



**MALDEF
California
Statewide
Redistricting
Plans**

**State Assembly,
State Senate, and
U.S. House of
Representatives**

*Mexican American Legal Defense and
Educational Fund*

*Submitted to the California Citizens
Redistricting Commission
Los Angeles, California
May 26 2011*



MALDEF
The Latino Legal Voice for Civil Rights in America.

Table of Contents

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives
Submitted to the California Citizen's Redistricting Commission
May 26, 2011

Subject	Page
Executive Summary	2
About MALDEF and MALDEF's Redistricting Program	4
Community Education and Outreach Description	6
Statement of Use of Redistricting Criteria	10
Statement of Voting Rights Act Compliance - Section 2 and Section 5 District Narratives	12
Community of Interests Identified - Remaining District Narratives	26

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Maps of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly
- Appendix 2: Maps of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Senate,
- Appendix 3: Maps of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for U.S. House of Representatives
- Appendix 4: Demographic Statistics of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly
- Appendix 5: Demographic Statistics of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Senate,
- Appendix 6: Demographic Statistics of MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for U.S. House of Representatives

Executive Summary

The statewide redistricting process that occurs after the decennial Census is an opportunity to examine questions of fair representation, inclusiveness, and political empowerment. Redistricting is an essential element of our democracy, a value that MALDEF works to promote. This will be MALDEF's 5th redistricting cycle.

California has a new opportunity to empower its residents given the element of the new California Citizens Redistricting Commission, as approved by Proposition 11 in November 2008 and Proposition 20 in 2010.

MALDEF submits three statewide redistricting plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives (or Congressional) for consideration by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. These configurations work to satisfy the following criteria, in order of priority, compliance with the United States Constitution, the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the California Constitution, and focus on keeping communities of interest together to the greatest extent practicable.

MALDEF's community of interest choices were informed by three sources: MALDEF's community outreach and education efforts, collaboration with other civil rights and civic engagement groups, and public testimony submitted to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission (CCRC).

The attached plans are submitted as reasonable, fair, equitable, and legally defensible picture of electoral districts that fully comply with redistricting criteria mandated by Federal and State law. This assessment is based on MALDEF's over 40 years of redistricting experience, knowledge of the law, and information from the community. These redistricting plans comply with the following redistricting criteria as required by state and federal law:

- These redistricting plans contain the following deviations:
 - The Assembly redistricting plan contains a total overall deviation of 3.99% and an average deviation of 1.04%, in compliance with the equal population requirement of the United States Constitution.
 - The Senate redistricting plan contains a total overall deviation of 5.77% and an average deviation of 0.99%, in compliance with the equal population requirement of the United States Constitution.
 - The Congressional redistricting plan contains a total overall deviation of 1 person and an average deviation of 0.00%, in compliance with the equal population requirement of the United States Constitution.
- These plans fully comply with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act, as they do not dilute minority voting strength.

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 2

- These plans fully comply with Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act, as they do not retrogress the voting strength of minorities in California's four covered jurisdictions of Kings, Merced, Monterey and Yuba Counties.
- These plans do not elevate race above other traditional redistricting criteria.
- These plans create districts that are contiguous.
- These plans respect political subdivisions by avoiding, to the extent practicable the splitting of counties and cities except to comply with the rules of equal population and the Voting Rights Act.
- These plans respect communities of interest, based on information gathered by MALDEF community outreach and education meetings, collaborations with other civil rights and civic engagement groups, and testimony heard at CCRC public input meetings.¹
- These plans, in relation to each other, use many of the same principles to create districts and therefore feature many similar shapes that nest in many places where higher ranked California redistricting criteria do not take precedent. The Assembly and Senate plans fully nest in most areas.

¹ The partnerships with these organizations is limited to educational and outreach efforts and in no way indicates endorsement of the MALDEF redistricting proposals
MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives
May 26, 2011
Page 3

About MALDEF and Overview of Redistricting Program

Mission Statement

Founded in 1968, MALDEF is the nation's leading Latino legal civil rights organization. Often described as the "law firm of the Latino community", MALDEF promotes social change through advocacy, communications, community education, and litigation in the areas of education, employment, immigrant rights, and political access.

About MALDEF and Past Redistricting Work

In 1968, out of a national and multi-racial civil rights movement, Latino community leaders created an organization to protect the constitutional rights of the Latino community. With the support of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, they founded the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF). MALDEF quickly gained recognition as the "law firm of the Latino community". Throughout our 43-year history, MALDEF has promoted social change through advocacy, communications, community education, and litigation in the areas of education, employment, immigrant rights, and political access.

MALDEF's expertise in advancing Latino redistricting equity is singular. In MALDEF's first redistricting decade, following the 1970 Census, MALDEF secured an historic ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court in *White v. Regester*, striking down a discriminatory multi-member districting plan for the Texas House of Representatives and leading to the creation of the first Latino-majority Texas House districts in Bexar County. Following the 1980 Census, MALDEF expanded its redistricting work beyond achieving greater political opportunity for Latinos in Texas; in *Valle v. State Board of Elections of the State of Illinois* and in *Velasco v. Byrne*, MALDEF successfully challenged the Chicago ward redistricting and the Illinois legislative redistricting plans. MALDEF's litigation led to the creation of the first Latino majority wards and state legislative districts in Illinois. Similarly, in 1989, in *Garza v. County of Los Angeles*, MALDEF successfully challenged Los Angeles County's supervisorial districts as intentionally discriminatory against Latinos and secured the first Latino-majority supervisor district in Los Angeles County. The U.S. Attorney General praised this litigation as "a victory against discrimination in the most important role citizens play in our democracy: the right to vote in free and fair elections in districts drawn without bias".

Following the 2000 Census, MALDEF brought highly-publicized litigation, *Cano v. Davis*, arguing Latino vote dilution in redistricting of congressional districts in California's San Fernando Valley and San Diego city. This was the only federal litigation challenging California's last redistricting exercise. Although the three-judge district court denied relief, impeding a re-drawing of the congressional district lines for

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 4

that decade, MALDEF's educational outreach efforts and litigation deterred and will continue to deter similar attempts at Latino vote dilution in Los Angeles County and in redistricting elsewhere. In 2006, MALDEF secured its latest redistricting victory in the U.S. Supreme Court in *LULAC v. Perry*. In MALDEF's Latino vote-dilution challenge to the 2003 Texas congressional redistricting plan, the Supreme Court ruled for the first time that the rights of Latino voters under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 had been violated. The New York Times hailed MALDEF's litigation the most important voting rights case of the decade. (June 28, 2006).

MALDEF operates regional and program offices in Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C., with headquarters in Los Angeles. Since August 2009, MALDEF has been led by President and General Counsel Thomas Saenz.

More information on MALDEF is available at www.maldef.org.

