. Some of these lines -- this actually is all the Outer Mission that can be taken in by this census block.

We'll go to page 28 to a visualization called PALORED. This visualization starts in the north at South
San Francisco and it comes south along the freeway through San Bruno, Millbrae -- this is all San Mateo County -- Burlingame, Hillsborough, San Mateo, Baywood Park, Highlands, Belmont, Foster City, Redwood City, San Carlos, Emerald Hills -- sorry, Emerald Lake Hills, and some unincorporated areas at the end. There are no city splits in this visualization.

Moving to page 27 to SMATEO. This visualization starts in SMATEO and then goes south into other counties. But it does start in Pacifica at its northwest corner, comes south through Montara, follows the coastline through Moss Beach, El Granada, and Half Moon Bay. For population, we then come in through Woodside, Atherton, North Fair Oaks, West Menlo Park, Stanford/Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, Palo Alto, Ladera, Portola Valley, Los Altos Hills, and Los Altos, and Loyola. This area is another extension of Palo Alto. This visualization also includes La Honda, Loma Mar, and Pescadero. And in Santa Cruz -- sorry, Santa Clara County includes Lexington Hills. This visualization then incorporates all of Santa Cruz County, with the exception of the coastal cities of Twin Lakes, Pleasure Point, Capitola, Seacliff, Rio del Mar, La Selva Beach, and the areas of Aptos Hills, Larkin Valley, Amesti, Freedom, Interlaken, and Watsonville, which were used in the second visualization.
CHAIR TURNER: Tamina, are we still on 27?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, we are still in SMATEO, the green area, or green on my screen. So we are including Santa Cruz -- I'm sorry, I may have confused folks by saying what was not included. We are including Santa Cruz, Paradise Park, Live Oak, Soquel, Aptos, Day Valley, and Corralitos. All of these cities are whole and not split in this visualization.

We're now going to page 55. Page 55 is BENSAL. This visualization is marked in a brighter yellow to indicate that it is one of the potential VRA districts to look at. This area incorporates -- includes all of San Benito County and eastern Monterey County along the freeway, coming down from Pajaro, through Salinas, Spreckels, Chualar, and Gonzales. It also goes north into Gilroy, San Martin, and Morgan Hill, and into Santa Cruz County for Interlaken, Watsonville, and Pajaro, Freedom, and Amesti.

And I'd like to invite Mr. Becker, if he has any comments on this area.

MR. BECKER: None.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. Then we will go to page 56, to MONTCOAST. 56. MONTCOAST incorporates the southern cities of the coastal areas of Santa Cruz County. So we have Twin Lakes, Pleasure Point, Capitola, Seacliff, Rio
del Mar, La Selva Beach, and Pajaro Dunes. We then continue the coast in Monterey County through Moss Landing, Marina, Seaside, and the Monterey Pacific, Del Monte peninsula, Carmel-by-the-Sea, we include Carmel Valley Village. And then the rest of Monterey County is also included coming east to the county line and over the freeway, this is the county line here between Monterey and San Benito, and taking all the cities whole along the freeway, coming down south to the county line. This visualization also includes most cities of San Luis Obispo, Oak Shores, Lake Nacimiento, San Miguel, San Simeon, Cambria, La Paso Robles through Atascadero, Whitley Garden, Shandon, Creston, Garden Farms, and Santa Margarita, continues down the coast with Cayucos, Morro Bay, and Los Osos, and the Cal Polytech area with San Luis Obispo, Los Ranchos, Avila, and Pismo Beach. After Grover Beach, the visualization ends. Arroyo Grande is not a part of this visualization. This visualization does travel east all the way to the county line of San Luis Obispo to the southern and eastern county lines, including this section over here, which is also part of the county.

Page 58. This is SBARBARA. We'll start in the northern end, which has the areas of San Luis Obispo County, which are included. These are Arroyo Grande,
Oceano, Los Berros, Callender, Black Lake, Woodlands, and Nipomo. We then have a majority of Santa Barbara County and I will call out cities over here until we get to this area. We have the Guadalupe, Santa Maria, Orcutt area. Garey and Sisquoc, Casmalia, Vandenberg Air Force Base and Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, and Lompoc, Los Alamos, Los Olivos, Ballard, Santa Ynez, Solvang and Buelton. This visualization does go to the north and eastern boundaries of the county for Santa Barbara, and along the coast includes Goleta; University of California, Santa Barbara; Isla Vista; Eastern Goleta Valley; and Santa Barbara City. These cities are also intact in this visualization. Oh, and the -- and lest I forget, I'm sorry, the incorporate -- the islands, as well, south of Santa Barbara. And this island, which is also part of Santa Barbara County.

And lastly we go to page 59. This visualization is called VENTURA. This is the green one we're looking at. Starting in Santa Barbara County, the cities of Mission Canyon, Montecito, Toro Canyon, Summerland, and Carpinteria. We then travel into Ventura with Ojai, Mira Monte, Oak View, and Meiners Oaks. This visualization includes Ventura and the Port Hueneme, all the way up through Piru corridor, so Port Hueneme, Oxnard, El Rio, Santa Paula, Filmore, Piru, and also includes Santicoy.
And all unincorporated areas of county east -- north to the county line, and east to the county line. And this visualization ends right before any of these cities start, so there are no city splits over here. So the Moorpark, Somis, Camarillo area is not included in this visualization.

CHAIR TURNER: Tamina, is Toro Canyon split?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: No, Toro Canyon is not split.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. I noticed you had it listed on both 58 and 59, so I wasn't sure.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: My apologies for that. No, Toro Canyon is not split. It is completely in this visualization.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Unless there's like a tiny -- no. Unless there's a very tiny zero pop block piece of Toro Canyon, but no, I don't believe so.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. On 58 it says except for.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, so I think you're okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, beautiful. Thank you. Except for.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: And that concludes this area. I'm sorry, and lest I forget this -- the islands south of Ventura, which goes with Ventura County, is incorporated
in this visualization as well.

MS. MACDONALD: Well, so Chair and commissioners, where would you like to go? Would you like to go up north and then start looking at the visualizations and start to maybe talk about it a little bit, give a little direction, ask some questions?

CHAIR TURNER: Definitely want to do that. Let me give just a couple of minutes for commissioners to look at the notes that they've made, things that stood out for them. And then we can take it from the top and work down together, since we did a little creative jumping. That was good for an attention span for all.

MS. MACDONALD: We -- if we may, we have a little addition to one of the visualizations, please, that we forgot to --

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I apologize, I was too excited. In the first visualization for North Coast, I do want to point out that this square corner -- northeastern corner of Humboldt County has been excluded from this visualization; and, therefore, Humboldt County is split in this area. This was done in order to keep the Karuk lands together, and this visualization has them together with their lands in Siskiyou County.

CHAIR TURNER: Which page was that on?
MS. RAMOS ALLEN:  This is page 11.

CHAIR TURNER:  Oh, the first one.  Okay.  Yep, take us away.  Let's take it from the top and we keep moving.  So, Karin and Tamina, we're ready for you to lead us.

MS. MACDONALD:  Would you like to start with the upper -- with that district we were just on, and maybe start a discussion, if anybody has some comments on it, then maybe we could just start there and then work our way down.

CHAIR TURNER:  Yep.  And I'd like to recognize Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY:  Thank you, Chair.  So I started going on deep dives at the very beginning of this and looking at numbers and this and that and figuring out.  And then I said okay, let them walk you through it, because I remember being told it's a lot easier once you let us walk you through it first.

I think where I keep coming is what questions should we be asking ourselves as we're looking at these?  I mean, obviously, if there's a deviation number -- yeah, the deviation piece, but I mean, should we even -- what questions should we be asking ourselves right now?  You know, which is the same question I asked last time when we started the visualizations.  But now we're in the third iteration.
MS. MACDONALD: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So are there new questions, deeper questions? What should we be really looking for?

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah. Thank you for that question. So I think when you're seeing this coastal districts -- so for example -- they're going north-south right now.

So if you're generally okay with that, you know, look at the boundaries and see if there's any splits, for example.

So you just heard Tamina say, for example, on that NCOAST district on page 11 that we kept the tribal lands together. Are you okay with that? Maybe you're okay with the way that that district looks right now, and then that's fine. Then we'll just move down to another district and we can look at the edges a little bit more.

Are you okay with the way that that next one -- the little blue one there, for example the Sonoma/Napa one? I'm guessing that perhaps you might want to have a conversation about that just to see what's in it.

And you may perhaps have a question about why the certain areas that are in there are in there and perhaps not another area that you may have been expecting to be in there. Or you may want to say could we do something else with this particular visualization or with this particular, you know, potential district there? So I
think it's more they're like broad architecture
questions.

The flow -- is the architecture generally okay? And
then if it isn't, you know, if we were to change it, what
would the ripple effect be, for example? Is there
something that could be done? Is there an exchange that
could be done, for example, on the border? Like if you
put this particular city in or perhaps you notice that
there is a city that's split, why is it split? Could we
perhaps keep that city together? Or you remember a
particular COI that you thought just really stood out for
you, right? And, you know, you may just want to say
okay, well, I remember that there was a COI over here and
I think it went into this particular area, can we explore
that, what are your thoughts on whether that could be
kept together and -- you know, so I think that's a
conversation right now. And I would just encourage you
to have a conversation with Tamina right now about this,
you know, about whether certain things might be possible.
And sometimes she may say I have to go home and figure
this out, but sometimes she may be able to give you just
a gut reaction because she's been mapping this nonstop
for the last weeks -- few weeks. And then sometimes she
may say okay, this is something that she needs to discuss
with Kennedy or that you may need to discuss with
Kennedy, because it's going to infringe on some areas of Kennedy's map.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, thank you for that question because, Karin, that was a very helpful response and that will kind of direct the conversation as we're getting ready now to know where our liberties are and what we can talk about. That's beautiful.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And I wanted to thank line drawers for the visualization and putting this together. It certainly fits my view of the North Coast, in terms of the coastal region -- keeping the coastal region together. We heard that loud and clear. I am supportive of the Karuk Tribe being put with Siskiyou County, unless we can find another alternative, but that seemed to be what they were advocating for.

The -- if there is one change I would attempt to look at making is Lake County. Lake County has provided testimony that they would like the county -- the official statement from the county, if I remember correctly, is that they'd like to be with Napa County. That would mean we'd have to look at some of the -- adding a portion of Marin County or adding more of Sonoma County, in order to make that happen. But if that's possible, that would be something that I'd like to see. Thank you.
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Thank you for that. I'd like to ask some clarifying questions about that. We did look at taking Lake County and keeping it with Napa and the Yolo. We have a previous direction by the Commission not to go over the Golden Gate Bridge over here. And so taking population south from Marin would be problematic in this situation. We could definitely put Lake in with Napa and I would just ask which of these other counties you would like to join the North Coast?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So with that, I don't want to go over the Golden Gate Bridge. And so if the option is to -- and Commissioner Andersen may have some other thoughts -- but I also think that Shasta, Tahoma, Glenn, and Colusa are different than this particular area. So I think, at this point, if we can't do it without going across the Golden Gate Bridge, I think this may be the -- we might be able to put Lake County in other maps. Whether it's the state senate or the congressional that are larger, and be able to meet their needs that way.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: That was fun, Commissioners. This is getting good. Okay.

Anything else, Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Not on this map.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. If we could momentarily, if it's possible, could we put on the freeway layer and the geography there? And as we've heard testimony of -- from some community members that desire a map with more of a east-west orientation, I'm still struck by those that speak to access their community of interest. And the thought of having to go out of state to find your seat of government, to me, is pretty poignant. So I still lean towards a north-south orientation as far as the upper portion of this map goes, and I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the Commission. I think it is important -- that access is important that we shouldn't have to travel, as Commissioner Turner alluded earlier, hours to be able to access your government services. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: And what we're trying to do now is to have -- are there other commissioners that want to respond or add into what Commissioner Taylor has said before we move on?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Along that line, you know, we did hear that there's three corridors, travel corridors. And I think we're covering the 101 and then there's the 5 and then there's the 395. And I feel like we've lost the
5 and the 395 to a certain extent and I don't know if that helps us in helping, you know, in organizing this area. I still don't think that Lake would be able to fall in with Napa because I would like to see that as well, because they asked it. But I just wanted to keep -- remind us that there was three full corridors that were brought up.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy, are you commenting on the same topic about this corridor and the freeways?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yep.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: On this map.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. So just to go a little bit farther, you know, I want us to think carefully about, you know, the rationales. And, yes, we are doing our best to listen to everyone, but there are also facts to keep in mind. So, you know, fact number one, Lake is not a coastal county. If the underlying rationale for this district is to put together a coastal county, I would say Lake is not a coastal county.

Fact number two, wine is -- from what I've seen, wine is Lake County's number one commercial crop. So if the idea of the TEHANAPA visualization is to bring
together wine country, then we need to look at at least
bringing in the wine country part of Lake County. Not
all of Lake County is wine country necessarily, but a
quite substantial part of it is wine country and wine
grapes are the county's number one commercial crop.

So if that's the idea of that neighboring
district -- the blue district to the south -- you know, I
would prefer to prioritize adding Lake or at least the
wine country portion of Lake County, which from my
experience driving through it, is most of southern Lake
County, into that district -- the blue district there to
the south. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we have that on the floor,
perhaps splitting Lake at the wine portion of that
county. I'm showing Lake using our handy dandy sheet
from Commissioner Yee at 68,000 people or thereabout.

Commiss -- yep?

MS. MACDONALD: Can we please ask a clarifying
question about this?

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MS. MACDONALD: So if Napa -- if the TEHANAPA
visualization here, so this is the blue district, were to
pick up parts of Lake County -- so this is already at
4.55 percent, right? And so where would we shed
population? And then also the upper district here is


already under-populated, so we need to figure out where
to pick up and are there any suggestions?

    CHAIR TURNER:  Yep, we do.  But let's run through.
    So, Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have suggestions
for the question on the table?

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA:  I have a comment on this
map or a question on this map -- the North Coast, not
Lake.  But we've moved down, so --

    CHAIR TURNER:  Not -- we haven't quite left Lake
just yet.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA:  Oh, I -- it's not about
Lake, it's about the North Coast specifically map.

    CHAIR TURNER:  Okay.  Then if you would, hold one
minute, I'm going straight down.

    Does anyone else want to talk about Lake
specifically?  Commissioner Andersen.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Yes.  I think I was one of
the ones who said put Lake into this grouping and it was
before we'd actually heard a lot from Lake County.  I
agree, Lake, Napa, and the wine portions of Sonoma, we
should put together, which means population out of that
Sonoma/Marin is where we grab the, you know, right now,
NORCOAST is low.  I'd say pull Lake out of it and put
quite a bit of the Marin in because the other part of --
like I'd like to see Sonoma right now only cut into two
districts instead of three because the wine -- there's a lot of like Glen Ellen, Eldridge, Hot Springs, Sonoma, all of that's wine country. So and then Yolo, which is separate --

CHAIR TURNER: Before we move to Yolo. Okay, let's go back through and then see. So what we're keeping now is kind of thought processes. So we're looking at wine country or the wine area of Lake. We're looking at --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, I'm looking at all of Lake.

CHAIR TURNER: All of Lake?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All of Lake.

CHAIR TURNER: All of Lake.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Napa and the wine part of Sonoma.

CHAIR TURNER: So we have two suggestions on the floor now. One was a portion, one is full.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And the question was like where we do we lose population?

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I say pull Yolo out of the blue. Yolo/Solano together.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we hear that. Let's go back up to the top.

Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'd like to just see also the visuali -- or the overlay with the Karuk Tribe lands. I think I'm just trying to understand how that little corner makes a difference because when I saw the last -- previous time -- last week when we saw it, it was further into Siskiyou County, so.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This was actually the exact square that came from the tribal group that came to testify.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay, thank you.

Because the map -- what you showed before was a little bit different, so it looked like we needed to grab more in from Siskiyou, but okay. Thank you. This is helpful and I'm glad that we have that testimony.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen, did you have something else on the north?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On this particular one?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, yes. You hand was still up, so I'm just --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, no. I'm sorry. I'll take it down.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I'm just -- I'm trying to understand this process.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: And I realize that if we take something out, then we've got to put something in.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: But also, I mean, when we get to the Yolo, I'm going to want to tear that completely up. So it's hard -- like if we get to the section and they say move this and move that, because what I say, you know, three steps down the road, it's going to impact that as well. So I just feel that it's not helpful right now to take things out or ask us to take things -- I mean, I have recommendations on what to take out and what to bring in. But I think if we -- this process is going to take very long if we continue down this path.

I think maybe we should all give our comments and then maybe the line drawers can go back and maybe come back with questions in terms of okay, where should we even things out? But I mean, we've talked about just the one assembly -- proposed assembly visualization and it's been half an hour maybe. So I'm just -- how we did it the last couple of times is you just gave your input and you moved on to the next. But now we're trying to consolidate everybody's comments and also try to even things out. And as we know, everything we say impacts the entire thing. So when we get to Yolo, it's going
to -- it can potentially impact what we're talking about right now. So I'm trying to think of like a better way --

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, and I --

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: -- to do it.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. And I think, Commissioner Fernandez, your point is exactly where we are and what will happen. And rather than leaving it to the mappers to just -- well, they can't just keep taking information from us, because then it leaves them outside out of the meeting trying to still determine how to make decisions. So they've been struggling with it and now it's time for us to struggle. We do have to do this somewhat.

And so we won't come to -- because we still have another round of visualizations, but what we want to be able to do right now is to at least give our best effort and -- and we want to feel the pain. We want to know that if we do or not do, include or not include Lake, that is going to ultimately impact Yolo or some other area. And so perhaps we'll just make notes concerning that, talk about what we think we'd like to see, and just kind of go through this messy process. So it will take -- we're starting at the north. Yep, it'll stay interesting, but let's just keep working with it for a little bit and see how it shakes out.
So right now, we've heard from a couple of folk about Lake and we're going to get into Yolo.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Let's see, if we take Lake out of the red and put it in the blue. And then take Yolo out of the blue, we still got to add back to the red and that's going to go through the Yolo. So you know -- I mean, it's -- we're basically redrawing the entire map here in some way. So I just want to make sure we're not losing that thought.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, yes.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. You know, I do think it is a little helpful and I'm hoping this is for the line drawers. If we say pull this out, add that, if you -- it's a necessary means like I sort of did and take Yolo out, I think that sort of completes the cycle for the line drawers. Is that helpful because you're getting population info from them. So basically, it's going to end up with two districts in that area and the Yolo -- I can see Commissioner Fornaciari shake his head, but Yolo/Solano becomes a different area. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Where would you like to split Solana back up into --
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Blue gets a bit bigger. It all shifts a little bit.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Commissioner, where would you like to split Solano because we're already at 4.93 --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- so if more of Yolo comes in, where would you like to split Solano?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'd like to split Solano -- because if we add Yolo to Solano, I'd like to split Solano with taking Benicia out.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: And --

CHAIR TURNER: Benicia.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Benicia and -- you have Davis, you have a lot of population here, so I get Benicia. Which other areas would you like to split?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We could do part of -- because you have quite a bit of Sacramento in there as well, although I like the Delta in. We could pull -- I'm sorry, can you go -- well, Elk Grove, I'd like to take that out.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Elk Grove is a 150,000 people, so this will now be under-populated. Where would you like to add population from?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Wait. If you added Yolo in?
CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yolo and Solano, and then you're cutting people out from there.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So perhaps we're not ready for this just yet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: This is tricky. This is very tricky.

CHAIR TURNER: This is indeed tricky. Let's do -- Commissioner Andersen, I appreciate what you're trying to do. Thank you. I see that Commissioner Taylor, Toledo, and Sadhwani, and then Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. So it seems that maybe we do have a small victory in here somewhere. It seems that we are in favor of a north-south orientation because there's no desire to push the sides where we would be able to -- as Neal said, we'd be able to capture population if we were to go east-west. But it seems that we're working north-south, correct? So there's a little victory there, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Come on with that.

MR. BECKER: There's eighty assembly districts. You're on the first.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, they get easier from there.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We've got to take the wins
we can.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I'm in favor of the district as drawn at this point; north-south, as Commissioner Taylor has said. I do think Lake has a lot in common with Sonoma and Mendocino. There's roads that go in and out both the -- there is wine, but there's other factors and certainly lots of people live -- commute from Lake -- because it's a place of more affordable housing -- commute from Lake to both Sonoma and other places across the North Bay, and certainly into Napa as well. So I could see it both in Lake and Napa County.

And it's not the only noncoastal district in this visualization. You also have Trinity that's not necessarily on the coast. So I am in support of something like this. I'm sure we'll have to refine it as we go through the other counties, but I'm not opposed to this for assembly.

CHAIR TURNER: Com -- thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I think, you know, hey, this is redistricting. Welcome. We are still technically on district one, so that's okay. I agree with you, Commissioner Taylor, that's a win. We like the architecture of that district going north-south.
I think as we start moving down, I agree with all of the comments of thinking about other alternatives for Lake County, whether that's the entirety of Lake, splitting Lake, some other option for Lake.

And I just wanted to offer, as we move further down, you know, I know Commissioner Andersen was thinking about like, well, what are the other options? I think as we move further down -- and I don't know if we want to go there yet -- but as we're moving further down towards the Bay Area, we have received other testimony in that -- I don't know, how do you want to say it, T-E-H-E-NAPA, right?

In particular, I was looking at some of the testimony that we received last week and there was a request actually for Vallejo to be removed to keep it with Pittsburg/Antioch/Bay Point, together in a district that connects with East Contra Costa. That would change the architecture of that district, that Napa-y district, it's that little piece of that district right down there and create something going east-west further down. So that would be a larger shift of architecture at a different point in the map. But I just wanted to offer that, that might help. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: And, Sara, if I may, I'd just like to say that I -- we have tried this Lake orientation and
I'm going to try it again.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: But please rest assured that your previous comments, we've worked through them and tried these different things. And so we -- but we are happy to go back and try things again and answer any questions you have.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Tamina.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Tamina, your last comment was really important. I do want to remind those of you in the room who have done this in the past to please be patient for -- to -- with us that haven't -- no, no, no, I'm talking about legal and others -- to please be patient with us because we're learning. And it might take us a long time to do the first one and the second one.

And I also want to remind everybody that this is a third of the state. We'd like to think of it that it's just, you know, that part -- top part of the state is just two districts, three districts maybe. But it is a third of the whole state. And I'm glad we are taking that time. I also want to -- Tamina, what you said was really critical at the very end, is that you have heard us before and we're all going to have to say that often,
that we have heard the public. And we need to be careful
of pulling out just one comment we've heard from the
public, because there will be -- you know, just don't
just look for those that match what you think might work
or you know, try to figure out how the Vallejo comment
does make sense because Vallejo is more of an industrial
area like Benicia is and like Martinez is. And so it
needs -- you know, we need to connect things with a
little bit more than we just heard a comment because
remember, we have about 8,000 -- 5,000, 8,000 -- I don't
know where we are.

I was just picking on you, I'm sorry, Sara. But I
was just trying to say that as an example.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm used to it, it's okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, you do it to me too, so
that's good.

But I want to just remind ourselves to be able to
say to the public, we have heard you, we've heard this,
but it's not working. It's -- there's going to be a lot
of stuff that's not going to work and it's going to be
tough.

I also want to say that maybe -- I liked where we
were heading originally when we were talking about how to
anchor these communities. We had started talking about
travel corridors as an anchor. You know, let's think
about it as travel corridors, or as coastal corridors, or as wine, you know, something that anchors a community together, so we can have our yesses and our nos. And it's really hard, but I always say, you know, once you know what your limitations are, it's easier to say yes. But if we keep saying yes but, we're never allowed to say yes or no. And so we are going to have to start making some tough decisions.

And maybe if -- you know, just to keep -- I really -- I would say we had a lot of wins, because I liked that we were talking about anchors. You know, and anchors meaning not just a commute -- regional -- you know, what are we -- how are we defining them? Why are we defining them? We did decide north-south, though I would still argue that if you read the comments, they say Humboldt down, and Del Norte -- folks from Del Norte do want to go east. But the numbers aren't all there, but there are different people -- you know, there's -- depending how you read them, what comes out. So just -- it -- when we're thinking about it, think about how we're anchoring them again, be it geography, be it culture, be it whatever.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, thank you, thank you. Yes. I see you, Karin.
Commissioner Andersen, your hand is still up. Did you have something, again?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I did. I misspoke when I said put Yolo in with Solano. I apologize. I wasn't realizing how large Solano actually is and I should have -- very obvious. I meant Yolo should go up north, because Yolo is, again, with Commissioner Sinay said, it's agriculture. Woodland, right through that entire area, you know, Knightsen, that direction, that's agriculture and it really ties in with the counties north of it. So I just wanted to say that. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Karin?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Chair, if I may offer something which may be helpful to the Commission. The northern area, which Kennedy and I have been working on, we've been working on some -- the major direction that you have given us is not to go over the Golden Gate Bridge in the west, so really looking at this western north-south district profile for the maps. And then on the eastern side of the state, this Inyo up the eastern border, through kind of this Placer area, and then the keeping Nevada and Placer together. So really what ends up happening in the north is that we have a western column and we have an eastern column. And then things can really only be moved around the middle. And so that's
why you'll see some of these areas -- and Kennedy's areas as well -- we overlapped and came back and forth. But that's really the only space we'd be able to move around in unless you would like to rescind your direction of keeping this eastern area together, or going over the bridge.

CHAIR TURNER: Looking around for hands or thoughts.

Commissioner Andersen, your hand is up, and then Commissioner Kennedy, followed by Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I really appreciate that comment, because I see that -- and I understand. And parts of it is because I know we're starting up here in the north, but parts of it that are kind of anchoring things are a little bit farther to the south, which kind of pushed things around in that direction. And I think if we do go a little bit further north on the eastern side, we can come down further south than the central, where now we have -- it appears we have several like, you know -- one, two, three, four different assembly districts in the center and maybe we can make those into two. Does that make sense? If -- it's a little hard unless we really nail out all of the different counties because of things that are further south, which are pushing things around.

But it -- but I don't think any of us -- since
numbers don't require us to go across the Golden Gate Bridge, I'd hate to see people from Marin just being thrown into San Francisco just for numbers when I think they would lose their voice. And we have similarities of interest along the coast, along the agricultural center, and along the Sierras. So I think we'd like to keep the direction that we've given and try to rework with it, if at all possible, if that helps. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And with that, we do need to take a break. I will -- I promise, I'll let you all have breaks on time. So we're going to take a fifteen-minute break and we will be back with the hands that are raised. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And welcome back from the break. At this time, I'm wondering if Commissioner Kennedy is ready?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sure. Thank you, Chair.

To be additive, not repetitive, I agree with north-to-south coast for now.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, beautiful.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I would also say that I still support the basic architecture and
I believe that the center of the state is a good area to make adjustments in. I think because we have more population in a lot of those areas, we have a little more flexibility as far as where we shift boundaries. So I would support the general architecture that we have at this point. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much. And for sure as we move along, we'll be able to add -- be a little bit -- you know, things will shift as they need to. But for now, I agree.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I -- well, I guess if I have to prioritize to Tamina's question, I think that we do need to leave intact the eastern side of the California Sierra 395 corridor. I'm sure that I will not get a lot of love for this, but I am more willing, if we have to, to cross the bridge, I guess I'll say, and allow, you know, Marin and point south to be combined, if needed. But I do also agree with what Commissioner Kennedy said, that if it's possible to stay within the middle, then obviously we want to try to honor that direction to not cross over if we can.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And, Commissioner Akutagawa, I vow to never withhold love for you -- from you.
Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Quickly as an ally to Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm also open to the option of crossing the bridge.

CHAIR TURNER: Let's -- thank you, thank you. Let's take a few more comments on other parts of the north, if there are because I'd really like to also get Kennedy in on the conversation and start that process, so that we'll have even a broader space to play in.

So, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay. So there's a couple of -- for me I wrote down pages but -- so am I okay to go ahead into Yolo now and --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: All right.

CHAIR TURNER: Free to roam about the country.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay. And I think --

CHAIR TURNER: In the north only.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay. In the north and I'm probably going to bring Kennedy into this conversation because I know that some of the -- some of her visualizations will be impacted as well. I'm just trying to find the page numbers, so sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez, a question for you then. Would it be helpful for Kennedy to do her
presentation, if you're going to bring her in or what are
you thinking when you say that?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: What do you think, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: What -- how far does your
presentation take us? How's that?

MS. WILSON: Ours goes all the way down to Kern and
a little bit into San Bernardino. But I can stop in the
San Joaquin area and go past that part of about Grove.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Yes. Is that -- because
then you jump into Chair Turner's territory.

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Is that a good stopping
point, if we just have her --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: We certainly can do that.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So then why -- let's do this.

Marcy, or is that Jose? If you can give us some
overview of the next area for assembly districts for B, D, F, and G. And we'll take all of the overview from
you, so that you don't have to split out areas.

And then, Kennedy, if you would then go with just
the top portion.
And since we didn't have a lot of comment in between and more, it sounds like passion around commenting after the mappers, we'll hold our comments until that time.

Jose, are you ready?

MR. CHAVEZ: Yes, Commissioner. I'm pulling my notes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful. And while he's doing that, I just want to make sure that my fellow commissioners know that this is very serious process, but -- I'm not making light of it -- but I am indeed enjoying it. We've never mapped lines and drawn lines before. And so this is something that we're all learning and willing to do some give and take where we need to for California to have the best maps possible. So I want people to be encouraged and know that we're all here trying to just do our best.

Jose, we're ready when you are.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you, Chair. Hello, Commissioner and hello California. My name is Jose Eduardo Chavez and I am the outreach field team lead for central California. And I am giving a report -- a high-level report of sums D, B, F, and G. And again, as my colleague, Ashleigh, emphasized at the -- earlier, the following is an
overview of high-level trends derived from submissions to
the Commission. And this overview is meant to provide
commissioners with some examples of public input
received.

Given that -- with that said, in total the
Commission received 1,233 communities of interest input
from sums B, D, F, and G, and 280 visualizations feedback
forms so far. And those sources came from visualization
feedback forms, 280 of them, as I mentioned, Draw My
California Community website, 468 community inputs came
out of there. And 425 community input meetings came from
live meetings. Email 101, letter, submissions via letter
183, and communities of interest public input form 43,
and CRC website Contact Us forms 9, and a report 4.

And I will go ahead and give some high-level report
on the northern California communities. And we
receive -- or the Commission received an abundance of
input from inland northern California to keep their
communities together with the communities east of
Siskiyou County. Common themes expressed are fire
protections, forestry management, watershed, county
collaborations for public services during crisis, and
similar rural communities. Many of the communities of
interest input that we received also emphasizes not
belonging or sharing commonalities with the northern
California coastal communities. They emphasize that there are infrastructure and geographical divisions, such as mountain ranges.

Another major input that we received, or a large input that we received was not to include urban communities, such as Yolo, Sacramento, or Solano into northern counties. They expressed the importance of keeping these rural northern Sacramento Valley counties together.

And with that in mind, I'll be moving south to Sacramento communities. Again, these are high-level summaries of the input that we have received as a Commission. There are numerous inputs asking the Commission to place the counties of Yolo and Solano together, while keeping these counties whole. Now, there -- we also received a handful of input where they -- the stakeholders want to put Yolo with other greater Sacramento communities together, emphasizing the similarities in economy, emergency responses, and fires and floods. And we also received some input to put the City of West Sacramento with Yolo County and with the City of Sacramento, again emphasizing in the similarities of a similar economies and culture.

There was input received also asking to keep the City of Sacramento and the flood plain communities
together. There was a handful of input also that came in, asking the Commission to keep rural communities together. They would like the Commission to graft communities around the City of Sacramento, rather than combine urban populations with rural communities. There was also a handful of communities of interest input to keep Elk Grove as one community. And there was also a great amount of communities of interest input where the stakeholders are asking rural communities, such as El Dorado and Nevada, Placer Counties to not be kept together. And not -- excuse me, that those counties should be placed together and not placed in urban communities of Sacramento. Placer, Nevada, and El Dorado Counties should be kept together. Also a high emphasis in the communities of interest that we've received and should not be in the same district as Amador, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and Madera Counties.