MALDEF's 2011 Redistricting Efforts

In 2011, MALDEF is conducting its largest redistricting effort in its over 40 year history. MALDEF is currently conducting redistricting efforts at either the statewide or local level in 12 states: California, Arizona, Nevada, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Virginia, Georgia, and Florida. This national program is headed by MALDEF's Vice President of Litigation Nina Perales. MALDEF's California efforts were executed by National Redistricting Coordinator Steven Ochoa, and aided by Western Redistricting GIS Assistant Jorge Gonzalez and National Redistricting Program Assistant Elsa Carrillo.

MALDEF's California Redistricting program consists of two primary phases. The first phase is the community education and outreach conducted from February through April, and the second is advocacy efforts as presented through these redistricting plan proposals, which were informed by the outreach experience and are submitted today for consideration to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Community Education and Outreach Description

From February through April 2011, MALDEF conducted 14 community education and outreach sessions throughout California, reaching nearly 200 participants. The objectives of MALDEF's redistricting workshops were to provide civic education and encourage Californians to participate in the redistricting process. Workshops were held in areas with large Latino communities. Workshops started in San Diego, continued north to the Inland Empire, Los Angeles County, the Central Valley, and the Central Coast in Watsonville.

MALDEF partnered with nonprofit organizations that were also working in areas with large Latino communities and providing education on the redistricting process. The National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund was a key partner and co-hosted 13 of the 14 workshops done by MALDEF. Other partners included the Coastal Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE) in the Tri County area and the Whittier Coalition in Whittier.²

The workshop curriculum included redistricting and fundamentals, such as equal population, the importance of the Voting Rights Act (VRA), and communities of interest. Workshop attendees also learned about California's new process, including the redistricting criteria and timeline of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. At the conclusion of each presentation, participants were also given the opportunity to get into groups and discuss with other members of their community their communities of interest and define their respective boundaries.

MALDEF provided the groups with community map exercises to assist them in identifying their communities of interest. The exercises facilitated identification of different demographic statistics for their communities of interest, such as average income, educational achievement, language most commonly spoken in the community, and age demographics. It also allowed for extensive discussion of community history, and shared community experiences including hardships. By the end of the exercise, each group had identified a community of interest, established its boundaries, gathered demographic statistics for their respective community of interests, and established important community networks. The exercise and training provided community members a rough outline of their community of interest testimonies. Community members were encouraged to continue developing their testimonies and to provide their comments and input to the Redistricting Commission through the public hearing process or through written testimony.

² The partnerships with these organizations is limited to educational and outreach efforts and in no way indicates endorsement of the MALDEF redistricting proposals by NALEO Educational Fund, CAUSE, Whittier Coalition, or CHIRLA.

MALDEF and its key partner, NALEO Educational Fund, followed up with participants after the workshops. MALDEF compiled the various communities of interests from the maps and worksheets that participants marked up over the 14 workshops conducted February through April. NALEO Educational Fund, as part of its program did more personal follow up with participants, encouraging individuals to attend public hearings and provide testimony to the Commission and continued gathering more community of interest information. NALEO Educational Fund provided MALDEF with greater details on the community of interests that individuals were submitting to the Redistricting Commission and helped inform MALDEF's map drawing efforts.

In addition to providing education about redistricting, MALDEF and the NALEO Educational Fund provided additional support to workshop attendees as community members prepared to participate in the California's redistricting process. MALDEF and NALEO Educational Fund provided assistance on testimony structure, information on where to find the UC Berkeley resource centers, demographic data of their community of interest, and information on the California Citizens Redistricting Commission (CCRC) public input hearing calendar and meeting locations and how to submit testimony in writing.

Below is a complete list of MALDEF's co-sponsored community education and outreach workshops conducted for the 2011 California redistricting process, including list of sponsorship partners:

1. February 24, 2011 - San Diego
 - a. Region: San Diego County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Centro Cultural de la Raza, 2004 Park Blvd., San Diego, CA 92101
2. March 10, 2011 - Central L.A.
 - a. Region: Los Angeles County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: NALEO Headquarters, 1122 W. Washington Blvd., Third Floor, Los Angeles, California 90015
3. March 12, 2011 - San Bernardino
 - a. Region: Inland Empire
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Libreria del Pueblo, Inc., 972 N. Mt. Vernon Ave., San Bernardino, CA 92401
4. March 12, 2011 - Riverside
 - a. Region: Inland Empire
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 7

- c. Location: Nati Fuentes Centro de Niños, Community Room 2010, Martin Luther King Blvd., Riverside, CA 92507
- 5. March 26th, 2011 - Monterey, Santa Cruz & San Benito
 - a. Region: North Central Coast/ Tri-County
 - b. Partners: NALEO Educational Fund & CAUSE
 - c. Location: Civic Plaza Community Room, 4th Floor 275 Main St., Watsonville, CA
- 6. March 30, 2011 - Southeast Cities
 - a. Region: Los Angeles County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Instituto Mexicano De Arte Y Cultura y Club Guadalajara USA 11441 Atlantic Ave., Lynwood, CA 90262
- 7. April 2, 2011 - San Fernando Valley
 - a. Region: Los Angeles County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Lake View Terrace Branch Library, 12002 Osborne Street, Sylmar, CA 91342-7221
- 8. April 2, 2011 - San Gabriel
 - a. Region: Los Angeles County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: AZUSA SENIOR CENTER, 740 N. Dalton, Azusa, CA 91702
- 9. April 9, 2011 - Bakersfield
 - a. Region: Central Valley
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Kern County Superintendent of Schools CITY CENTRE, 1300 17th Street, Bakersfield, CA 93301-4533
- 10. April 9, 2011 - Fresno
 - a. Region: Central Valley
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Ted C. Wills Community Center, 770 N. San Pablo Ave., Fresno, CA 93728
- 11. April, 10 2011 - Modesto
 - a. Region: Central Valley
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: El Concilio, 1314 H St, Modesto CA 95354
- 12. April 14, 2011 - Whittier
 - a. Region: Los Angeles County

- b. Partner: Whittier Coalition
 - c. Location: Whittier Union High School District, 9401 S. Painter Ave.
Room B-221, Staff Development Room, Whittier, CA
13. April 19, 2011 – Los Angeles
- a. Region: Los Angeles County
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund and the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA)
 - c. Location: Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles 2533 W. Third Street, Suite 101 Los Angeles, CA 90057
14. April 30, 2011 – San Bernardino
- a. Region: Inland Empire
 - b. Partner: NALEO Educational Fund
 - c. Location: Norman Feldheym Central Library, 555 W. 6th Street, San Bernardino, CA 92401

Statement of Use of Redistricting Criteria

MALDEF ensured that each of the districts in the accompanying redistricting plan comply with the ranked redistricting criteria outlined by California Proposition 11 passed in November 2008 and California Proposition 20 passed in 2010.

- Compliance with the U.S. Constitution: One Person, One Vote
 - These plans are in compliance with the one-person, one vote rule in Article 1, Section 2 of the United States Constitution.
 - The Congressional districts presented contain an overall deviation range of 1 person, or 0% (-1 person to 0). The plan features an average deviation of 0%.
 - The Assembly districts presented contain an overall deviation range of 18,562 people, or 3.99% (+9,290 people to -9,272 people or (+1.99% to -1.99%). The plan features an average deviation of 1.04%.³ In this plan, deviations from the ideal district size are justifiable on the basis of non-discriminatory legitimate objectives.
 - The Senate districts presented contains an overall deviation range of 53,702 people, or 5.77% (+15,633 people to -38,069 people or +1.68% to -4.09%). The plan features an average deviation of 0.99%.⁴ In this plan, deviations from the ideal district size are justifiable on the basis of non-discriminatory legitimate objectives.
- Compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act
 - The MALDEF Plan contains several districts that contain legally protectable communities under Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. MALDEF evaluated evidence as to these districts satisfaction of the three prongs of *Thornburg v Gingles*, as well as other factors that help the courts in evaluating whether a plan illegally dilutes minority voting strength. Please see the Section "*Statement of Voting Rights Act Compliance*" for a detailed, per district description of Voting Rights Act compliance.
 - The MALDEF Plan maintains or increases the voting strength of protectable communities in the four Section 5 covered jurisdictions of California to avoid retrogression. The four covered jurisdictions are Kings County, Merced County, Monterey County, and Yuba County. Please see the Section "*Statement of Voting Rights Act Compliance*" for a detailed, per district description of Voting Rights Act compliance.
- Contiguity
 - The districts in this plan are contiguous.
- Preservation of Communities of Interest, Cities, and Counties

³ Average Deviation = Average of the Absolute Value of all deviations.

⁴ Average Deviation = Average of the Absolute Value of all deviations.

- The MALDEF plan respects communities of interest and incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data in determining whether residents of a district might be fairly and effectively represented. MALDEF conducted over a dozen workshops where local residents shared their unique knowledge about their community and their similarities and differences with neighboring communities. In addition, demographic and socioeconomic information reported by U.S. Census Bureau, including information on income, linguistic isolation, housing, educational attainment, unemployment, were also used as guides to reasonably group communities within the newly shaped districts.⁵ MALDEF also received community of interest information from other civil rights and civic engagement groups working around California, such as NALEO Educational Fund, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC), the African-American Redistricting Collaborative (AARC), and the Coastal Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE). Finally, MALDEF staff observed CCRC public input hearings listening to additional testimony about different areas of California.⁶
- This plan also respects political subdivision boundaries to the extent possible after compliance with one person, one vote or the Federal Voting Rights Act.
- Broadly, the MALDEF plan also strives to respect the integrity of California's basic geographic regions (coastal, mountain, desert, central valley, and intermediate valley regions), to the extent possible after compliance with one person, one vote or the Federal Voting Rights Act.
- MALDEF did not use partisanship, relationships to elected officials or relationships to candidates for public office to identify communities of interest. Nor did it use partisan data as a basis for redistricting and only reviewed such information to examine proposed districts for compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act.
- Compactness
 - The districts in these plans are as compact as higher ranked criteria allow. MALDEF also acknowledges that there is no standard measure of compactness.
- Nesting
 - Many areas within these three plans are based on the same information, as such; many districts in given regions follow similar patterns. Furthermore, the MALDEF Assembly plan was created first, and a nested configuration was created to use as Senate District benchmark and adjusted to comply with all the above ranked criteria, thus creating plans that are nested where possible.

⁵ U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 5-year Estimate Data (2005-2009)

⁶ The partnerships with these organizations is limited to educational and outreach efforts and in no way indicates endorsement of the MALDEF redistricting proposals by NALEO Educational Fund, APALC, AARC, or CAUSE.

Statement of Voting Rights Act Compliance

Section 2 and Section 5 District Narratives

After the rule of equal population, the first rule of redistricting is constructing districts to comply with both Section 2 and Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

The MALDEF State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. Congressional Redistricting Plans contain several districts that contain legally protectable communities under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The districts submitted by MALDEF which are protected as majority Latino districts under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act include:

<p>Assembly Districts (17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assembly District 31 (Central Valley) • Assembly District 34 (Central Valley) • Assembly District 39 (San Fernando Valley) • Assembly District 45 (Northwest Los Angeles) • Assembly District 46 (South Los Angeles) • Assembly District 50 (Southeast Los Angeles County) • Assembly District 53 (South Los Angeles) • Assembly District 55 (South Bay Los Angeles Co.) • Assembly District 56 (Whittier Region) • Assembly District 57 (Northeast San Gabriel Valley) • Assembly District 58 (Southwest San Gabriel Valley) • Assembly District 61 (Pomona/Ontario) • Assembly District 62 (Inland Empire) • Assembly District 64 (Inland Empire) • Assembly District 69 (Orange County) • Assembly District 79 (San Diego) • Assembly District 80 (Coachella/Imperial) 	<p>Senate Districts (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate District 4 (Monterey/Fresno) • Senate District 16 (Kings/Tulare/Bakersfield) • Senate District 22 (Northeast Los Angeles/West San Gabriel Valley) • Senate District 24 (East San Gabriel Valley/Pomona Valley) • Senate District 27 (Southeast/South Bay Los Angeles) • Senate District 28 (Central/South Los Angeles) • Senate District 30 (Whittier/South San Gabriel Valley) • Senate District 32 (San Bernardino/Riverside) • Senate District 40 (San Diego/Imperial/Coachella) <p>Congressional Districts (11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congressional District 20 (Central Valley) • Congressional District 21 (Central Valley) • Congressional District 28 (San Fernando Valley) • Congressional District 31 (Northeast Los Angeles) • Congressional District 34 (South Los Angeles) • Congressional District 36 (East San Gabriel Valley) • Congressional District 38 (Whittier/South San Gabriel Valley) • Congressional District 39 (Southeast/South Bay Los Angeles) • Congressional District 43 (San Bernardino/Riverside) • Congressional District 44(Pomona/San Bernardino) • Congressional District 51 (San Diego/Imperial)
--	---

The districts listed above provide Latinos with an equal opportunity to participate in the political process. These redistricting plans do not fragment or over-concentrate Latino communities into districts that dilute their vote. The Latino population within these districts is geographically compact and sufficiently large enough that Latinos have an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice. In keeping with the rules under the 9th Federal Court Circuit, all districts feature a standard of 50% or higher Latino Citizen Voting Age Population percentage as the definition of sufficiently large.⁷ Finally, MALDEF supplies votes cast for various statewide Latino candidates of choice to show the effectiveness of these Section 2 districts for the Latino community.

⁷ Note: Assembly District 49 is also a Section 2 Voting Rights Act district for the Asian Community which will also be described in this section.