With the last sentence read or reported, I'll move down to central Sierra and Nevada high-level summary, where we also received a majority of communities of interest input where Sierra and Nevada residents are asking the Commission to keep communities west of the valley together. And if counties, such as Madera and Fresno are to be included, it has to be the foothills or mountain regions. And there was a handful of communities
of interest input where they -- where stakeholders in this area do not want Kern or valley communities to be included for population. Again, emphasizing the -- to respect the central Sierra region.

Northern Sierra communities have more in common with central Sierra, Nevada communities, if needed for population rather than central -- than communities in Central Valley. There was a handful of input that came from these region as well, where they are asking the Commission to do the best possible to not include San Bernardino County in their region. And as the region includes national forests and national park gateway communities, while geographic areas are largely remote, having many shared interests and economies primarily resulting from tourism should be kept together.

There was -- there is also a handful of communities of interest input that came from greater Placer, Nevada, El Dorado communities that expressed opposition to being in a district with Fresno County and Alpine -- Fresno County, Alpine, Amarillo County, Calaveras County, Mariposa County, Tuolumne, and Madera, again expressing -- there was also a handful of communities of interest that came from that community as well.

With that in mind, I can move down to Central Valley communities high-level summary. We've received -- or the
Commission received a large amount of communities of interest input where stakeholders highlight the need to keep San Joaquin County together combined with valley agricultural communities.

There is a large amount of communities of interest input where they would like San Joaquin County and Stanislaus County together and remove Bay Area communities.

They -- we also received a handful of communities of interest input where they want -- stakeholders want to place urban communities together, such as Stockton and Tracy. They -- a large -- a handful of communities of interest also -- or received asking the commission to keep valley communities together and remove foothills communities, again emphasizing the need to keep the valley communities together and Sierra communities together.

There is also a large -- a good amount of input received where communities -- or stakeholders do not want Merced County with foothills communities. When drawing the valley, they emphasized the idea of drawing north and south, not east or west. And a good -- a handful of communities of interest also received asking the Commission to keep Merced with Madera and Fresno Valley community -- and Fresno County communities together and
remove foothill communities.

A handful of communities of interest input received were asking the commission not to combine north Fresno, Clovis and Madera Ranchos in a district with Merced, Atwater, and rural communities in Merced County and Madera County.

A handful of communities of interest input received also was to ask the Commission to keep north Fresno, which is north of Shaw Avenue, and the city of Clovis together as they have numerous similarities. The same goes to keep areas south of Shaw Avenue, southeast Fresno, and west Fresno, as well as the rural towns of east -- rural towns east of highway 41, which includes Fowler, Kingsburg, Selma, Parlier, Reedley, Orange Cove, together. They emphasize -- these communities also emphasize the rural towns west of highway 41 having similar populations and similar issues.

We also received numerous -- or a handful communities of interest input from stakeholders from residents of Hanford requesting to add Kings County to Fresno County, as they share commuting routes, higher education, and entertainment.

There is also a handful of communities of interest that the Commission received to keep communities of Fresno County together. That would not include Clovis
with these communities. The Commission also received a number of input where stakeholders do not want combined Kings County with Kern County. And there is also a large amount of communities of interest input where stakeholders want to keep Three Rivers with Visalia and other Valley communities and remove Kern County and L.A. communities.

We received a handful of input asking the Commission to place Tulare County and Kings County together as well. We also received a handful of input from Kings County to be placed together with Fresno and Kern. That's also a common trend that we received. We also received a handful of input where communities of Kings County should not be combined with Fresno. And there was a handful -- there is a handful of communities of interest input where stakeholders want to keep Kern County with small rural towns together.

There is a large -- a good amount of communities of interest where stakeholders want to connect south of Fresno County communities with east Bakersfield as much as possible. And we received a large amount of input from stakeholders in Tehachapi not wanting to put together with Bakersfield.

There is also a large amount of input where stakeholders are asking for Lamont, Shafter, Arvin,
Wasco, McFarland, Delano, and east Bakersfield to be placed together and exclude desert and mountain communities. And there is also -- we also received a handful of input asking the commission to leave Ridgecrest together with Bakersfield.

And again, this is -- these are high-level summaries of the trends that we received so far on communities of interest that we received as well as visualization feedback forms.

Thank you, Chair.

MS. TURNER: Jose, thank you so much for the high-level overview of what we're hearing and seeing.

And with that, I'd like to invite Kennedy to walk us through the visualizations that she has prepared up into the portion we talked about earlier.

I think Kennedy we wanted you to stop up at -- was it Oak Grove or Fresno? How far down are we going?

MS. WILSON: To the South Sac, San Joaquin district has it carved it out in there. So I was thinking I'd go down to this one, and that's six into my -- six visualizations into my presentation.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we'll go there, Commissioners. And then have discussion as it relates to the maps that we've seen, the visualizations that we've seen previously. And then after that, Kennedy will come
back and finish up.

MS. WILSON: Sounds good. So we are going to start off on page 12. And I'll give everyone time to get that up.

This is the nor-California, NORCA visualization. So here, as Tamina pointed out also, we have the Karuk tribe, and so we did split Humboldt in this corner to keep the Karuk tribe together. And we have visualizations going forward that try something different, but the numbers and purposes, we decided to take this one and take this corner.

And then we have the eastern, northern inland counties, moving south here. I tried to keep Sierra Nevada together. I wanted to keep Butte with Sutter and Yuba, and so that's why there's this carve-out here in the middle. And keeping those two together as well from previous testimony.

So this is Plumas, Sierra Nevada. Then coming this -- down on this bottom corner the other corner is Glenn and Tehama. And then moving north, we have Shasta, Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, and of course that part of Humboldt containing the Karuk tribe's land.

And now we will be moving on to our next visualization on page 13, titled central north, CENNORTH. And I'll zoom in a bit closer so we can see that. This
here contains Butte, Colusa, Sutter, and Yuba. So
keeping these three counties together and then Colusa
also for population was still not enough, so I had to dip
into Placer because from previous -- from our last
visualization, there was Yolo that was a part of this as
well. And we heard Yolo wanting to be with the wine
country, so I did not dip into that. I dipped into
Placer and I took -- I'm going to zoom in so you can see.
I took Sheridan and Lincoln to populate this. And we're
still at negative 4.14 deviation. And then I'll zoom out
so you can see those again together as well without the
cities. Oh, thank you.

Now, we are going to move on -- it's a big jump.
We're going to go to page 37. And this is titled west
Placer. So as you're flipping your pages, I'm going to
zoom in so we can see what cities are in here.

Here, in west Placer, I have excluded North Auburn
and Auburn and I have New Castle, Penryn, Loomis. I keep
Rocklin, Roseville, Granite Bay together. And I also
from previous visualizations did not have Folsom and
Orangevale, so I was moving those in. And Citrus Heights
for population as well, which has a fairly large
population as I've learned clicking things around, but
this is helping to populate that there.

Now, we will move on just to the next page, 38, and
we're going to see north Sac County and -- NSACC is what it's titled. It's here in purple. And here I am keeping Rosemont out of the main Sacramento area, which is guidance I received before, with Mather, La Riviera, Arden-Arcade and Carmichael, keeping those together based on testimony, COI testimony, commissioner testimony. We have Fair Oaks, McClellan Park, North Highlands, Foothill Farms, Antelope, Elverta, and Rio Linda.

We did have some testimony to have Antelope with Roseville, and some to keep it with this -- parts of Sacramento as well. And just how the population worked with this visualization, I kept it here, away from Roseville.

And then we're going to move on to page 39, right to it as well with west Sac and Sacramento. And so here, I did keep Sacramento with Sacramento in one district. And to give this population, I had to cut into Sacramento. However, I tried to keep key communities together, and I'm going to display that terrain layers so you can see up north we have Natomas staying together.

And then zooming in here, we have Del Paso Heights, which is in this area here that I'm waving around under the Dwight D. Eisenhower freeway, following Rio Linda Boulevard, keeping that together. And then we have east Sacramento staying together and not being separated as
well as Oak Park. And then we have Fruitridge, Lemon
Hill, Parkway, and this Greenhaven area staying together.
And it goes down, keeping most of Sacramento whole, but
then this area here between -- Bruceville Road stops at
Sheldon, so this part of Sacramento right before Elk
Grove. And I'll zoom back out and turn off that terrain
layer.

Now, we will move on to our last one of this section
for now, on page 42. So a bit of a jump. It is titled
south Sac with SJ, San Joaquin. And so here is where I'm
sure questions will arise. But here, I'm trying to keep
these farming communities together and they do need
population from somewhere. I was trying to keep Lathrop
and Manteca together, and also from one of the previous
presentations we received last week, we had Manteca and
Lodi wanting to stay together. But Lodi not wanting to
be with Stockton, so this is how this came about. And I
did have to reach up into northern Sacramento to get some
of this population here.

But using Elk Grove was messing with these numbers
here and making it too high. And then cutting out some
of these was messing with these ones here. So that's
where a lot of -- oh, and by these, I was meaning these
visualizations here. So I was playing back and forth
with adding some and taking out some, and not wanting to
split anything, so this --

CHAIR TURNER: Kennedy, the visualizations is
jumping too quick for us to focus on what cities. As
you're talking, they just keep moving.

MS. WILSON: My apologies. So I will slow it down.
And come back out and just show you here, there's Ripon
and Escalon, keeping those with Farmington and Linden and
Dogtown. And keeping this eastern part of San Joaquin
together is where I started. And then I was speaking
about Lathrop and Manteca and keeping those together.
And then keeping Lodi -- in this visualization to keep
Lodi with Manteca but not with Stockton.

And any other questions you can ask as well, but
that's just --

CHAIR TURNER: No, thank you so much for that. And
this is going to give us context and allow us to go back
to Commissioner Fernandez now that we've had that portion
of your presentation and a follow-up by Commissioner
Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

So the first two will actually be with Tamina, page
16 and 17. It's the Yolo, Napa. And I'm trying to get
my notes together here.

Okay. Which one is -- this one is the Solano --
oops. Tamina has got it to go on. Okay.
Because they are related, I guess my first one which -- with the one that you have up, the blue one, that I see is blue. I'm hoping you see is blue as well. That one my initial recommendation was to move American Canyon as Vallejo. I know we've already talked about that. That's at the -- that one's already over deviation. I'm sure it'll take it way under, so we'll have to work on that. And then also on that blue is if you move over towards Sonoma and I believe Santa Rosa.

Was Santa Rosa split on that one, Tamina?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. Santa Rosa is split into three districts.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So my recommendation was going to be to bring in Santa Rosa and I'd have to defer to Commissioner Toledo, but I always -- when I think of Santa Rosa, I think of Rohnert Park as well in term -- and Petaluma. So I -- that's probably something we have to contend with.

And then -- okay, so I was thinking on that blue, you see where that -- up, up. If you go up where that Calistoga -- oops. Where that line -- where that -- I think that is a -- right there. Yes. You see the line. Is that the -- is that the county line?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, that's the county line.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I was thinking of
ending it there, if that makes sense. But then bringing
in the Santa Rosa piece of it so -- because I'm trying to
add -- anyway, so then if I go to the east part of it,
east part of this map. Thank you. If you can just zoom
in just a little bit.

Yolo County is mainly rural. We do have a few major
cities, but they're not major cities as L.A. major
cities. They're just major cities in terms of more than
10,000 inhabitants, so very different. So what I was
looking at this one -- oh, it's just -- to bring in that
whole delta area from Sacramento to probably Rio Vista,
bring that in to include Dixon. So I'm tearing up kind
of this one as well as the Solano. I'm bringing in some
of Solano as well because there is quite a bit of Solano
that is rural.

Pardon? I just said because of the rural areas, so
anyway.

So Solano, I would bring Solano in until you get --
from Rio Vista up until you get to Dixon. Include Dixon
because that still is a rural area, as well as Winters.
So I was thinking going all the way up. So this would be
more of a east-west obviously. All the way up where you
could potentially even go into Colusa, into Williams and
Arbuckle, to those rural areas. So that's just
completely raking up those too, so I'm not sure how we're
going to -- how you would like to address that right now.
So that's for 16 and 17.

And then, Tamina, since I have you, on page 55 --

CHAIR TURNER: Before you move, Commissioner Fernandez --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

CHAIR TURNER: -- Tamina, that was a lot. Are we
good with those directions or any other commissioners,
because we're working off of one map, have comments on
that area?

Okay. So, Commissioner Fernandez, as soon as we
hear back from Tamina, we can move.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. I'm sorry, can you -- so
the direction was -- can you repeat the -- it wasn't --
the map wasn't working in my mind, so if we could please
repeat the -- you said to go up into Dixon. Which --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So down a little.
See where Solano is? It's right there. Okay, so keep
going down. A little bit more. So where you get to --
like right where Rio Vista is --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I would carve all that
up. Go straight up.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Go straight up to
your -- to Dixon. So --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- you zoomed out again.

Zoomed out. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, and then go out to -- include Dixon. And then Winters as well.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: In -- you mean included in the blue area? Or which --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, that's what I'm say -- yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm saying that I'm blowing this piece up.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. So you want to include Dixon in the blue area, and take which areas out of the blue area?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was taking out the bottom part, the American Canyon and Vallejo.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. That --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But also from Rio Vista -- I mean, you got the -- from Rio Vista up, right?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This will be more population than all of this in Dixon combined, so where else would you
like to take?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And on that one, I was
talking about taking Santa Rosa and -- right? Yeah,
Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park and Petaluma. Like that -- I
forget what quarter that is, but -- yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Let me --

MALE SPEAKER: It's the 101.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. 101.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: So all -- you want all of Santa
Rosa in with the N coast district? This -- this whole
area here is Santa Rosa, including all of this. This is
all Santa Rosa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Right, right. That
would be with the blue.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: So you want all of Santa Rosa to
be with the blue?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. And then --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And for the numbers, yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: That's --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I don't know what the
numbers are because Santa Rosa appears to be split maybe
in three.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Santa Rosa's 178,000 people.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. But right now it's
split into three visualization, if that's correct, right?

    MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. And you're saying you want it unified in the blue area?

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I'm just -- I don't know what the -- I -- I don't have the numbers in front of me, but yeah. I mean, if that's where it works and we'll see how that goes.

    MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Chair, if you like, I can put the populations of the cities on it.

    CHAIR TURNER: No --

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think that's too detailed right now.

    CHAIR TURNER: No, we --

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let's just --

    MS. RAMOS ALLEN: No problem, no problem.

    CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, and if I -- and if it's helpful under the ready reference that we have, we have the city populations as well.

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. But I'm not -- I'm not going to -- I don't think we have the time for me to sit and count all of the little towns and cities that I'm moving.

    MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Well, then just one last question, the Vallejo, American Canyon?

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Did you want to move that into the Solano district or did you want to move it south?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It would -- to me, I -- in my opinion, it should be kept together where -- because there's other changes that are being made on all of the counties, so wherever -- whatever area or visualization needs that additional population.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: It depends on where you would like it, but happy to look at it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, because I'm just -- sorry, Tamina, but I'm just kind of concentrating on the rural parts, and then we'll also go a little bit north as well as Sacramento.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: One second, please. There's a couple, just for clarifying, questions.

Commissioner Sadhwani, you had a question?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I just wanted to clarify. So you want to create a rural district out of Yolo County pulling in parts of, like, Santa Rosa. But I'm just trying to figure out how did that connect with some of the earlier comments about Lake County and have Lake connect to Napa. I mean, ultimately what I think --

I'm just trying to wrap my head around it. Is that
we would take this -- and I'm having such a hard time
with the colors because what we're being shown here is
blue, but on the PDFs it was yellow. So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Hey, hey, Napa. Whatever
we want to call that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is the suggestion, like,
just kind of scrap that district, split kind of in a
different direction? Is that kind of where we're going?
Is that where -- what we're doing?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kind of. And I'm not
including Santa Rosa with the rural districts. I'm just
trying to keep that together because it can go with
Sonoma but I don't know what we've done -- see, the
problem is we've made changes to the other visualizations
so I don't know what the counts are right now.