The MALDEF State Assembly, State Senate, and, U.S. Congressional Redistricting Plans also comply with Section 5. The districts submitted by MALDEF which prevent protected minority voter retrogression under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act include:

<p>Assembly Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assembly District 3 (Yuba County) • Assembly District 17 (Merced County) • Assembly District 27 (Monterey County) • Assembly District 28 (Monterey County) • Assembly District 30 (Kings County) 	<p>Senate Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate District 1(Yuba County) • Senate District 4 (Monterey County) • Senate District 11 (Monterey County) • Senate District 12 (Merced County) • Senate District 16 (Kings County)
	<p>Congressional Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congressional District 4 (Yuba County) • Congressional District 18 (Merced County) • Congressional District 17 (Monterey County) • Congressional District 20 (Kings County) • Congressional District 21 (Kings County)

Section 5 and Section 2 District Narratives

The regions within the state where Section 2 districts can be created are The Central Valley, Los Angeles County, Inland Empire, and the San Diego/Imperial Boarder area. In addition, the Monterey County and Yuba County are Section 5 jurisdictions outside these regions.

Please note that from this point forward, if a district is mentioned to be at "Section 2 strength," that it refers to the district have over 50% Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (LCVAP).

Central Valley - Assembly

- MALDEF Assembly District 30
 - MALDEF AD 30 was created by removing the excess population from Fresno and Kern Counties. Keeping Kings with northern Tulare County and some of rural Fresno allows AD 30 to maintain its current voter participation levels near the benchmark figures. The benchmark district featured 46.8% Latino CVAP and 48.2% Latino Registration. The MALDEF plan features a 45.6% Latino CVAP and 44.2% Latino Registration. Even though there is a slight drop in percentages, the Latino community's ability to elect a candidate of choice remains at the same effective level.
 - Counties: Kings, Tulare (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Sanger, Parlier, Reedly, Dinuba, Orange Cove, Cutler, Orosi, Woodlake, Visalia (Split for VRA Compliance), Tulare (Split for VRA Compliance), Hanford, Corcoran
- MALDEF Assembly Districts 31 and 34
 - Another part of the reasoning in pairing Kings County with Tulare County, rather than Fresno City or Bakersfield, was that community members in both cities advocated for separation if possible. Pairing Kings with Tulare allows

Section 5 to be observed and affords the chance to create two Section 2 districts for Fresno City and Bakersfield Latinos.

- The excess population growth in the Central Valley allowed for an extra Section 2 district to be created. The Kern portion of the existing AD 30 paired with southwestern Tulare County allowed for a second effective Section 2 district to be added in the Central Valley, MALDEF AD 34.
 - Counties: Kern (Split for VRA Compliance), Tulare (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Porterville (Split for VRA Compliance), Pixley, Earlimart, Delano, Bakersfield (Split for VRA Compliance), Weedpatch, Arvin, Lamont
- To maintain the existing Section 2 district (AD 31), there was enough population generally in Western Fresno County west Fresno City. To keep the district at 50% LCVAP, it was necessary to go north into part of Madera City.
 - Counties: Fresno (Split for VRA Compliance), Madera (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Fresno (Split for VRA Compliance), Fowler, Selma, Kingsburg, Madera (Split for VRA Compliance),
- MALDEF Assembly District 17
 - Current AD 17 contains Section 5 jurisdiction Merced County. It also maintains bypasses the more immediate population pocket of Modesto for Stockton in San Joaquin County. MALDEF was able to better respect the community of interests and retain Section 5 standards by including parts of Modesto and Stanislaus County, rather than stretching to Stockton. The benchmark district contains a 35% LCVAP and 33.7% Latino Registration. The MALDEF AD 17 features a 34.9% LCVAP and 33.7% Latino Registration for no retrogression of Latino voter opportunity to elect candidates of choice.
 - Counties: Merced, Stanislaus (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: (Ceres), Dos Palos, Gustine, Los Banos, Livingston, Merced, (Modesto), Newman, Patterson, Turlock

Central Coast - Assembly

- MALDEF Assembly Districts 27 and 28
 - Current AD 27 and 28 contain Section 5 jurisdiction Monterey County. Monterey County is split at the Assembly level to protect the mostly Latino community inland compared to the non-Latino coastal community. The MALDEF AD 28 removes more non-Latino coastal communities with Monterey County, and the San Jose area, and adds the town of San Martin for population needs, which has a better relation to Gilroy than San Jose. The benchmark district AD 28 contains a 44.3% LCVAP and 44.9% Latino Registration. The MALDEF AD 28 features a 46.3% LCVAP and 46.9%

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 14

Latino Registration for a slight increase in Latino voter opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

- Counties: Monterey (Split for VRA Compliance), Santa Cruz (Split for VRA Compliance), and Santa Clara (Split for VRA Compliance)
- Cities/Communities of Interest: Gilroy, Gonzales, Greenfield, Hollister, King City, Salinas, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, Watsonville
- Conversely, AD 27 was left the same, gaining more coastal areas in Monterey County and losing San Martin.
 - Counties: Monterey (Split for VRA Compliance), Santa Cruz (Split for VRA Compliance), and Santa Clara (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Capitola, Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Morgan Hill, Pacific Grove, (San Jose), Sand City, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Seaside.

Central Valley and Central Coast - Senate

- MALDEF Senate District 16
 - A nearly whole nesting of MALDEF AD 34 and 30, with minor changes, maintains an existing Section 2 district, and avoids Section 5 retrogression for Kings County. The benchmark district for Kings contains a 50.9% LCAVP and 51.5% Latino Registration. The MALDEF SD 16 maintains Latino voting strength levels by creating a district at 50% LCVAP and 49% Latino Registration, allowing Latinos to continue electing candidates of choice.
 - Counties: Kings, Tulare (Split for VRA Compliance), Fresno (Split for VRA Compliance).
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Arvin, Avenal, (Bakersfield), Corcoran, Delano, Dinuba, (Farmersville), Hanford Kingsburg, Lemoore, Lindsay, McFarland, Orange Cove, Parlier, (Porterville), (Reedley) Sanger, (Shafter), (Tulare), (Visalia), (Wasco), Woodlake
 - MALDEF Senate District 4 and 12
 - The Central Valley and Central Coast present a unique Voting Rights Act compliance situation. First, Merced County and the Latino portion of Monterey County are currently placed in the same district together, creating benchmark figures of 37.6% LCVAP and 37.8% Latino Registration. . First, there is a pairing issue. From the MALDEF Assembly Plan, there are three Latino districts within the Central Valley, and with two nested, the third district (AD 31) in Fresno County is left without a regional partner for Section 2 strength within the Central Valley.
 - However, the non-regional pairing of MALDEF AD 28 and 30 *do* generate a Section 2 district for the Central Valley/Central Coast. MALDEF SD 4 is a new Section 2 mandated district that also avoids Section 5 retrogression for Latino voters in Monterey County. It features a 50% LCVAP and 48.5% Latino Registration, which are higher than current benchmark SD 12. Also note that this district was

given an even number district relocated from Northern California, to keep these Senate District voters participating in the same election cycles to which they are accustomed, and avoids potential voter displacement.

- Counties: Monterey (Split for VRA Compliance), San Benito, Fresno (Split for VRA Compliance), Santa Cruz (Split for VRA Compliance), Santa Clara (Split for VRA Compliance)
- Cities/Communities of Interest: Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fowler, Fresno, Gilroy, Gonzales, Greenfield, Hollister, Huron, Kerman, King City, Madera, Mendota, Salinas, San Joaquin, San Juan Bautista, Selma Soledad, Watsonville
- Monterey County is moved from one non-functioning Section 5 district to a function Section 2 district. Therefore there is no retrogression in Monterey County.
- For community of interest reasons, Merced County, now placed with Stockton and Modesto to create MALDEF SD 4. While this results in some decrease in LCVAP % and Latino Registration %, there is no change in the Latino community's ability to elect.
 - Counties: Merced, Stanislaus (Split for VRA Compliance), San Joaquin (Split for VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Merced, Modesto (Split for VRA Compliance), Turlock, Ceres, Stockton

Central Valley - Congress

- MALDEF Congressional Districts 20 and 21
 - MALDEF CDs 20 and 21, while complicated, are both Section 2 and Section 5 compliant districts. Current CD 20 is a Section 2 district, and like all other types of Central Valley Districts, over populated from ideal population, with benchmark figures of 50.1% LCVAP and 46.6% Latino Registration.
 - MALDEF CD 20 becomes a primarily Fresno County based district, separating it from the Bakersfield area. Compelled by the strict one person one vote standards for congressional districts and the need to satisfy the Section 2 and Section 5 Voting Rights Act mandates to keep the district at a specific Latino voter strength, several detailed cuts had to be implemented.
 - Counties: Fresno (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Kings (Split for VRA compliance), Tulare (Split for VRA compliance), Madera (Split for VRA compliance).
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Coalinga, Dinuba(Split for VRA compliance), Firebaugh, Fowler(Split for VRA compliance), Fresno, Hanford (Split for VRA compliance), Huron, Kerman, Kingsburg(Split for VRA compliance), Lemoore(Split for VRA compliance), Madera (Split for VRA compliance), Mendota, Orange Cove, Parlier(Split for VRA compliance), Reedley(Split for VRA compliance), San Joaquin, Sanger, Selma.

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 16

- MALDEF CD 21 becomes a primarily Bakersfield and Tulare County based district, separating the regions from the Fresno area. Compelled by the strict one person one vote standards for congressional districts and the need to satisfy the Section 2 and Section 5 Voting Rights Act mandates to keep the district at a specific Latino voter strength, several detailed cuts had to be implemented.
 - Counties: Kings (Split for VRA compliance), Tulare (Split for VRA compliance), Kern (Split for VRA compliance).
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Arvin, Avenal, Bakersfield (Split for VRA compliance), Corcoran, Delano, Exeter (Split for VRA compliance), Farmersville, Hanford (Split for VRA compliance), Lemoore, Lindsay, McFarland (Split for VRA compliance), Porterville (Split for VRA compliance), Shafter, Tulare (Split for VRA compliance), Visalia (Split for VRA compliance), Wasco (Split for VRA compliance), Woodlake
- Note on the Kings County split: MALDEF acknowledges that it split the Section 5 County of Kings. However, given that the minority residents were previously in a district with figures of figures of 50.1% LCVAP and 46.6% Latino Registration and that the residents would now reside in two districts of stronger or equal opportunity to elect candidates of choice, MALDEF feels no retrogression occurs.

Los Angeles County - Assembly

- MALDEF Assembly District 39
 - Current AD 39 is a protected Section 2 District contained in the East San Fernando Valley. It is also arguably a packed district. To also respect the growing Latino community which is trending west in the San Fernando Valley and to unpack the district, MALDEF AD 39 moves north to Sylmar, and west to include areas such as North Hills and Granada Hills, and uses southern boarders of the I-5 and 101 freeways, and rail lines.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), San Fernando; Neighborhoods of Sylmar, Arleta, North Hills, Pacoima, Panorama City
- MALDEF Assembly Districts 45, 46, and 53 (Central Los Angeles County)
 - MALDEF AD's 45, 46, and 53 (a new district, moved from the Los Angeles County Coast) were drawn in ways that try to respect nearby communities of interest while trying to unpack two existing Section 2 districts.
 - MALDEF AD 45 is anchored out of East Los Angeles, which is kept mostly whole in this configuration compared to the benchmark plan. It is made up of the community of interest neighborhoods of El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Highland Park, and Eagle Rock. Additional related neighborhoods of Silver Lake and Chinatown were also added for both relationships, one person one

vote compliance, and to also unpack the district to allow other Section 2 districts to be drawn. South Pasadena was also added to help unpack the district, and shares a modest relationship with the Eagle Rock/Highland Park area. Current AD 45 is also a Section 2 district in the benchmark plan.

- Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), South Pasadena, East Los Angeles (Split for VRA Compliance), Boyle Heights (Split for VRA Compliance), El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Highland Park, Silver Lake, and Chinatown.
- MALDEF AD 46 is anchored by most of the Southeast cities in Los Angeles County. It stretches north through most of Boyle Heights, Downtown Los Angeles, and follows the 101 Freeway to the Hollywood area. Current AD 46 is also a Section 2 district in the benchmark plan.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), Vernon, Maywood, Huntington Park, Bell, Cudahy, Boyle Heights (Split for VRA Compliance), Downtown Los Angeles, Hollywood
 - MALDEF AD 53 is a new Section 2 district mandated by the Voting Rights Act, based in South Los Angeles. It runs north-south with most of Florence-Graham to the south, bounded generally by the I-110 on the west and the borders of the Southeast cities/AD 46 on the east, goes through Pico Union, and ends with Koreatown in the North.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), Florence-Graham, South Los Angeles, Pico Union, Koreatown
- MALDEF Assembly Districts 50, 55, and 56 (Southeast Los Angeles County)
 - MALDEF Assembly Districts 50, 55 (a new Section 2 district, reconfigured from an existing South Bay District), and 56 generally flow from the Southeast cities toward southeast Los Angeles County. They were drawn in ways that try to respect communities of interest while trying to unpack two existing Section 2 districts.
 - MALDEF AD 55 is a new Section 2 district mandated by the Voting Rights Act, generally following the 110 Freeway from Lynnwood to the San Pedro-Wilmington area. Starting with Lynnwood in the north, the district takes care to go through Paramount (around Compton), North Long Beach, the Eastern part of Carson, and the San Pedro/Wilmington area. Watts and parts of western Long Beach are also included for one person one vote needs and VRA Compliance issues to unpack the district to allow others to be maintained.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), Watts, Lynnwood, Paramount, Long