And yeah, and it would probably be more appropriate
to go with Sonoma, but I don't know Sonoma needs the
additional numbers right now. And maybe it does. So
that might be a good place.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So kind of -- so to answer,
Commissioner Sadhwani, I'm kind of breaking up with
Solano -- the Solano with the Napa. And I'm kind of just
taking the east side of it, if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum. So it sounds like
it's, like, splitting it into -- if I -- and I'm just trying -- I apologize. I'm just trying to like wrap my head around this. So it sounds like splitting it, right? So that there's an -- rather than kind of going more east -- well, yeah, east-west as it is now, almost north-south.

CHAIR TURNER: I think there's a couple of others that might help with this, Commissioner Fernandez, if you don't mind. And then we'll keep going with you.

Commissioner Toledo, were you going to help with what's currently on the floor? If not, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I can try. I can try.

CHAIR TURNER: -- Fornaciari has -- okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I get what Commissioner Fernandez is moving towards. I think it's appropriate. I would -- I see Vallejo moving to another area based on COI testimony. American Canyon is part of the city -- the county of Napa, so I would want to keep that together, given that it does -- that's where a lot of the wine -- a lot of the wineries store their wine for shipment.

I am thinking instead of including Santa Rosa in this, maybe the city of Sonoma, it's kind of where it's a little bit less populated, and into Rohnert Park area, a portion of Rohnert Park if we need population. And maybe
by taking out Vallejo, we might be able to come up with
some numbers to include some of the agricultural areas in
Lake County or more -- because Lake County I believe is
six -- you know, is not as populous as other areas in
this area, so -- but anchoring it as -- I mean, the
anchor would be an agricultural district that has small
farming communities, the -- of course the wine country
area.

CHAIR TURNER: And Fornaciari had a little bit more
to add to that and then we're coming back to you,
Commissioner Fernandez. I didn't forget you're not
finished.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just -- you
know, I was just getting a little concerned. If we're
going to pull 100,000 people out of the Sonoma, Marin, we
got to put about 80,000 people back in to get it even,
and where would those 80,000 come from I guess is -- but
if we're not talking about moving Santa Rosa out, if
we're talking about moving fewer people out, but I would
guess that even those -- so we're about 20,000 -- no.
Yeah, we're about 20,000 over in Marin at this point, so
that's about the flexibility we have, unless we want to
add some more back in.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, you had a thought
too?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: We heard really clearly from American Canyon several different times as well as Napa that they wanted to be together, that American Canyon was split from Napa last time and they are asking to please be together, so -- yeah, just building on what -- what Pedro said, I think it -- I mean, sorry, Commissioner Toledo said, I think it's important to go back to the communities of interest testimonies.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Are you ready, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. I'm just going to do my high-level ones.

12 and 13, were those yours, Kennedy? Yes? Okay. So I'm on to Kennedy now.

MS. MACDONALD: Would it be possible to ask some clarifying questions? So we're here looking at the whole -- the Lake question, right? So we've -- hold on, yeah. Putting the map back up. So we were kind of looking at the Lake question, and just trying to figure out maybe some -- you know, just step back a little bit and just get some broader direction, if that will be possible. So if possible, should we in this plan try to put Lake in with Napa, if possible? Yes? Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: If possible.

MS. MACDONALD: And if it's not possible in this
plan, then we'll try to do it in another plan?

CHAIR TURNER: I'm seeing some affirming head nods.

MS. MACDONALD: So we're going to play with that a little bit.

Then we heard that Santa Rosa is split into three pieces. Should we try to make that maybe into two at the very least? So kind of work on --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. MACDONALD: -- working on split and see if we can minimize the split?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay. Okay.

And then let's talk about the rural district a little bit. Could we get maybe a little bit broader direction of what you're trying to accomplish with the rural district? So in your perfect world, you would like to see what in there?

And then -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In the perfect world, what I would like to see -- let me grab my -- I'd like to win the lotto in the perfect world, just FYI. But number two would be I would like to see the majority, if not all, of Yolo County to include those additional -- what I call the delta -- the northernmost delta communities because those are separate and apart from the other delta
1 communities down below. That was Pittsburg and all those
2 other communities.
3       So I would like to see from, like, Rio Vista,
4 Isleton all the way up to include Dixon because that
5 whole area before you get to, like, Heartly and Vacaville
6 and all that, all of that is rural, agricultural area and
7 I'd really like to keep that together. They do have a
8 common community of interest obviously with their open
9 lands as well as all the agriculture as well as their
10 water issues. So I would like to keep those together.
11       And moving north as I go -- if you go up just a
12 little bit. Yeah, so part of the Solano. And then move
13 up and include it with Yolo County. That was what I was
14 trying to grab. Tamina --
15 MS. MACDONALD: So Yolo does not go with Napa?
16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: For numbers-wise, if it
17 needs to, you can grab from Napa. But I would say Solano
18 and Yolo have more of a connection because of the
19 agriculture piece of it. And Napa is also highly
20 agriculture, but there also is, like, that divide --
21 like, that -- what is that pass? The American -- what is
23       But there is, like, a actual divide versus flat
24 lands. How's that? We've got flat lands and then we've
25 got those that are not flat lands.
MS. MACDONALD: Could we turn on the terrain?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

MS. MACDONALD: And then we have another question at the -- at the bottom of this -- since we're kind of rippling through here a little bit. So at this point, Golden Gate Bridge, don't hop, but there -- don't hop over the Golden Gate, but the Carquinez Bridge, we can hop the Carquinez Bridge?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But I think some said you can actually go over the Golden Gate Bridge, right, if needed? I think we're kind of open.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay. Just trying to keep my bridges -- just trying to get my bridges in order. So just because we -- this is a big ripple what you're talking about here. And you know -- and we don't know how it's going to play out, so.

CHAIR TURNER: And also I don't want to settle on this totally because we have hands that has been waiting, and if it's to comment on this, I don't want to leave their conversation out.

Andersen -- Commissioner Andersen, Akutagawa, and Kennedy, do you want to weigh in before we solidify the directions on this?

Okay. Andersen, and then -- Akutagawa, are you saying yes? Okay. Then hold your question. One moment.
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, I like what Commissioner Fernandez is trying to do. And I think the issue is it -- you know, say, the red area is the coastal because we're all kind of going -- we like that north-south. I would continue -- I would actually kind of get rid of Marin. We're cutting up that Marin one, the yellow. Because the red is coming all the way down -- it's losing Lake -- coming down, but then a large portion of Sonoma is moving into the blue to go with Lake and Napa, and then the Yolo is coming out of the blue and grabbing a large portion of Solano. But where I see the issue is, what happens to Vacaville, Fairfield, on down on the I-80 corridor, because you could make all of those areas work and I don't quite know what you do with Vacaville down into the Carquinez Bridge, unless -- here's the thought. Just going to throw this out here. It's a transportation corridor question. And a portion of Marin, the 37, from the 101, across to Vallejo, and up is a lar -- it would be essentially from Seal Point -- here. Across the 37, going into Vallejo, and up -- it would catch Benicia, possibly all the way up to Vacaville. Would that possibly be the -- essentially, like, the yellow would become -- that would be the new yellow that would make all of that fit. Is that a
possibility?

    CHAIR TURNER: Okay, hold that thought. Hold that thought. Everything's a possibility. We're here to --

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, it -- it may not work. It may not work.

    CHAIR TURNER: Let's just figure it out. We could -- we have to -- we may just have to augment it in some places. We'll see. Let's hear though from Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Kennedy.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just want to say that the reason I proposed that is because it keeps the coastal area, the wine area, the rural -- it's not just rural, but it's sort of delta rural and flood plain area, west of Sacramento, together. And then the issue is there's still numbers in there we don't know what to do with.

    CHAIR TURNER: We see it.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And that's the proposal. So thank you.

    CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Can you zoom in on that -- kind of just that western -- no, eastern Sonoma County area? Just wanted to get a closer look at it. Okay. Can you go up just a little bit more. Okay.

    That's good. That's good. Maybe a little too far up. Go back down a little bit. Okay.
Okay. One, I'd like to suggest -- and I don't know if this is really going to be feasible, to make it easier. Would splitting the Lake -- we did talk about that earlier. Would splitting the Lake help in giving you some of that flexibility or is it best to include all of Lake? That was one thought just in terms of giving some flexibility. I noticed -- I looked it up using the little handy dandy guide that Commissioner Yee gave us.

So Lake is about 80,000 people. The north coast or the VAD N Coast visualization that includes Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, and parts of Sonoma is short about 20,000. If you remove Lake -- my thought was maybe we could add back in some of the parts of that Sonoma County, that eastern Sonoma County that was taken away.

My initial thought was to follow Fernandez's idea, was to put all of Santa Rosa, but the population numbers are way too big and it would just tip it over to about over 100,000 people. And that's just -- the deviation would be way too big. So that's why I wanted to see some of the other smaller areas up there. I don't know if that would make sense.

I know that part of it -- looking at the terrain, it is rather mountainous as well too. I do see that it includes some of the wine growing areas of Sonoma as well too. So maybe it would still make sense to stay together
to achieve the right population deviation, which would
then bring Lake in with Napa as they have very explicitly
asked for several times, including the most recent COI
testimony we've gotten from them.

And then maybe looking at some of the other changes
that are being suggested. So just wanted to bring that
up.

CHAIR TURNER: So Commissioners, we have still
Commissioner Andersen's thought that you heard and in
your mind you either said, huh, that's intriguing,
interesting, let's build on that. You heard Commissioner
Akutagawa lift up a different thought.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I did
want to say, yes, you know, from what I was hearing from
Commissioner Andersen, I am supportive of the concept of
-- we had the coastal district, we have a wine area, and
then to the east of the wine area, we have kind of the
rural district that Commissioner Fernandez was talking
about.

I -- my sense -- and I'd be interested in hearing
from Commissioner Toledo on this, is, you know, Napa
County, basically wine is pretty much the whole county.
I mean, possible exceptions in the far south, but you
know, it's basically wine country. There's a good
portion of Sonoma County -- and I'm not entirely clear.

I've been to some wineries in Sonoma County, but I
don't know the exact contours of the wine area in Sonoma
County, and then as I said -- and I've gone to the Lake
County Winery Association web site and looked at their
map. And yes, most of the wineries are kind of south and
east of the lake. There is -- there are a couple on the
west bank, the north bank and beyond the north bank of
the lake.

But I -- it seems to me that we're very close to
having population for a wine country district here. And
I'd just like to see if we can get there. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: And Tamina and Karin, you all were
asking some questions still. And I wanted to get -- I
didn't want to ignore the hands that was added in. With
the added comments, was that helpful or what do you need
to know now before we go back to Commissioner Fernandez?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I'm enjoying hearing all of the
different ideas, and some of them conflict with each
other, and so if there could be a general direction from
the commission on how they would like me to go, what the
definition of wine country areas would be, for example,
then I'd be happy to try to execute that.

CHAIR TURNER: I love it. Yes, Commissioner --
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's where I was saying I would appreciate Commissioner Toledo's input on this. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. He hasn't taken on that challenge of lifting his hand just yet. So we're going to go to Commissioner Fornaciari while Commissioner Toledo decides if he's going to engage.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I -- let's see. I'd be willing to step into that one myself. So I just kind of want to get some clarity about what Commissioner Andersen proposed. And I'll just say what I heard. Okay? Or kind of -- what I heard and if I would like to see, because maybe that's the way I heard it.

So would you propose to go -- so if we move Lake County out, that's about 68,000 people I think is what it was. We're about 20,000 people short, so we'd need 90,000 people, so go down coastal Marin and somehow grab 90,000 people. Or maybe part of Santa Rosa, but go down, get coastal Marin, grab 90,000 people somewhere. And then take the more urban part of Marin and go across 37, up 80, is what you were saying?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Almost.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Through Vallejo?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Almost. I was also taking out of -- not just take Lake out, but take the wine country of Sonoma out, because right now there's a lot of wine country of Sonoma that's in that area, in the north coast -- in the Sonoma, Marin area, so.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, yeah, I was going to step into that next.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So that would come out. But yes, the urban -- like, kind of the urban from -- 37 doesn't go all the way down to the bridge. 37 comes in about -- well, about Novato, and then goes across. So it would be a portion of that and I don't know population-wise if you could pull enough to make that a transportation corridor. That was --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That was the idea. So essentially trying to make a full -- as Commissioner Kennedy said, a full wine country district. Coast district, wine country district, transportation, and rural.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So if I was going to define the wine country in Sonoma County, I would keep the blue part that's north of Santa Rosa. I would go
around Santa Rosa, down the Valley of the Moon into Sonoma. And it does go a little bit east of that to -- you know, on the other side of 101 around Petaluma.

But I would say the main parts are -- it's all over the place, but the Valley of the Moon is a big part of it that's sort of south -- or just goes north from Sonoma up to Santa Rosa, and then north around Healdsburg and across the freeway from Healdsburg to over in the Dry Creek Valley.

CHAIR TURNER: And I see Commissioner Toledo, our phone-a-friend, has lifted his hand.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I would agree with Commissioner Fornaciari about the Valley of the Moon, the city of Sonoma, Kenwood area, those are all wine growing areas. The southern part of Lake County tends to be the closest to Napa with most of the wineries. But I also would keep a portion of Yolo. You know, Winters has a Winters area that does have wineries as well, and is also agricultural and has a long history with Napa and the wine area, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sorry, I have -- you know, I have one more question for Commissioner Fernandez. You know, the areas that you're choosing are not very populated, so where are you going to get the population?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I have to look at the areas. Can you bring it up real quick? Thank you.

MS. MACDONALD: Which area would you like us to zoom into?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, that's fine. That map is fine.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I mean around Yolo, Dixon. You know, you're going up, you're cutting Solano County in half.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: That's not a lot of people. You're going up into Yolo County, that's not a lot of people. You need 500,000 people to make an assembly district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So where -- where would you get it, from Elk Grove?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I was --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I mean, there was 100-and-something-thousand people in Elk Grove. But where would you propose to get the folks.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So again, I haven't been looking at the numbers. I probably should since I am a fiscal person, but my brain's a little fried right now. I am not opposed to going towards the east, like St.
Helena. But I would probably go more north. Again, yes, smaller populations.

So I just want to bring in that one -- and you're absolutely right. In terms of the Solano, the piece that we're taking out of it is not that big in terms of population, so if you add that Yolo and you take out the Vallejo -- like, that bottom part of the blue, that could potentially be a district right there. Or a visualization, sorry. Visualization. A scenario.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, could you repeat that last part, around Vallejo?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, man. It was probably something really good that I said too. So what I was saying was the areas that I'm proposing to move out of the Solano visualization are, as Commissioner Fornaciari noted, they are not highly populated, so if you carve that out and put it in with a -- the Napa area, and then moved Vallejo to the green, that might be a even exchange.

I know. I know. Everybody else has done something else, but I'm just going to be in my lane. I'm in my lane. And the thing is, it's -- yeah, I'm throwing it out there, and if it works with the numbers, it works. If not, then we'll have to look at something else, but that's my thinking right now.
CHAIR TURNER: Yes, Karin.

MS. MACDONALD: So your wine country district's getting bigger and bigger and -- I mean, we can try it -- with the direction that you've given in general, we can try to work these things out a little bit. I think what you're probably going to see with this direction is that you're going to see a couple of districts next time -- or visualizations next time that are, like, 18 percent under population, and then maybe another one that's, like, 25 percent overpopulated or something like that.

You know, we can try to figure it out. Again, you know, kind of big picture a little bit, we heard the Lake area and we heard your direction about -- yeah, so the Vallejo thing. Actually, I'm a little bit stuck on the Marin to Vallejo honestly, because -- so basically you would go Marin over the Richmond bridge to Vallejo. But -- and then would you also go up to American Canyon? So hop over the Napa County? Or is -- yeah, is American Canyon the wine country also?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: American Canyon is wine country. Vallejo would probably be going towards the Contra Costa area. So you'd be hopping over the -- hopping over the bridge into Contra Costa or Alameda. Or

Contra Costa.