- Beach (Split for VRA Compliance), Carson (Split for VRA Compliance), San Pedro, Wilmington.
 - MALDEF AD 50 is anchored in the north by South Gate, Bell Gardens, and Downey, going south for unpacking and existing Section 2 and community of interest purposes through Bellflower and stopping south in Lakewood. It picks up portions of Long Beach for one person, one vote considerations.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: South Gate, Bell Gardens, Downey (Split for one person, one vote and VRA purposes), Bellflower, Lakewood, and Long Beach (Split for one person one vote purposes)
 - MALDEF AD 56 is anchored in the Pico Rivera area, and features strong related communities of interest of Whittier, Los Nietos, South Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, and Norwalk. It reasonably includes Cerritos/Artesia to the south, and La Habra Heights for unpacking purposes, and the eastern portion of La Mirada for one person one vote necessities.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Pico Rivera, Whittier, South Whittier, Los Nietos, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Cerritos, Artesia, La Habra Heights, and La Mirada (split for one person one vote compliance).
- MALDEF Assembly Districts 49, 57, and 58 (San Gabriel Valley)
 - MALDEF AD 49 is not a Latino Section 2 district, but an Asian-American district based in the western San Gabriel Valley and listed here as it influences the shape of MALDEF AD 57 and 58. It unites a core of Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Temple City, along with San Marino, Arcadia, and Temple City. It modestly splits off an Asian portion of Montebello, and splits El Monte in a way that attempts to respect both the Asian Section 2 needs and the Latino Section 2 needs of MALDEF AD 57.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Temple City, San Marino, Arcadia, Temple City, Montebello (Split for VRA compliance), and El Monte (Split for VRA compliance)
 - MALDEF AD 57 is an existing Section 2 district based in the eastern San Gabriel Valley. It is anchored in Baldwin Park, Puente Valley, and West Covina, and includes reasonable neighboring cities of Duarte, and Azusa, and includes Monrovia, Walnut, and part of Covina for unpacking purposes.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Temple City, San Marino, Arcadia, Temple City, Montebello (Split for VRA compliance), and El Monte (Split for VRA compliance)
 - MALDEF AD 58 is anchored in part of East Los Angeles, Commerce, and Montebello, and stretches along the 60 Freeway, going through South El Monte, Acevedo Heights, Industry, and La Puente. It includes Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, and Rowland Heights as both their own communities

of interest, unpacking purposes, and being bound by Section 2 Districts AD 49 and 57 to the north, and AD 56 to the south. Finally, it includes the city of La Habra in Orange County whole also for Voting Rights Act compliance, the need to avoid splitting another city, and to stay within one person one vote compliance.

- Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), Orange (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
- Cities/Communities of Interest: East Los Angeles (Split for VRA Compliance), Montebello (Split for VRA Compliance), Commerce, South El Monte, La Puente, Acevedo Heights, Industry, La Habra, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, and Diamond Bar.

Los Angeles County - Senate

- MALDEF Senate District 28
 - MALDEF SD 22 is a new Section 2 district primarily constructed from a nest of Section 2 MALDEF districts AD 53 and 46, starting with a base of southeast Los Angeles, moving up south Los Angeles, downtown, and culminating in Koreatown and Hollywood.
 - County: Los Angeles (Split for one person, one vote compliance), Orange (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Bell, Cudahy, Huntington Park, (Los Angeles), Maywood, Vernon
- MALDEF Senate District 27
 - MALDEF SD 27 is a new Section 2 district which is primarily constructed from a nest of Section 2 MALDEF districts AD 55 and 50, starting with a base of southeast Los Angeles, moving south through Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Northwest Long Beach and culminating in the San Pedro-Wilmington region of South Bay.
 - County: Los Angeles (Split for one person, one vote compliance), Orange (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Avalon, Bellflower, Carson (Split for VRA compliance), Compton (Split for VRA compliance), Downey (Split for VRA compliance), Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood (Split for VRA compliance), Long Beach, (Split for one person one vote and for VRA compliance), Los Angeles (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Lynwood, Paramount, Signal Hill, South Gate
- MALDEF Senate District 30
 - MALDEF SD 30 is a southeastern Los Angeles county and South San Gabriel Valley area district. With a base of Pico Rivera, El Monte, La Puente, Acevedo Heights, Whittier, and Norwalk. It also contains the areas of Monterey Park, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar to maintain a community of interest area and Voting Rights Act considerations.
 - County: Los Angeles (Split for one person, one vote compliance), Orange (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
- MALDEF Senate District 22

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 20

- MALDEF SD 22 features a base of East Los Angeles, Northeast Los Angeles City neighborhoods and the western San Gabriel Valley, short of stopping at El Monte.
- Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)

Los Angeles County - Congress

- MALDEF Congressional District 28
 - Current CD 28 was the focus of a minority vote dilution case as a result of the 2001 redistricting process. The region of the East San Fernando Valley was a large, cohesive community of interest that had achieved Section 2 strength, but was separated as a result of the 2001 redistricting process. MALDEF CD 28 features the tightly knit communities of Sylmar, Mission Hills, San Fernando City, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, Sun Valley, North Hills, Van Nuys, Panorama City, Valley Glen and North Hollywood, generally bounded by the Los Angeles City boundary to the north, I-405 to the west, mountains to the east, and North Hollywood, Valley Glen, and Van Nuys to the south.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: of Sylmar, Mission Hills, San Fernando City, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, Sun Valley, North Hills, Van Nuys, Panorama City, Valley Glen and North Hollywood, generally bounded by the Los Angeles City boundary to the north, I-405 to the west, mountains to the east, and North Hollywood, Valley Glen, and Van Nuys
- MALDEF Congressional Districts 31 and 34 (Central Los Angeles County)
 - MALDEF CD 31 is anchored out of East Los Angeles, which is put whole in this configuration compared to the last few decades. It is made up of the community of interest neighborhoods of El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Highland Park, Eagle Rock, and moving west along the 101 Freeway towards Elysian Park, Echo Park, Koreatown, and Hollywood.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - MALDEF CD 34 is anchored by most of the Southeast cities in Los Angeles County. It stretches north through Boyle Heights and Downtown Los Angeles and South Los Angeles along the 110 Freeway, and ending at Pico Union.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Los Angeles City (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), Vernon, Maywood, Huntington Park, Bell, Cudahy.
- MALDEF Congressional District 38 and 39 (Southeast Los Angeles County)
 - Current CDs 38 and 39 were some of the districts most in need of respectful reorganization in the state, and they also needed to be maintained at their Section 2 voting strength.
 - MALDEF CD 39 follows a base in the Southeast Cities, generally following the 110 Freeway from South Gate, Lynnwood, Paramount, through Long Beach and Lakewood, to the San Pedro-Wilmington area
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 21

- Cities/Communities of Interest: South Gate, Lynnwood, Paramount, through Long Beach and Lakewood, San Pedro-Wilmington
 - MALDEF CD 38 is anchored in the Montebello and Pico Rivera area, and flows naturally through the strongly related communities of interest of Downey, Whittier, Los Nietos, South Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, and Norwalk. It reasonably includes Cerritos/Artesia, Bellflower, Lakewood to the south and La Mirada to the east.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Downey, Whittier, Los Nietos, South Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, and Norwalk. Cerritos, Artesia, Bellflower, Lakewood. La Mirada
 -
- MALDEF Congressional District 36
 - MALDEF CD 36 is a Section 2 District in set efficiently in the eastern San Gabriel Valley. It features a base of El Monte, Baldwin Park, West Covina, La Puente, and Azusa, and completes its total population needs by reasonably taking in Glendora, Covina, and San Dimas.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: El Monte, Baldwin Park, West Covina, La Puente, and Azusa, Glendora, Covina, and San Dimas.

Inland Empire - Assembly

- MALDEF AD 61 is an existing Section 2 district, and takes in the whole, related cities of Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, and part of Fontana for one-person one vote purposes.
 - Counties: Los Angeles (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance), San Bernardino (Split for One Person, One Vote Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, and Fontana (Split for one person, one vote purposes)
- MALDEF AD 62 is an existing Section 2 district which is anchored in Fontana, north Rialto, and North San Bernardino City
 - Counties: San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Fontana (Split for one person one vote compliance), Rialto (Split for VRA Compliance), San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton (Split for VRA Compliance), Muscoy, and Highland (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance)
- MALDEF AD 64 is a new Section 2 as mandated by the Voting Rights Act. It is anchored by Latino community members in Riverside County, with a base in the Perris region, going north through western Moreno Valley, parts of eastern Riverside City, the areas of Sunnyslope, Rubidoux, Glen Avon, and taking in the cities of Bloomington, South Rialto, west Colton, and part of San Bernardino City to achieve VRA compliance.

- Counties: San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance), Riverside (Split for one person one vote compliance)
- Cities/Communities of Interest: Bloomington, Rialto (Split for VRA Compliance), San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton (Split for VRA Compliance), Riverside (Split for VRA compliance), Glen Avon (Split for VRA Compliance), Rubidoux, Moreno Valley (Split for VRA compliance), Perris (Split for VRA Compliance), Good Hope (Split for VRA Compliance), Mead Valley (Split for VRA Compliance), and Meadowbrook (Split for VRA Compliance)

Inland Empire, East San Gabriel Valley, and Pomona Valley - Senate

- MALDEF Senate District 24
 - MALDEF SD 24 is an eastern San Gabriel Valley and Pomona Valley district, and is a pure nesting of MALDEF AD 57 and MALDEF AD 61.
 - County: Los Angeles (Split for one person, one vote compliance), San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
- MALDEF Senate District 32
 - MALDEF SD 32 is an Inland Empire Section 2 District, the result of pure nesting of MALDEF AD 62 and MALDEF AD 64.
 - County: Riverside (Split for one person, one vote compliance), San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Fontana, San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton, Muscoy, and Highland (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance), Bloomington, Rialto, San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton (Split for VRA Compliance), Riverside (Split for VRA compliance), Glen Avon (Split for VRA Compliance), Rubidoux, Moreno Valley (Split for VRA compliance), Perris (Split for VRA Compliance), Good Hope (Split for VRA Compliance), Mead Valley (Split for VRA Compliance), and Meadowbrook (Split for VRA Compliance)

Inland Empire - Congress

- MALDEF Congressional District 43 was created by removing Fontana from MALDEF Senate District 32, and remains a Latino Section 2 district.
 - County: Riverside (Split for one person, one vote compliance), San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Fontana, San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton, Muscoy, and Highland

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 23

- (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance), Bloomington, Rialto, San Bernardino (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Colton (Split for VRA Compliance), Riverside (Split for VRA compliance), Glen Avon (Split for VRA Compliance), Rubidoux, Moreno Valley (Split for VRA compliance), Perris (Split for VRA Compliance), Good Hope (Split for VRA Compliance), Mead Valley (Split for VRA Compliance), and Meadowbrook (Split for VRA Compliance)
- MALDEF Congressional District 44 naturally pairs the Pomona Valley community of interest to the central Inland Empire to become a new Latino Section 2 seat. In flows from Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, and Fontana.
 - County: San Bernardino (Split for one person, one vote compliance and VRA Considerations), Los Angeles (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, and Fontana (Split for one person), Upland (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance), Rancho Cucamonga (Split for one person one vote and VRA Compliance)

San Diego - Assembly

- MALDEF Assembly District 79
 - Current AD 79 is an existing district near Section 2 strength. It contains south San Diego City, western Chula Vista mostly following the natural community dividing line of the I-8 Freeway, most of National City, Barrio Logan, Logan Heights, Lincoln Park, Encanto, and Mountain View. Part of National City was removed to respect a small Asian American community, and Lincoln Park/Encanto were included to avoid cutting a small African-American community.
 - Counties: San Diego (Split for one person one vote purposes)
 - Cities/Communities of Interest: San Diego (Split for one person one vote purposes), Chula Vista (Split for VRA compliance), National City (Split for a community of interest purpose), Barrio Logan, Logan Heights, Lincoln Park, Encanto, and Mountain View

Imperial/Coachella Valley - Assembly

- MALDEF Assembly District 80 is an existing district near Section 2 strength. It contains Imperial County whole, and pairs it with strong community of interest in the Coachella Valley to the north. Following the Route 111, it includes the population centers of Coachella, Indio, Thousand Palms, and stopping at Cathedral City.
 - Counties: Riverside (Split for one person one vote compliance), Imperial

- Cities/Communities of Interest: Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley. Cities of Whitewater, Desert Hot Springs, Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, Indo Hills, Desert Palms, Indio, La Quinta (Split for one person one vote and VRA compliance), Coachella, Vista Santa Rosa, Thermal, Mecca, Oasis, North Shore, and all of Imperial County.