MS. MACDONALD: Right. So then you're going to
start to ripple quite a bit more than I think perhaps you
had initially looked at, so.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. I only had last
night to look at these, so I didn't look at the numbers.
I'm doing the best I can.

MS. MACDONALD: No, no, no. Not for pointing
fingers, and actually --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And I think it'll
be easier, like, once -- and if there are visualizations
next time that are over, I think at that point, it'll --
I don't want to say it'll be easier to make some of the
those decisions, but I think just looking at it and
seeing whether or not they're plausible, will be easier
for me to move forward, if that makes sense.

And I don't know if that's the same for all the
other commissioners, but right now, it's just about me,
so.

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, I mean, and what we've tried
to do so far -- and honestly, I was just looking at you
because you're kind of in my line of vision, so looking
at all of you, so not pointing fingers. So what we've
tried to do so far is, you know, just comply with the
criteria. And you know, just, like, 18 percent under, 25
percent over, it just doesn't -- it's just not equally
populated, right?
And so we can take some of these big points and figure out what we can do. I mean, there's a little bit of a rotation there, definitely. Or maybe a bit rotation. There's a Lake County issue. There is, you know, how big does your wine country district go, or are you looking for two wine country districts, because at this point it's starting to sound like you may be looking at two and not just one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: California likes its wine.

MS. MACDONALD: It is growing, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner -- yeah, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. That was actually what I was going to suggest. As you said, that we're getting bigger and bigger and bigger, is perhaps there is an east and a west wine country. I don't know that they would see themselves that way, but maybe something worth exploring, taking those parts of Lake, Sonoma, and portions of Napa. Perhaps a portion of Napa with Yolo and upper Solano County. I don't -- I'm not familiar with that area myself, so it's hard for me to really envision what that's -- if they go together. But I mean, as we're talking about it, it seems like that might be one possibility.

I just wanted to uplift the Vallejo piece again for
Commissioner Sinay. Yes, it was from last week. It was COI testimony from the Black Census and Redistricting Hub. They have -- they had specifically suggested a black COI for communities that are connected on a socioeconomic perspective from Vallejo and stretching -- and this is where it would change the architecture of this map if we were to do this, but Vallejo, Pittsburg, Antioch, Bay Point, with eastern Contra Costa, and not with inland communities in central Contra Costa.

So I think that would -- that lower portion of this area that we're looking at would shift if we were to take that on. But I think that's one option for us as we're thinking about these shifts in that region.

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, to that point, just to, you know, look forward, that configuration is actually in a different plan.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Good. I haven't had a chance to look at that plan yet.

MS. MACDONALD: Totally, totally fine. You know.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. MACDONALD: Just saying, so we were --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect.

MS. MACDONALD: We did actually -- you know, we do hear you all. Just sometimes it may not look that way because this is 14 people giving direction.
CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, and I think as we go further, there may be other areas where we'll see larger deviations that are under that we would -- than we would like, and then that's also going to force our hand of having to do something different. So I propose that we just continue to move.

Commissioner Fernandez, are you --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure, I'm ready.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Now I'm with Kennedy.

Page 12 and 13. Actually, if you go to 13, if you could just put the terrain on for me please?

Wait, which one -- okay. Let me see that real quick. I was just interested in that mountain range that goes from, like, Dobbins to Butte. Okay, so if we go back to number 12. It's the Nor Cal.

Down a little.

MS. WILSON: Am I on the wrong one?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no. That is Nor Cal, right? That's Nor Cal. Sorry, my bad. I was looking at -- I may not do it right now, but I know in the future, Placer and El Dorado -- it actually is on the next one which is -- which one? That is the -- yeah. They have repeated requested not to go further south. And I would
agree with that. They have more commonalities in terms of their water issues, their transportation, with the northern counties.

So right now -- because, I mean, honestly with all the way down to Inyo, Placer and El Dorado are much more -- so work closely with Sierra and the other counties going north, not south. So I'm just going to make that comment right now.

It's too hard for me to make some suggested changes, but I'm going to go to 37 and 38. And that one's going to be a little bit of a stickler. Okay. Thank you.

Which one is this one? This one is west Placer.

All right.

CHAIR TURNER: 37 is west Placer.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Okay. Thank you.

And then 38 is the VADEC, right?

MS. WILSON: We actually have not gotten to the ECA yet.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Okay.

MS. WILSON: I can present it if you would like.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Not -- no. No. But thank you. I don't want to get totally -- I guess with my concern right here and of course -- well, the numbers are down. How big is Lincoln? I really don't like leaving Lincoln out of there, because they are actually, like,
physically attached. But how much are they? I'll look
at my numbers here, Commissioner Fornaciari. They are
49,000. Okay, I'll play with that one later.

I'm going to bypass that and go to page 39 and 42.
So if we can -- yeah, that's perfect right there. Right
now, we are splitting community of interest with your Oak
Park, your Meadowview, and your Lemon Hill, and your
Florin area, which they have commonalities in education,
transportation, and what I would propose -- it's giving
me a headache. Where am I? 39? Which one are we on
right now? Yes, thank you very much.

Yeah, I want to keep -- this is going to -- this
will potentially upset my west Sacramento neighbors, but
my proposal was to -- oh, there we go. Here's our people
that we're going to put into Yolo County, Commissioner
Fornaciari, west Sacramento.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, no, no, no.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And just so that you know,
we did also receive COI from individuals wanting to keep
west Sacramento in Yolo. It wasn't all just one-sided,
so it's both-sided. And right now, I am -- I'm trying to
be in the middle, but I can't be in the middle. So if we
move them back with Yolo, that might fix our Yolo County
under population concern. And I would like to add -- oh,
thank you for zooming out. One more time. Thank you.
I'd like to add if possible -- I don't know what the numbers are. Although I do have my handy-dandy form that Commissioner Yee did. I'd like to add if we get rid of west Sacramento, if we added the Florin vineyard and Elk Grove area to the same district, yes. So it would be in the west Sac/Sac district. Yes, thank you. I think that was it. And if needed, I would've moved the Natomas out of it, but if not, then leave Natomas in there, because that -- there is a divide there with Natomas but I'm good with leaving it in.

And my main concern here is, one, I'd like to keep Sacramento communities as much as possible in the Sacramento area. And if that requires moving west Sacramento with Yolo County, then that is a trade-off I'm willing to do. Thank you. That was it.

MS. WILSON: And I have a quick question regarding that -- I'm sorry. If I were to take out Natomas, would you want it going here with this other -- these counties here -- I mean, these cities, Elverta, Rio Linda --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, if possible. I don't know the numbers right now, but yes. That'd be great. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani. No? Your hand is up. Okay.

Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I've got a couple of things. One, I kind of like the idea of an east and a west wine country because that really might solve a lot of issues. It could put the transportation corridors for the wine country with -- back with them. And keeping the counties together would also help take care of the highway 37 issues, which have to do -- which they need county and also federal money for. So I kind of really like that idea. It might help.

I totally agree with Commissioner Fernandez about Lincoln. We have up there as the west Placer. Lincoln and Rocklin, it's -- you know, they're like sisters. They -- to split those would really be hard on the smaller towns because they're -- you know, the volunteer fire department works -- gets all their people from Rocklin, then all of sudden they have to go to a whole other area. It would be very impractical -- not practical at all.

But then I disagree with the El Dorado and Amador on highway 89 going up. They work, they're totally simpatico. They have their fire districts, as for the fire went right through that entire area. It ripped right through exactly that whole area. The -- and particularly, it might not be right down around the Sacramento area, but as soon as you start going up in the
hills more, they really are particularly for as I say
fire, recreation, because they go from one portion over
the hill to the other, and there's lots of little small
specialized cross country areas through that that they
work back and forth together.

So I kind of like that idea of keeping those
together. But there are some tweaks that I completely
agree and understand where Commissioner Fernandez was
trying to go. So I just wanted to bring that up. If the
wine country, we could do that, that might help alleviate
some of our issues. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: I also have a quick clarifying question
there. I'm -- you know, I don't know what everyone's
feelings are on this visualization. However, if I were
to take out Lincoln, it would still be -- it's, you know,
negative 14 right now. It would be under.

And where could I grab from?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm actually wondering if
you take it apart and put it into a couple of other
areas, because the NorCal is low. I know Sutter, Yuba
were together. I didn't realize it was Butte, Sutter,
Yuba. I thought Butte was more with Loomis. But that's
what I -- that was what I heard. And Colusa could
actually be with Yolo, is what I was thinking.

MS. WILSON: Because then -- yeah, Sutter and Yuba
might be left to -- not sure where to put them, I guess, if Butte goes north and Colusa goes west.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Or we -- or do they go -- it becomes a Yolo-Colusa-Sutter-Yuba, kind of in that area. They become -- I'd go back to Commissioner Fernandez on that in terms of what she thought those areas would go -- would be more organized with, would fit better.

So I put you on the hot seat, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, okay. Okay.

I'm -- I think there was quite a bit of COI testimony to keep Yuba, Sutter, and Butte together, I believe.

Right, Kennedy? That's why you kept them together? So thank you.

I will say that Colusa is more of a flat land, ag area, so that you could try to split up between Yolo and -- if you needs numbers definitely could attach it with that, if you're going to move Lincoln into that other visualization.

Did that help, Kennedy? No? She's being so sweet.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Let me have Commissioner Toledo add in to the conversation.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm just wondering if perhaps -- it looks like we're missing population in both
the -- in both of these districts that we're looking at. Might we want to add a portion of Yuba County that has strong connection to Grass Valley, I'm thinking the southern portion of Yuba County into the northern -- district that I see in yellow, the NorCal district, to get enough population to move that forward because I still see a -- that we're missing population there. And there is the portion of Yolo that does have strong -- strong connection to the Grass Valley, Nevada city area, Nevada County region. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Kennedy, got a couple of suggestions. Is that enough for a general? Okay. Okay. So we're going to keep moving down.

MS. WILSON: I will say I don't know what's going to happen with Yolo, but we will see.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Let's see. Our next break time. I have a couple of people inquiring. Christian is -- what -- was it 6:15?

MALE SPEAKER: 6:05, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: 6:05, so keep pushing everyone. Yeah, I tell you what. Let's just take a one-minute health break. If everyone can just stand and stretch, we're going to go to our break time.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, that's about seven. Seven
minutes. All right. Sit back down. Let's go. Seven minutes. That was just stretch break. We're going to keep going.


MS. WILSON: If I may ask a question?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. WILSON: I will say, adding Butte entirely to this northern California would be a lot of people too and maybe -- maybe direction with what I do with Butte would help more because putting it north I don't think is possible.

CHAIR TURNER: Butte.

MS. WILSON: I mean, is possible, if I take other things. Yeah, it is -- everything's possible.

CHAIR TURNER: Question, yes? Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Okay. Can we talk through -- can someone remind me about Nevada and Placer counties? I recall communities of interest testimony about Truckee being linked with Lake Tahoe. Is that something we can talk about or think about? Nevada wants to be whole as a county, I'm assuming.

CHAIR TURNER: And Nevada wants to be with El Dorado
and Placer?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I wonder if anyone has that handy. Would shifting Nevada around open up other alternatives for Butte and thereby Yolo?

MS. WILSON: I believe so. And there was other -- which is -- yeah. I was -- before, previously, trying to keep Sierra and Nevada together, but if I can separate those two, that opens up possibilities as well.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, we do have testimony supporting putting Nevada with Placer and El Dorado.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was -- I was going to go to the other side. I mean, yes, there was a lot of COI testimony, Sutter, Yuba together, and I was kind of curious as to why this green one was -- where the population was coming from and I assume it's coming -- a lot of it's coming from Butte.

So I would offer that Colusa is more like Glenn, okay? I mean, if you have to kind of monkey around that way, there's -- I don't know. I don't know off the top of my head how big Colusa County is but it's definitely more like 21,000 people. So well that would help, but -- so, anyway.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Colusa, 22,000.

Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: I'm sorry, Commissioner Fornaciari, was that it? Okay.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Nevada and Sierra -- I mean, you're Truckee is a gateway into Lake Tahoe and they are very connected. And Sierra only has, like, 3,000 people, so putting those together with Placer, El Dorado does make a lot of sense. And then -- and if you take those numbers, you could probably add Butte to the north -- to the northern area. If you added -- particularly if you added -- put Placer together, then you could put Butte -- well, I would think. Just numbers-wise I think that would make -- and then you could keep Sutter, Yuba, Colusa with Yolo. Does that make sense? No. I'm getting shakes, no.

CHAIR TURNER: Say it again. It may make sense.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would say put Glenn, Butte, Plumas north. And take Sierra, Nevada, put it with Placer, El Dorado, that one. And take Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, and add it with our portion of -- you know how we have that thin skinny portion of Yolo that we're adding with a little bit of the rural Solano? Would that area help?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Wasn't that the eastern wine
country?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, no, not Yolo. Only a little bit of --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Only a little bit of Yolo?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. But the eastern portion of Yolo --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, the eastern of Yolo, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- was with the eastern portion of Solano.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: To create a rural district.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct, yes. That was the rural district, going up with Colusa and then Sutter, Yuba.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Two minutes.

Kennedy, you got that?

Beautiful, beautiful.

Commissioner Fernandez, with a minute and thirty seconds.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I can make that. I do like the idea of having Sierra, Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado together. And I do agree with Commissioner Andersen when she noted that Amador is somewhat related with them as well, which is good. I was referring more to the southern counties in terms of no -- the lack of
commonality.

Yuba and Sutter should stay together. We shouldn't try to split them up. They have many combined services that -- when you call one, it's usually both. They're both connected in just about everything they do. So I just want to make sure that we continue to keep them together.

And I'm -- that's all I'm going to say because Kennedy has a huge task in front of her right now.

CHAIR TURNER: It's only going to get larger, but she's the right one.

All right. So we're going to take now our dinner break. So it is 6:04. We will be back at 6 -- it's 6:05. We'll be back at 6:35.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And welcome back from our break. We're moving on in our visualizations in the assembly district. And right now, we are taking comments and feedback from commissioners in regards to the map as has been presented.

At this time, let's see if there are any raised hands. If not, Kennedy I'd like for you to prepare -- got a couple of hands. I'll prepare to move on with the rest of central California.

Commissioner Toledo.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I -- in terms of--
I know Commissioner Fernandez was talking about west
Sacramento and within the Sacramento area as well. And
I'm just wanting to make sure that we keep the LGBT
community in west Sacramento together. The Equality
California raised a couple of -- a region in there. And
I want to make sure that it gets kept together and that
Johnson Business Park, Mansion Flats, New Era Park,
Boulevard Park, Downtown Sacramento, Midtown, Newton
Booth, are quite a few neighborhoods. Alhambra Triangle,
med center, Curtis Park, Land Park, Tahoe. ARC and
portions of west Highland Park known as Lavender Heights.
Just making sure that we are keeping those together
in our assembly seats.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: Did you have other areas you want to
talk about, over there, for Sac --
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Not, that one for Sacramento.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioners, as we go
forward, what we're going to try not -- certainly not to
rush the process but just to expedite perhaps a little.
What we're going to do is give our comments, our
feedback, have a little of a discussion, and then the
line drawers have our original directions, they'll have
the new direction and we won't focus so much on what we have to do remove. We'll just kind of move through what we're seeing, what we're noticing, and how this is informing us currently based on COI testimony and input that we've received.

So with that, Kennedy, let me have you do the rest of your presentation please.

MS. WILSON: That sounds great, Chair. So one moment while I get my -- Karin next to me. No, you're good. Take your time. And we see where we left off, which was on page 42, is where we left off. And we're going to move to page 43, Stockton.

So zoom in here. We're in blue. I have Stockton kept together whole. And they are paired with Tracy and Mountain House in a district. And it has a little bottleneck here, keeping Antigua and Lathrop out of this visualization and keeping those together.

Now, we're going to move on to page 44. And a lot of these are going to be right in row, so you won't have to flipping around too much. So now 44 is Stanislaus. Here, playing around with populations, I wanted to keep Modesto and Turlock together. And keeping these two -- this Riverbank, Oakdale, Knights Ferry region was too much to stay to keep it whole. Taking it north didn't necessarily work, so I pushed that population down and
that is why it is not connected here.

Now, we're going to move on to page 45. And we have
Merced and downtown to west Fresno. So it does include
that part of Stanislaus here. And then we have Merced.
We heard from keeping Atwater, Chowchilla and Fairmead,
these string of cities here, keeping the major cities in
Merced here and down into Madera.

And then we go into Fresno. We have -- I'll turn
that layer on. We have the 99 going this way, and we
have this west of the 99 staying together. And COI
testimony saying to keep the west of 99 together.

Now, we will be moving on to page 46, which has
Fresno here. And I would like to point out that the VRA
consideration visualizations are in the bright yellow and
so that does take out this chunk of Fresno here, but
keeping testimony to try to keep Clovis and north Fresno
together, as well as West Park, Sunnyside, and Old Fig
and those black populations here, keeping them together.

Now, moving on to page 47. And we have Fresno and
Kings. And last time you saw this visualization, we did
not have Merced in it, and so that changed the
configuration. That was a part of Fresno, but we went up
to add Los Banos to be a part of this as well. This is a
VRA consideration district, all of them in yellow.

Now, moving on to Tulare. This is similar to what
we saw before, working with the VRA attorneys. And this has keeping Visalia whole, Tulare. We saw the black community wanting Pixley and -- oops, my bad. Keeping Pixley and Porterville together. And over here in this Fresno, Kings, wanting Lemoore and Hanford to be together as well so those are pairings I wanted to go back to to show you, that were kept together.

Now, moving on to page 49. And this is this Bakersfield. And here, we did not split Shafter. We changed the configuration of that. And I'm going to zoom into Bakersfield. And we added in La Cresta, took out Bakersfield County Club, and then kept these smaller cities within Bakersfield together.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm sorry, what page is this one? 49?

MS. WILSON: This is page 49.

Yes, the one -- the visualizations that are this darker yellow compared to this paler yellow, those are the ones that are -- the VRA consideration, and I can zoom out again to show you that. This west Bakersfield, this Tulare, and this from Merced, west Fresno, and Kings.

Now, moving on to Fresno, San Bernardino. And so this includes -- I'm going to zoom into Fresno to show you here. This has none -- this has a bit of Fresno, the
city, here at the bottom, these outer boundaries. And that is giving some population to this as well. We go down and have the rest of Tulare in this as well as the Lake Isabella area, Ridgecrest area, being kept with Kern, but it's still needed population, so we went into San Bernardino and grabbed Barstow to keep this populated. This was on page 50.

Now, we'll be moving on to the next visualization on page 52. Page 52. The ECA, east California. And so we have up here as you've seen this eastern part of Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Alpine, Mariposa, Madera, Mono, and Inyo. And these two counties needed to be populated by something, and previously it was down in Kern and you wanted to -- there was commission instruction to have that population come from the north rather than the south, so that is why it's taken up here, and I've grabbed it from up here instead of trying to reach down.

And it has -- we wanted to -- you wanted to try to remove Fresno and Madera from this eastern part. It wasn't enough population to do both. We needed some of Madera, but I did move Fresno down this way to be Tulare, Kern, and San Bernardino.

And those are all the visualizations for my region.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Kennedy.
Okay. I think I'll start and -- I think I'll start
in this area. I don't see any hands just yet, so I'm not
technically jumping the line, but I wanted to go -- if
you could show me -- I know there was considerable
testimony wanting of course San Joaquin County together
and we know it's too big to be together, but show me that
again and what we shaved off of that.

MS. WILSON: So here, in San Joaquin, we have this
part of the delta region here that went out with Contra
Costa. We have Stockton staying with Mountain House and
Tracy. And then we have those eastern San Joaquin
forming cities going north.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So that's what page?

MS. WILSON: Page 42 and 43.

CHAIR TURNER: So in it, I know you worked hard to
keep, based on testimony, Stockton and Tracy together,
was the choice, and Mountain House?

MS. WILSON: Yes. And trying to keep Stockton
whole. And it can't be whole by itself. It still needs
population. And seeing as this wasn't going with
Alameda, this also needs to go somewhere as well.

CHAIR TURNER: And --

MS. WILSON: And this being Mountain House and
Tracy.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. The other parts that's cut
out of San Joaquin County, is that an unincorporated
area? What are those -- what are those?

MS. WILSON: Yes. These -- this is unincorporated
area that does not have the cities in it. Moving up,
there's Terminous, this delta city, but that's not a part
of it. That's here with Lodi, Lockeford, Woodbridge.
This is just water -- the area, this unincorporated area
in San Joaquin.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: Which could be -- I think there was --
there was a population of -- I'm not sure. It is very
small, but enough to put this at five percent. I believe
it was, like, 5.01 or something, close to. But I -- we
took that out and put that with the other delta counties
-- I mean, delta cities to keep this deviation.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Then let me just move here for
now to Fresno. So there was a lot of feedback and

concern about us dividing Fresno into five different
areas. So I do want to work on that and see how we can
minimize that split, starting with not combining north
Fresno -- or one of your visualizations included Clovis
with I think Old Fig Garden?

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: So I'd love to keep west Fresno
together with the other cities that -- I know you have a
bunch of them together and then we also have Clovis.

Clovis is north -- I think Clovis is north Fresno. And I don't want to have Old Fig Garden -- that we've heard lots of testimony about, I think they're trying to stay in with some of the other cities. I'm looking for my list. Of course not seeing it quick enough. But interested in not having Fresno -- so Fresno is split. I'm trying to see where the splits are. I see between -- oh, yeah, okay.

Tarpey Village, Old Fig Garden, good. Clovis not so good to be in there. I think most of the testimony that we received wanted them to stay with the north side and not have that vote in the area -- particularly the black vote diluted. I'd be in a part of that district.

MS. WILSON: If I may --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. WILSON: -- as I was drawing this, this came about due to -- so the way I had it originally, more of this part -- the more western part of Fresno was together going up with Merced and Madera, and Clovis and northeast Fresno were populating in a district that was just this easter side of Fresno and it was at about a negative 2, about deviation. However, when it comes down to these parts, something needed to be populated. So it was cut I think in a way that you are describing you would like it
more, but then this just doesn't have the population down here; this being San Bernardino, parts of Kern, and parts of Tulare.

CHAIR TURNER: So if we work on having southwest Fresno with West Park, Old Fig Garden, Sunnyside, and let's see the numbers and see where we can perhaps divide because that's still a five-way split for the city of Stockton -- or the county of Stockton. And keep Selma whole. Perhaps in one of the other areas there would cause a split somewhere else, but I'm trying to not have us divide that up and carve it out so deeply so many times.

Same thing with Merced. I think Merced was a previous VRA district. No longer. I see that. But I'm wondering if we still need to split that. Some of the earlier testimony with Merced spoke about the gains they've made based on what occurred in the past and no wanting to lose that ability. And so I'll just name those things and see what else can be done in these areas.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I made a mistake.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez.

Oh, I thought you said you was a mistake.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, I said I almost made a
mistake and pressed the whole button.

   CHAIR TURNER: Oh, okay. Oh, I see. I thought you
   said you did make a mistake, you didn't raise your hand.

   COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, no, no. It's more of a
   clarification question. You mentioned on the eastern
   Sierra, or -- I'm not sure how we're doing this because
   kind of all of the place before, and then --

   CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, because at this point
   everything impacts something else, so we're just kind of
   having a discussion right now.

   COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. It was just more a
   clarification question. And it's kind of along the lines
   of what you were talking right here. What part -- you
   said Fresno, this is on VAD_ECA_1027. This is the
   eastern Sierra visualization.

   MS. WILSON: Yeah.

   COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And maybe it's the
   Fresno_SB. That's that intersection there. Yeah. You
   had mentioned that you had to take a part of -- I think
   you said Fresno to take for population -- were you
   referring to the San Bernardino -- Fresno, San Bernardino
   visualization or -- it sounded like you had to take that
   for the eastern Sierra visualization.

   MS. WILSON: Yes. So I will clarify that. I had
   previously -- you know, before merging with the other
mappers and seeing what everyone's constraints were,
there was a district I was about to make that was solely
this eastern part of Fresno and it was populated mostly
by this Clovis and northeastern Fresno, the city and that
part of the city was populated here, but then I was left
with Tulare -- parts of Tulare, parts of Kern. And so
then we had to switch things around because I couldn't
dip lower into San Bernardino to populate these two. So
I needed to come back and reconfigure so I could take
this part of Fresno, this eastern part of Fresno and put
it here so that something could work.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And again, for
clarification, what part could you not dip into?

MS. WILSON: I was not able to dip lower into San
Bernardino.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I see. I do want to
just say out loud that -- I mean, this is a huge
district, and we've heard testimony from community folks
in California that have talked about, you know, just
being so far away from their representatives and -- I
mean, I'm just imagining getting from Barstow to, you
know, the tip of that Fresno County. I mean, that's
going to take several hours. I know in some of these
there's some hard choices, but I do want to just
acknowledge that that is probably not the most ideal, but
I understand the constraints.

And I guess the question I do have is, is there a way to look at it -- or re-look at it again where perhaps it's not so big, plus you got a high desert community together with a central valley agricultural community in a sense. It's in the foothills of the Sierras, but it's still very, very different and I can't see -- you know, wherever the representative is going to end up sitting, I think we're going to see that someone's going to feel like they're neglected because the issues are not going to be the same. So thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. I think I already gave these to you, Kennedy. So I'm sorry if I'm being repetitive. On page 42, that is the south Sac, San Joaquin?

So in this one, I think we've already talked about, you know, Elk Grove and all that, but I believe I forgot to mention Wilton and Rancho Marietta. Those two communities feed into the Sacramento. They are I guess commuter communities. And if needed, we could put Rancho Marietta up with, like, the Folsom, wherever they land, and Wilton can go with the Elk Grove piece of it. Again, it's more of a transportation type. And also again, they
commute to Sacramento.

And then the next one is on page 44. What did I have there. Oh, no, you know what, that one's fine. I was looking at something else. That's fine. I apologize for that.

And page 52. That's my -- and I already -- I believe I already talked about -- where am I? Yeah, we already talked about Placer and El Dorado not moving -- if they have to move anywhere, either go north or to the west. And that's it. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Excuse me, Madam Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: May I just please -- may I just please ask for clarification? Would it be okay to ask a clarifying question just when there is direction --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- to, you know, perhaps take people out of a district, just in general terms, where we might be able maybe not in exact numbers, but just in general terms where we may be able to grab people from? Like, for example, the yellow -- the yellow district that we just spoke about.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Ranch Murieta and --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yeah, exactly.
MS. WILSON: Yes, and so then we do have Manteca and Lathrop, which --

CHAIR TURNER: Right.

MS. WILSON: -- doesn't populate this enough.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: These farming towns. If this is all going north, then these smaller population, they need someone to populate them.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So that's a VRA, right, consideration?

MS. WILSON: No. And --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, it's not. Okay.

MS. WILSON: No. The VRA -- I know that is a bit --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry.

MS. WILSON: -- confusing. VRA is just a darker yellow. That's -- when they're next to each other, it's --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's a mustard.

MS. WILSON: Yeah, a mustard versus a baby yellow.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, because that would have been my suggestion, is to take from Manteca, add that back in on that end. Manteca and -- where's the other area? So if we take out Rancho Murieta up from the top in Wilton, and that population is not going to cover it. Okay.

Maybe --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't have the population for those two communities but I know Ranch Murieta, it's pretty small, I just don't know what the numbers are, sorry. And Wilton, I'm not sure what that is.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: If I may, we don't really need, like, perfect, you know, numbers, but just an idea of where you would like to -- so would you then like to move in, you know, to Stanislaus and -- because there may be some cutting going on down there. Because you need to get population somehow north, right?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Or you have to rotate it somewhere. So it has to come from someplace.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, I would rather it come from Stanislaus since we -- we already have some Stanislaus in there, right? Yeah, since we're already into Stanislaus, and not go into Contra Costa way.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. We'll take a look at it. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'd wanted a couple, but that one you sort of took care of. So back down to -- it's that Tulare -- let's see the AD Tulare 1027 -- well, 1027, but I don't know what page that's actually on, but I understand it looks like it's a very
proposed area. But I'm -- we did hear quite a bit of
testimony from the people who live in Three Rivers, so I
don't know how much population that is whatsoever, and
Lemon Cove, if they could please, please be connected
with Visalia, the city of Visalia.

So I don't know if that would work or not.

MS. WILSON: I would also like to mention that this
is here for this version, but in the other Tulare is
whole. In the Senate plan, there's one where Tulare is
whole. I don't know exactly what plans they asked for it
to be together, but there is a plan with them together.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was just wondering just
because it would just be a little tiny thing out of that
one. I don't know if that'd work.

MS. WILSON: Yes, and this is at -- I think this is
at -- it's at 55 percent Latina C VAP, something, and it
drops, putting --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, okay.

MS. WILSON: And there's just constraints there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's what I was wondering.

So okay, thank you.

And then -- oh, that was the Rancho Murieta, so.

All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. My direction is
very general. We started today with Mr. Becker showing
us some maps of our VRA obligations throughout the state.
He very clearly identified a vast portion of the central
valley. When I look at these visualizations, I'm
concerned whether or not we're hitting those obligations.
I think in particular taking a look at the Merced, west
Fresno visualization as well as even the Fresno one.

I'd like us to explore what the other options are,
if we need to. And I think that's kind of a question for
counsel and for the line drawers to consider in greater
detail.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Well, I think that that is a
question for counsel, for VRA counsel, and you know,
we've been working with VRA counsel very closely on the
configuration of these districts and/or visualizations of
districts and -- yeah, I think it's a conversation you
have to have with counsel. There is really -- I mean,
yes, when you're looking at these maps, they cover a
large area, but I think also when you're looking at the
public input and the public maps, you also see that there
is, you know -- there isn't, like, yellow visualizations
everywhere either.

There is, you know -- and also some of these, like,
visualizations are very similar, so there's just so much
you can do. I'm not entirely sure what to tell you right
now, honestly.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's fair enough. I think we can continue to think about what our options might be. Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners, any other discussion on these or direction?

And I think just generally, I am wanting, Kennedy, if you can, to find a way to not have a Fresno split in five different assembly districts. Finding a way to not include Clovis with that west and southwest part of Fresno.

MS. WILSON: Would that be okay to move into San Bernardino?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: That was the Clovis --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- the Clovis question. So I just want to ring a tiny alarm bell here. So once you're talking San Bernardino, we're talking, you know, potential VRA areas that are pushing from the south. We are then talking about Los Angeles and the VRA areas that are coming from the west, and then you also see these yellow areas come in south. So we are very happy to look at this, but just -- kind of just ringing a tiny little alarm bell here.

And Fresno, absolutely, we'll take a look at it.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just to confirm, that light yellow that stretches from all the way Fresno to San Bernardino, that was not VRA?

CHAIR TURNER: So yes, so north Fresno and Clovis is okay.

So Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'd just add to Commissioner Turner's comments about Fresno. Yes, Clovis and I believe north Fresno north of Shaw was the exact street that came up several times as a boundary for north Fresno.

So to keep that somehow separate from the rest of Fresno.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just trying to think through this a little bit. I appreciated Commissioner Akutagawa's comment about the distance, right, the length of the -- how long the district to the east is. And potentially, I'm just wondering if -- whether some of the region in Fresno and Tulare might be able to be combined with that district to create a district, right, that includes Inyo, that Fresno area, a -- the Clovis area of Fresno that is -- doesn't have much in common with the other piece of Fresno. And then down to -- down into
Kern.

And so making that a different congressional district. It would go into Kern, Tulare, Fresno, take out -- including Clovis and Inyo.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Would you mind if I just say something about that?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, absolutely.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We actually had direction previously not to do that. So just wanted to flag that.

And --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I believe that direction was because we wanted to go down the length of the -- California. Am I correct in remembering that?

MS. WILSON: It was more about what was populating these. I mean, yes, it was wanting to go north and before when it was being populated by these, it didn't -- these being populated by Fresno and Kern, that wasn't matching what Mono and Inyo or Tuolumne, Mariposa, Madera.

I was given direction that those counties align more with north and Placer and El Dorado rather than Fresno, Madera, or Kern, or going that way. So that is why that's kind of split up.

In my other plans, I was able to take out Madera completely, and Madera and Fresno are going down to
Tulare and Kern and not being paired with Mono, Inyo, Mariposa upwards.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So is it a population issue that we're dealing with or is it --

CHAIR TURNER: It was the mountains.

MS. WILSON: But they needed to be populated by someone because they weren't enough by themselves, so.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, can we see the terrain layer?

MS. WILSON: Oh, yes. So it is a large area. I can move into any county or region that you would like.

Yes, I can zoom -- and do you want me to zoom into the Fresno area, to Mono, Inyo?

Okay. I will zoom into Fresno and Tulare. There we go.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you put the roads as well? Because I see 395.

MS. WILSON: My apologies, it's blocking it. One moment.

So there in Brown, it's going down and that's where the 395 is.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, it's --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Are you able to see that because it's a pretty crowded map, so we're happy to take some stuff off also?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: This is good. I can see it. It's just I think my eyes are a little bit tired.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, this specific area, that mountain range, that's 11,000 to 14,000 feet mountains. And Inyo, Mono, and Alpine specifically asked to be together and not with Fresno, Tulare because their representatives are usually, like, in Bakersfield or someplace over here and they cannot get to them. They actually said, we'd rather drive up because that's where we cross over into -- like, say, down 89 or through, you know, Mammoth Lakes, across that way.

And Ridgecrest, which is just down in Kern, they specifically asked, they want to be with Tulare and you know, that whole area. They specifically asked that the Triangle there. So it may seem like these are far distances, but actually it's the easiest way for them to travel. And so it's -- it looks like, oh, we could -- why don't we put it nicely here together. But they're separated. It's similar to Del Norte can't get across -- you have to go up and around the mountains. So it's a similar thing.

And the idea of the -- I was wondering -- because I
understand what Commissioner Turner was saying with Fresno, and I'm wondering if we could maybe take a portion of the Fresno, which is, you know, plus two percent. And put -- put that back into the Merced, west Fresno, whatever that one is, a little bit more there to alleviate the north Clovis, you know -- if we could maybe do a little bit of subtraction out of it without dividing it entirely. If we might be able to rearrange a little bit. I don't if that's a possibility, but that was something I thought we may be able to try.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know, I want us to draw districts that make sense and certainly, you know, having access to elected officials is important, but I just took a look, for example, at the assembly webpage and the office addresses for the eighty members of the assembly. So yeah, you know, probably more than half have only one district office, but there are a number of assembly members with two district offices, three district offices. There are even assembly members with four district offices.

So I don't know that we need to be quite as focused on the distance to reach an assembly member's office because they clearly have the option of having more offices than just one. And so let's keep that in mind
and focus on making districts that make sense without focusing too much on the distance to an office. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: That was good, counsel. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with you on that, Commissioner Kennedy. I think that is definitely the case. That being said, I mean, when you look at this map, combining Fresno with the outskirts of San Bernardino, it just feels off to me. And San Bernardino is very much a part of the inland empire, not a part of the central valley.

So you know, I want to -- can we just move the map northward slightly. I'm trying to better understand the county boundaries for Madera and Mariposa. And I'm wondering if -- you know, if we were to pull in, like, that -- yes, right there where you're kind of locating -- for her to pull in -- I have no idea what the population is in those areas, but pulling in some of that as well as that north Fresno, Clovis area that had been identified as I think on both sides not wanting to be together.

Would that be enough to take out that San Bernardino component? That just doesn't -- I don't know, San Bernardino, I guess I could maybe see it, but those are
two very distinctive regions of the state, so keeping
them together seems a little off to me. But I don't know
if others have that sense on putting these two in.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'll comment on what
Commissioner Sadhwani just talked about. I just wanted
to also add on to what Commissioner Andersen said about
Inyo and about pulling some of them in. They were very
specific. All of the testimony -- or not all the
testimony, a lot of the testimony, but also in -- when we
were reaching out and I guess, you know, just talking to
the folks about making sure that we get COI testimony, I
guess because of that, I stayed focused on this
particular region and I recall, and I think we can see
this in the COI testimony, people talking about the
difficulties of, you know, getting across the Sierras or
the mountains ranges during the winter time and how they
had to go so far out of their way.

And also expressing extreme disappointment in the
fact that they pretty much never saw their representative
in their particular areas despite being in a district
that included the central valley floor, and they were
very adamant that they really wanted somebody who would
be focused on that particular corridor that separate --
is separated by the mountains from the valley floor. And
you know, that's just something that I just wanted to
make sure that we try to honor as much as I can -- as we
can. And I hear what Commissioner Kennedy is saying.
And I do agree, to a certain degree, I think we just have
to listen to also what we did say, particularly when they
were very adamant about it. There were others that said
oh, I don't want to drive that far. But then most of
those were saying no, we would rather be in a district
that reflects common interest.

But I feel like the COI testimony that we were
hearing, what we're reading, they were all very adamant
about just really wanting somebody that is centered in
their particular region. And I think this is the same
kind of challenge that even the San Bernardino one is
going to have because, yes, there may possibly be
multiple offices, but we've also seen that there's not
too. And we don't know what they're going to get. And
the likelihood is that they're going to be primarily from
a particular area and they may have district staff,
possibly.

But part of this is we want to make sure that
communities that have similar interests are also together
where they feel like then their needs are met. So I
guess that would just be my only comment on both these
districts that we're looking at right now.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you all for the wonderful conversation and discussion.

One of the -- I appreciate it as well, Commissioner Kennedy, just bringing that up again. And I don't think that that is in any of our criteria either, necessarily, to figure out where those offices are going to be. I think California's a big place. I think there's a lot of our Californians that have to do a long drive. And sometimes what even appears to be a short drive in southern California is a long drive. And so comparatively speaking I don't know how we would ever balance all of this out without really kind of mapping it through, and driving it out, and depending on the times of the day, and all of that.

So I do love sticking with the types of districts we're trying to draw and the communities of -- the community of interest testimony that we're receiving.

I'm -- I -- someone, I forget who now, talked about not taking Fresno into San Bernadino. I totally support that and would also love if we could find a way not to have Fresno going into Kern County either.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I agree with I think a lot of what has been said. But I am going to say that I am warming to the idea of having San Bernadino in a
configuration like this, not sold and definitely could be
convinced to say yeah, that this doesn't make sense,
leave it out.

That being said, and this is sort of what I'm trying
to sort of broaden my perspective in a similar way in
thinking about the Antelope Valley in L.A. county. Not
-- my fear is that because so much of San Bernadino's
physical geography in the north is rural and spread
apart, that those folks in Barstow are going to be -- are
going to end up districted in a place where they may not
be -- especially in the rest of San Bernadino may be
districted where the population is majority people not at
all like them, and we functionally orphan, you know, the
folks in Barstow to be voting with folks who don't give a
rip about their interests in rural San Bernadino.

And while I think they're absolutely -- Barstow is
Inland Empire, definitely not the central valley, in
thinking about common interests and organizing around
common interests, politically it would seem to me that
beyond sort of the identity of central valley or identity
of Inland Empire, which is very strong and very
important, that there are also additional identities
related to being in a rural part of a county or being,
you know, more separated from the suburban and urban
centers of their counties. And that, to me, seems like a
potential interest that we would want to protect,
especially for the smaller cities like Barstow, if we
can.

So agree and acknowledge that San Bernadino and --
is definitely the Inland Empire and not the central
valley. And I think there's potential for more common
interests in the central valley than potentially we may
be giving this region credit for. So I just wanted to
let at least my colleagues know that my thinking -- I'm
attempting to broaden my thinking on this.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you for that, Commissioner
Vazquez. We will do likewise. We'll try to keep broad
thoughts and keep out thoughts open as well.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually,
Commissioner Vazquez, that really dovetails perfectly
into what I was saying -- what I would like to say is it
was issues. I did mention about Inyo/Mono when I talked,
just about transportation. But really it's -- because
Inyo said they don't really want to be with San
Bernadino. And everyone thinks well it's high desert,
it's desert. But they have very different uses of the
desert. And it's Inyo, Mono, these counties, like 90
percent of their land is either owned by water districts
or the federal government because it's recreation. You
know, Death Valley, many other areas like that where San
-- that area of San Bernadino, it does have the Mojave
National Forest but -- National Preserve, but a lot of it
is aerospace -- well, aerospace military. It's -- that's
kind of more the -- it's not industrial at all. But it's
very rural. And then it has that other use to it.

So they're -- well, geographically you might think
oh, they're the same. They're not. And I didn't -- I
agree with you, I was thinking oh, San Bernadino and
Inyo, it looks -- works perfectly. But then I realized,
like what the people from Ridgecrest were saying, they're
-- it's that whole sort of aerospace triangle. And then
they sort of -- they are in the mountain area. They're
not in -- they don't consider themselves really in the
central valley at all. But they're more the mountainous
where -- and they're talking all about colleges and
education. Where the Inyo, Mono, Alpine, Mariposa,
they're all talking about fire districts and how much of
their land is actually owned by national forests. So
they have very little control over it. And they really
need to have a district -- a person in their area who
understands that issue of taking care of nature without
getting the funding from nature, and using
recreationally. So it's really about issues which I
think we need to consider.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: When I was -- thank you for saying that, for bringing that up.

MS. WILSON: If I may ask? You know, if we take Fresno out, and we have Tulare and Kern, and due to VRA not much of Bakersfield, where do you get that population because -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, I don't -- I guess -- yeah.

MS. WILSON: General direction. Do I go north or do we go to -- San Bernadino or Inyo and Mono seem like my options.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think I had asked if it's feasible to go up to, like, that portion of Madera and Mariposa.

CHAIR TURNER: Madera and Mariposa?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, Mariposa has 17,000 and all of, is it Versed -- no, Versed's pretty big. But (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- 151 -- 151 is all of Madera. And 17 is Mariposa.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: How about the city of Clovis?

CHAIR TURNER: Clovis is with, I think, north
Fresno.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It's more in Clovis than in the county. It's a couple hundred thousand right there.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

You know, when I reflect back on earlier this morning when Mr. Becker, our VRA attorney, showed us the map of the central valley, one thing that stuck in my mind was that Inyo County was actually in that. Inyo County was solid red meaning it met all Gingles, meaning we have some flexibility to ensure that we maximize the need -- for me, what I took in that as my interpret -- that -- I mean, I just -- I guess I'm a little bit -- I'm just wondering to myself at this point whether, you know, I want to make sure we're maximizing and optimizing the opportunities for people of color in the central valley to be able to elect people of their choosing. And we do -- VRA is the second criteria. And so above that communities interest. And I understand the strong community of interest that came out of the Inyo area, but if we -- if their -- if that's keeping us from being able to create opportunities for communities that are covered under VRA in this area, then we really need to take a look at that a little bit closer and make sure that we are ensuring that all communities that are under VRA and
meet those action two requirements have an opportunity to
elect the people of their choice. And so I just want to
make sure that -- I just wanted to bring that to
attention because that just -- that picture of Inyo
County in my mind is still quite -- you know, it was the
first time we saw the maps with the VRA district with all
of the analysis.

And so it's -- I'm still thinking through it. I
know the line drawers probably are thinking through it as
well. And so I just wanted to bring that back to the
group so that we can reflect on it and make sure that
we're maximizing opportunities for all people to elect a
people of their choosing.

MR. WOOCHER: I just want to point out that those
maps were based on the existing assembly districts, which
in certain cases -- I think even Mr. Becker mentioned --
that take from the central valley and went east into Inyo
County. So it's not necessarily that Inyo County itself
would qualify for VRA protection, but that it was an
east-west district that may have gone into that. So
we'll look into that for sure.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I understand that. I --

THE REPORTER: This is the court reporter, pardon
me, who was just speaking?

MR. WOOCHER: Fred Woocher.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I understand that. And my point was more of this is an area of where VRA is so prominent that really we need to make sure that we're maximizing and optimizing the opportunities for -- in this area. And if this area to the east is -- or south is causing restrictions, then maybe we should rethink some of those things.

CHAIR TURNER: Point well taken. Thank you.

Let's see. What time is it? 7:31 -- just thought I'd say that out loud.

Commissioner Akutagawa followed by Commissioner Andersen and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Commissioner Toledo, I hear what you're saying. I believe the map that you're referring to, the maps that David Becker showed us this morning, I believe the one that included Inyo was the one for the senate districts, not for the ones that intersected all of them. That was more narrowly up in the central valley. But the senate district was the one that had a much more expansive VRA district, and that included Inyo County.

Or is it assembly -- no. It was senate. He said it was senate. Okay. Okay.

Anyways, I also wanted to just remind people. We did also -- did get COI testimony about the difference
between the valley floor portion of Madera and Mariposa and the portion that are in the mountains as well too. And I suspect that for Madera, their population numbers are pretty significant. I believe or I suspect that the valley floor portion of Madera is the one the probably holds the majority of that population, less so into the mountains. And so I think that was also potentially why the split was done for Madera and Mariposa as well too, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Fred Woocher actually made my point. So I'm going to take my hand down. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just to kind of bring it up a little bit, Inyo and Mono County together make up less than 7 percent of an assembly district. Fresno, on the other hand, is a half-million people in that district. So if we split -- and the surrounding areas are very, very sparsely populated -- so if we split that district, you know, the population has to come from somewhere. I just want to echo Commissioner Toledo's comment that VRA is our number two. And communities of interest are number four. And so if we have to start breaking up
communities of interest to ensure we're giving folks an
opportunity, then --

CHAIR TURNER: So be it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- we got to do it.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay.

Kennedy, talk to us. What else do we need to
clarify or respond because --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: We could, perhaps, think
about it overnight and then ask you tomorrow whether we
need some additional clarifications. I would like to
flag for you that we didn't talk about anything below the
Golden Gate Bridge. So perhaps you're all incredibly
happy with those visualizations as they are. And it --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Just keep moving, Karin, just
don't bring it up.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- and in that case, you
know, Tamina can pack up. But I think if we're, for the
moment, perhaps we can pause that area. And if you'd
like to re-hop over west and talk about that a little
bit. Yeah, hop back over to Tamina and then maybe talk
about something San Francisco related? How does that
sound?

CHAIR TURNER: We're looking. We're going back.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Fantastic. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SANDHWANI: I'm sorry. Are we going to
San Francisco or are we going to the coastal regions?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I thought we talked about
the coastal region quite a bit. Would you like to talk
more about --

COMMISSIONER SANDHWANI: No. No.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: -- the northern coastal
region?

COMMISSIONER SANDHWANI: I wasn't sure what you were
suggesting.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh. Thank you for that
answer. And just if --

CHAIR TURNER: I do have something. On the map that
was VAD Alameda actually, I noticed that Dublin was not
included in those areas. I think it was Dublin,
Livermore, Pleasanton that we're trying to keep together.
And one of the visualizations removed Dublin from those
other areas. And I wanted to just kind of inquire about
that.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. Dublin is removed here for
population to not go across these bridges here. Dublin
is with Pleasanton and Livermore on the other two maps.

CHAIR TURNER: Why did I write something about Union
City? Oh, yes, so you split Union City. And there's a
population of 70,000. Thank you. Yes.

So, Tamina, is there a way we can keep Union City
whole?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. You can split Fremont which
it whole. You can split Castro Valley. Yes, you'd have
to split something else.

CHAIR TURNER: Fremont is what? So I'd rather split
Fremont of 230,000 people as opposed to the 70,000 people
of Union City.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Just to point out the COIs in this
area as well, this was a lot of Asian COIs in this area
that -- this area has a higher Asian CVAP, and so that's
why this was drawn this way. But happy to explore taking
out some of Fremont.

CHAIR TURNER: Another just point I'll make. On
page 23, I think Saratoga was also not included when --
and COI I think testimony wanted them included with Los
Gatos and Cumbria Park.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yeah. I can move those out --
move Saratoga out. And you would like to move in -- we
can take parts of Palo Alto or if Saratoga's with this
area, then parts of San Jose -- downtown San Jose over
here, and --

CHAIR TURNER: Perhaps that. Perhaps downtown San
Jose.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- then move this line.

CHAIR TURNER: Perhaps. Yeah, I'm thinking downtown
San Jose. And --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: -- I just wanted to inquire, this is a question, Tamina, on page 26 -- and maybe even of the commissioners that know the bay a little bit more, I'm wondering about the COI testimony as it relates to Bayview. I notice there's a carveout of Bayview and they are included with areas that I'm just wondering if there is likeness for Bayview with this -- I can't even see it -- Excelsior and Brisbane?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This is actually the conversation that we had last time.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: And we actually had -- sorry turned on the -- we actually had Bayview with the eastern side before. And the Commission requested that it be moved west.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. I see hands that's going to comment on that as well.

Commissioner Yee, Sinay, Fornaciari, Andersen.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I was going to hop over to Oakland. So maybe if anyone has Bayview comments --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- first?

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. The Bayview, we got -- we just received more COI testimony using the visualization comments saying that Bayview, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley should stay together. Obviously they would rather be with the city of San Francisco versus with Brisbane, you know, with San Mateo. And that's just a tough one to figure out. But one of the thoughts I had was Seacliff and Presidio Heights would probably fit in better with that east district in San Francisco. And I don't know if that gives enough -- I don't know what I was thinking about that. But it just felt like Seacliff and Presidio Heights worked better with that east. But I can't remember what I wanted to move in. So I apologize.

Oh. I know what I was -- I was trying to figure out south San Francisco -- how to fit south San Fran -- but, no, that wouldn't work. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. But yes, those three -- to answer your question was yes, those three have come together in COI testimonies.

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful.

Going back up to Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Hi.

CHAIR TURNER: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SANDHWANI: Did anyone else before me have Bayview? Do you want to go Commissioner --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I am starting before you. Yeah. On the Bayview, you could go -- and Potrero Hill and Bayview are becoming very, very, you know -- third avenue is starting to become quite the highway and the cultural area of connecting those two.

I do agree go Presidio, Seacliff/Presidio Heights, Seacliff/Presidio -- Presidio Heights. But you also have to -- you can't cut part of Castro out. I mean, that's just -- I'm not sure a little piece of Castro was cut out, you know, right there between the Inner Sunset, that section right there, I'm not sure how that got cut out.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: That's Haight-Ashbury, that's actually not a section of the Castro.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Haight and Castro is the same. Haight-Ashbury was -- that part it is. Yeah. Right there?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. So you'd like the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood with the Castro neighborhood?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: With that section, yes, because that's on the other -- this side of the -- it's on the southside of the crest of the hill there. And then you'd need a little bit more -- I'm sorry. So we were trying to put -- keeping Bernal Heights that's already -- yeah, if we switched it around a little bit like that, would that help if you went -- added Bernal
Heights and Presidio with Bayview and then essentially shifted the yellow section a little bit to the north and brought Potrero Hill and Bernal Heights into the Bayview, would that help keep it out of the -- it would give it a little bit more of San Francisco. Would that help at all?

CHAIR TURNER: We'll check it out and see.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We'll check it out and see.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Crossing the bridge, over to the -- no, I'm sorry. Commissioner Sadhwani had a Bayview thought.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm sorry, I had a Bayview comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay again.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I just wanted to uplift testimony that we received from the LGBTQ community who I think area had been a key area of concern for them for their communities of interest. In their testimony they had talked also about -- hang on, let me pull that back up -- Twin Peaks and west of Twin Peaks which you can see is not included here. I don't have population totals for these areas. So I would be curious to see what happens if you pull in west of Twin Peaks.

The green piece -- the green side of this
visualization was also an area identified by Asian American communities of interest and the AMEMSA community. And in particular, there was an interest to have it linked from Daly City down in the south all the way up and linking across, almost like a hook, up to Chinatown. I have no idea if, from a population standpoint, if something like that is even feasible or possible. But that was just some of the testimony that we received.

And so from that perspective, interestingly in both of that COI testimony, Bayview was mentioned. And so I am not personally familiar with Bayview. But I'm curious about what it would look like to split Bayview between those two districts. I don't know if there are, you know, census blocks or neighborhoods that are more heavily Asian or communities that more aligned with the LGBTQ community. I'm not sure, you know, what that area looks like. But I was curious to think about some various options there, especially given the strong testimony from both of those communities.

CHAIR TURNER: Bayview, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Bayview, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley, but specifically Bayview were traditionally black communities where there's been a lot of -- where there's been a lot of gentrification. So we
just need -- that's why they've asked to be kind of kept together even though it's a very small community. The black community in San Francisco was pushed out back in the early in the '80s or '90s. They redid all the affordable housing in that area at the same time and never really rebuilt it. And that was the -- kind of the enclave that was kept. And so a lot of the cultural aspects are there. So it's just looking to see what is still -- you know, how to keep all those communities of interest kind of together.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Anyone else for Bayview?

CHAIR TURNER: Going once.

COMMISSIONER YEE: If not, we go across the bridge to Oakland. And so looking at pages 21 and also 32, so Oakland and Eastbay. I'm particularly interested in the boundary between those two as it comes down -- in full disclosure -- right through my neighborhood, so right below Piedmont there. It's -- so I'll be curious just to hear the thinking behind how that was drawn, the line that goes right from 580 to meet up with the Dublin district.

It's a tough -- it's tough to figure out where to draw that line for sure because it's not a natural place.
There's several streets that go up from 580 up the hill there, but none that is an obvious divide that would be the clear one to choose. But 580 is much more of a divide than any of those streets. So I would -- you know, if it were me, I would draw that line farther down 580 than go up somewhere farther south than it is. And I think that would actually balance the two districts, since the more southerly one is quite a bit more overpopulated than the northerly one. That would probably balance it a little bit.

So going down south on 580, maybe to Keller, maybe to Golf Links, go up from there, is probably what I would do. Even that is still a little artificial, but I think it's better than what's there which goes right through some intact neighborhoods. You know, almost through my front yard actually, so.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: We were just checking to make sure you were paying attention, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, it's odd because if you look at, you know, I -- we don't routinely look at the ten years ago districts I did for this one. And it's actually on a similarly odd line. It's very intricate. And I can't understand why it was drawn that way. But that's my suggestion.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
Commissioner Fonaciari, Andersen, Sinay?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see, the VAD Alameda on page 20, I'm just going to say, I am not a fan. I don't have any direction though, because I can't think of a way to fix it, but I really don't like going over that hill. So just a comment.

But kind of more sort of general, on page 27, I know we initially gave direction to try to keep east of the Skyline -- or west of the Skyline Boulevard, if you will, down to Santa Cruz. But it just -- and I'm very curious to hear what my colleagues say -- it seems to me it'd make more sense if we just went down the peninsula on both sides of the hill to make districts and continue down because again, we've got Pacifica and those cities, Half Moon Bay with Santa Cruz County with Palo Alto -- East Palo Alto, Stanford, Woodside. I mean, it just doesn't make sense to me to draw the districts this way whereas the cities on the bay or near the bay have much more in common with each other.

And again, the -- Santa Cruz County would go kind of -- if it had to go, it would go to the east to get population.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Commissioner, would you like to go back to the visualization we had last week that had that part intact?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I don't remember what it looked like. So -- the -- I -- but I want to hear what my colleagues have to say about that. That's just me. I -- you know, we all have to kind of feel it together.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Colleagues, comments on -- Commissioner Ahmad, also Sinay and Ahmad wants to -- Commissioner Sinay, can we let Commissioner Akutagawa go? Okay.

Yes, ma'am?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair. Just while Commissioner Fornaciari raised this question, I do have thoughts on it. While staring at it, I think where I keep getting stuck is the numbers. Right now both of those VAD PALORED sits for 76,000. And SMATEO sits at 475. So they're roughly the size of an assembly district, which to me means it's like a puzzle piece and populations can be shifted around to keep roughly that same size.

I do agree that it's kind of weird, Palo Alto, Stanford being looped in with Aptos, Santa Cruz area. That does seem a little distant. So I'm wondering what we can do to shift around the populations within VAD PALORED and SMATEO to kind of put the northern part of that general area together in one district and the southern part in a different. I don't know if that's all
aligned with what your thoughts were, Commissioner Fornaciari, but those are my thoughts on that area.

CHAIR TURNER: And I feel if I don't call on Commissioner Andersen, I don't know what's going to happen with her hand.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This same area. I actually saw that the negative three and the negative three. But then it -- the -- Los Gatos, a little further down, well, actually if you go back a little further, that one's a positive. And I would -- excuse me -- like to put the Palo Alto RED actually going a little bit further south, as Commissioner Fornaciari said, along the coast getting Palo Alto that sort of area -- exactly -- getting a couple of those in, so its population comes up because, no, the -- they don't have a lot in common with -- even though I might've said something about this, with the coast, where further down to Los Gatos that's part -- starts to go part of the 17 up and over. And I think that area would make sense to add some of that to the San Mat -- SMATEO which is essentially down to Santa Cruz.

So I think we could make -- you know, take a bit of Menlo Park, North Fair Oaks --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: So you would -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Just want to let you know that none of these cities could fit in here by themselves. So which one would you like to split to put in?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: None of them? They're all too big?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: They're all too big or else they'd be in there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Even from negative 3 -- negative 6 -- negative 3.64?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, that's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Huh. Woodside, really?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I mean, maybe North Fair Oaks. And then -- but then this would be underpopulated. And I'd have to split the city down where else.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And then -- and we'd be getting people from elsewhere. So maybe North Fair Oaks. I mean, I'd like to see -- I mean, it could go from negative 3 to like, you know it was positive 2. That's a 5 percent swing. You know, I'd like to see if we could do something there.

And -- because the LEXSUNNY, they actually wanted to move a little further over to Palo Alto. And so that -- if we come down, then we might be able to grab -- to put back into San Mateo. Maybe -- I don't know about Saratoga, but, you know, Los Gatos, it's already with
Lexington Hills. Try -- basically I'm trying to get down to 17. So those have areas a little bit more comparable with Santa Cruz Count. If we could take a little -- like basically a little bit from one, little bit from another, to shift it around so the populations work out to have things that -- areas a little bit more in common. That's where I'm trying to go.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners, I just want to let you know that our internal queue is closed. We don't have time for any more of you to raise your hands with the amount of time that we have left. We have about ten minutes for if you and Kennedy, I'm sure, may want to ask some questions as well.

So if those that have your hands up will prepare your comments. And then we are going to be close to recess for the evening so that you can take notes accordingly so that you'll know where we left off when we start tomorrow morning again.

Commissioner Andersen, were you wanting to wrap up the rest of your comment?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually I wanted to go -- I was -- originally about the East Bay where I agree with Commissioner Yee. And I would like to actually see, rather than -- Oakland actually needs to go a little further east, quite frankly, because you know you still
have parts of Oakland with Moraga and Orinda which

generally doesn't work.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Oakland is this area here. It is

in the pink district and in the blue district only.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Okay. Well, I mean,

if you get -- if you -- because I was looking at the

boundaries and Joaquin Miller is still in Oakland. You

see where 13 -- you have 13, that little number -- keep

on going up.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. That road is still

parts of Oakland. No --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- not 13, then going east.

It was going east.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Going east?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And go -- no. Not

that -- that area right through there. That's the -- not

the separate, close in --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This is in a different county.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Further west.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. This is the county line?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Mills College? You see

where it's here -- Mills College is?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Redwood Central --
regional -- National Park.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Right down here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. That's Oakland.
That's still -- that's the Oakland area. Technically
it's not but, that's all considered parts of Oakland,
that area.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All the way to Anthony to --
so basically what I'm trying to say is go a little bit
further north, south and cut them --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This is the city --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- instead of that -- I
agree with Commissioner Foranciari about that -- the
large Alameda County one, that's -- it just doesn't make
a whole lot of sense. And I think we could rearrange a
bit. So thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Can I just --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Just wanted to say that I just
double checked, and this does follow the city of Oakland
foundry. And I will take a look at it again later.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, she said not technically. Just
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible) the park districts.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. Going back to the Oakland conversation, that's when I raised my hand the first time. You know, as much as we can keep Oakland together and Oakland with Emeryville, which I know it is in other ones, it's good. We did receive a comment today on -- let me find where I wrote it -- on -- of -- they also agreed that the way we split Oakland was kind of strange. And they said use the Hayward Flat to divide Oakland. So I don't know if that's helpful at all? I don't know what the Hayward Flat is. But I was just reading the visualization comments.

And then regarding what Commissioner Fornaciari said, I do -- you know, the -- I do agree with you that that was an original idea of hey, let's see if the coast fits. And that came from someone else from a COI and we were playing with it. I would like to explore San Mateo County with San Mateo kind of in the Santa Clara County with Santa Clara -- always keeping in mind the Asian COI that we had in the north part of San Mateo and San Francisco, but see if we could do something a little bit better in that area. There are -- you know, at Half Moon
Bay there is one freeway that goes all the way across. There are different entryways that go across the ridge and just to look at those.

Thank you so much for all the hard work.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Similarly for the Oakland visualization, if possible to include Emeryville. We've had a bunch of testimony about Emeryville being kept with Oakland.

Moving downward to Fremont. I know we had started there quite some time ago. And I think the question was do we split it or not. And it was just looking back at testimony from a refugee community of Afghani Americans who have strong social service needs in that area asking if Fremont is split, to keep Centerville -- which I'm not entirely sure where Centerville is, but I believe that's a neighborhood of Fremont -- so keeping Centerville whole, if we're going to split Fremont.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you for that, lifting that.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I -- just on the large Alameda -- from Hayward to the Livermore area, that just seems like a -- that's a pretty large district. And I don't see the community of interest there yet. And I'm
not sure what to do either. But I -- it just doesn't -- it just seems a little strange to me, connecting those couple -- those areas as well as the Palo Alto -- east Palo Alto to the coast. So just wanted to -- those are the two that I -- and then I think we can refine a little bit more.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I was going to go a little bit south, but I -- we probably ought not start that tonight. So we can get into that tomorrow.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, I don't know. You have two or three minutes. Can you get it done? No.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's a challenge.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. If you can go south to the green one, the San Benito. Well, okay. Just show the northern tip of that. So -- no. Sorry. Show the whole thing because based on the visualization we saw today, this whole area down here, this -- I'm pointing at it. That doesn't help.

So I'm not going to get it done in two minutes. Was it Soledad, Greenfield, King City, that part of the Salinas Valley, I think that's an important part to add to this district. And so what I would propose is like a
rotational thing. You got Morgan Hill in the tip here.
If you could rotate it to the blue and then rotate some
of the blue to the -- around or -- because I know this
is -- is this Watsonville right here? This little tip
thing --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that goes into Santa
Cruz. What is that?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This is -- we did experiment with
these areas here.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Including this area and taking out
some of these, will drop the Latino CVAP.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. It will? No, I know.
But --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Believe it or not, it -- yes.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- it will drop the CVAP?
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.
MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Unfortunately.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Then -- all right.

Thank you. Appreciate all your hard work.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, with that, Commissioners, we
are at the end of our day today. I'd like to thank you
all for your hard work, for staying in it, putting up
with this Chair that you currently have. I'd like to
thank our line drawers and our counsel. We will come
back tomorrow and review what we've heard today. I'd
like to thank those that have listened -- dialed in to
listen. We will be taking public comment at the end of
our session. But please do continue to -- oh, and I also
want to let you all know if we're not getting it right,
it's okay to just call and kindly let us know that you'd
still like to see something different. We are not
refusing to hear you. We're just trying to hear a lot of
you. And so from that perspective, keep writing in, keep
sending it. We'll keep talking about it and reading it
until we do the best we can to make as many of you as
possible happy with our maps that we ultimately will
draw.

Okay. Well, thank you all so much. And remember
we'll be back tomorrow morning at 11 a.m. Thank you.

(Recessed at 8:04 p.m.)
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