San Diego and Imperial/Coachella Valley - Senate

- MALDEF Senate District 40
 - MALDEF SD 40 is a nearly pure nesting of MALDEF AD 79 and MALDEF AD 80, mirroring an existing, legally protected Section Senate District, current Senate District 40.
 - County: San Diego (Split for one person, one vote compliance) and Imperial

San Diego and Imperial Valley - Congress

- MALDEF Congressional District 51
 - Current CD 51 was the focus of an intentional minority vote dilution case as a result of the 2001 redistricting process. MALDEF CD 51, starting with the existing Congressional District made minor edits to the benchmark district to make it a new, legally mandated Section 2 district. The neighborhood of Barrio Logan, which was intentionally removed 10 years ago, was added back to the district. Mirroring the communities of interest that helped create MALDEF SD 40, Bonita was removed from the benchmark and part of National City was removed to preserve an Asian Community of interest.
 - County: San Diego (Split for one person, one vote compliance) and Imperial

Yuba County Districts

- MALDEF Assembly District 3
 - MALDEF AD 3 is comprised nearly of the whole counties of Lassen, Plumas, Butte, Sierra, Nevada, and Yuba, with a small part of Sutter cut for one person, one vote compliance. The district maintains an 8.6% LCVAP and 6.8% Latino Registration, which is comparable to the benchmark's 8.1% LCVAP and 6.3% Latino Registration.
- MALDEF Senate District 1
 - MALDEF SD 1 is the nesting of MALDEF AD 3 and 4, which adds most of Placer and El Dorado Counties to the Yuba County Assembly District. As a result, the Latino CVAP was moved to 7.86% and Latino Registration moved to 6.63%, a small drop from its benchmark SD 4, which held a 8.6% LCVAP and 7.3% Latino Registration.
- MALDEF Congressional District 4
 - After hearing some community of interest testimony for the northern California counties, MALDEF created a district generally running from east to west. As a result, Yuba County was placed in MALDEF CD 4 with Placer. The Latino CVAP was moved to 8.8% and Latino Registration moved to

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 25

7.6%, a small drop from its benchmark CD 2, which held a 9.6% LCVAP and 8.4% Latino Registration.

Disclaimer: In crafting these Section 2 and Section 5 compliant districts for the Latino community, MALDEF was careful to preserve African-American voter influence and Asian-American voter influence in those districts where those communities have historically demonstrated significant electoral strength.

Community of Interest Report

MALDEF collected community of interest information from several sources including the CCRC's public hearings, public comment available on the CCRC's website, community of interest information collected by NALEO Educational Fund, and the community education and outreach sessions held by MALDEF and its partners from February through April 2011. This section focuses information collected outside of the CCRC's official process, through the outreach efforts of MALDEF and its partners, and includes community of interest testimony not yet received by the Commission.

Although MALDEF and NALEO Educational Fund worked to encourage the Latino community to provide testimony directly to the CCRC during the Commission's public hearings in April and May, many workshop participants felt too uncomfortable participating in the Commission process for a variety of reasons including time constraints, personal obligations to work and/or family, and feelings of intimidation. MALDEF's maps therefore include testimony of community members whose voice would otherwise be left unheard.

Below is a summary of key points made in input delivered to MALDEF via workshops, emails, or those received by NALEO Educational Fund. The sections are organized by the CCRC nine Public Input regions⁸.

Region 1 - San Diego and Imperial County

Chula Vista was identified as a community of interest. There is an east/west divide in Chula Vista by the 8 Freeway. East Chula Vista is characterized by having residents with a lower income, and a greater Spanish speaking community. Community members of East Chula Vista have lower educational attainment than West Chula Vista. West Chula Vista is a Latino community as well; however, this community is characterized by higher incomes and higher educational attainment. While there exists an East and West divide by economics and education, these communities are still tied through their cultural and social activities. Another shared resource is the Chula Vista Elementary school district which is highly Latino.

Community members also identified an African-American community of interest in National City and San Diego.

Region 2 - Inland Empire (Riverside County, San Bernardino County)

⁸ Note: Not all CCRC regions are list
MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and
U.S. House of Representatives
May 26, 2011
Page 27

The communities of East Riverside and Moreno Valley are largely immigrant and are experiencing job shortages. Residents want this COI to remain intact. Residents told MALDEF that these communities also share common shopping areas, the same challenges to access quality healthcare, and quality schools. The urban areas of Riverside do not seem to share many commonalities or interests with the high-desert areas of Riverside (i.e. Palm Springs). The areas and communities that border the San Bernardino County lines and Riverside are considered a major corridor between the two cities.

Another Latino COI exists in Jurupa Valley and West Riverside. Residents in these two areas have similar levels of education and income. Jurupa Valley and West Riverside both experience language isolation, high unemployment, and low homeownership. In contrast, the communities of East Vale, Corona, and Norco are higher income communities, residents are mostly homeowners, and the area is part of a community college district. East and West areas of Central Corona also have high Latino populations and many residents who rent property. This area is low income with relatively low levels of educational attainment and high unemployment.

In **San Bernardino** community members identified similarities between Rialto, Fontana, and San Bernardino. Rialto is not similar to the West end, East Valley, or Victorville. **Rancho Cucamonga** was described as a community whose residents are mostly retirees, senior citizens, and low income. Chino, an area that has historically been divided by race and political parties, is very similar to Ontario, Pomona, and Fontana. It is uniquely different from Chino Hills and Diamond Bar. The San Bernardino community wants to be joined with the communities of Moreno Valley as well as with the Perris communities. San Bernardino residents also feel that Pomona, Montclair, Claremont, and Ontario should be kept together. Some residents also feel that San Bernardino should be kept in the same district as Rialto and Fontana. Their COI's were described as low income and linguistically isolated. The majority of the COI population seems to flow along the 10 and 210 freeways. Other residents feel that **mountain communities** should be kept together and can form their own COI. Finally, San Bernardino residents do not want to be in a district along with Norco, Corona, or Palm Springs. They feel that they share no interests with these areas. Residents of San Bernardino would rather be included with areas south of them such as Temecula.

Region 4 - Los Angeles County (San Fernando Valley, San Gabriel Valley, Los Angeles Metro, South East Cities)

San Fernando Valley

Several communities of interest were identified in the San Fernando Valley. One community of interest identified is **Pacoima**. Residents of Pacoima have shared commonalities such as schools and Spanish language.. Residents of Pacoima emphasized the size and importance of their annual Christmas Parade which unites their community. **Pacoima, San Fernando, and Sylmar** were described as a COI because of shared Mexican heritage, Spanish language speakers, similar income levels, access to Mission College, and a local shopping center. These areas also exhibit similar levels of education, shared schools, churches, and parks. **The Sun Valley, North Hollywood** areas form their own COI because of similarly low income levels and large Spanish speaking

communities. The Southeast portion of North Hollywood is the area described as most similar to Sun Valley. Residents are mostly low income, working class and renters. This area is also very densely populated. Sun Valley residents share the same schools and have invested a lot of time and money into improving the quality of their schools. North Hollywood was also identified as a community of interest with Van Nuys. These communities also share common levels of income, Spanish language speakers, and a strong linkage with the transportation corridor that links Van Nuys to the subway in North Hollywood. Residents identified that the Van Nuys-North Hollywood COI was most similar to Panorama, North Hills and Pacoima. The **Panorama** community has, over the years, worked to unite the city's business interests. Community members ask that their district remain whole so that their business efforts do not go to waste. Panorama was also described as being a very densely populated city. **Arleta** was also described as a community of interest. Specifically, the city neighborhood boundaries of Arleta were defined as the preferred COI boundaries. The Arleta community is a strong knit community known for coming together to improve their neighborhood and their quality of life. The Arleta Neighborhood Council is working on getting a new sign to demarcate their neighborhood. The residents share a similar income, lifestyle, and community amenities such as parks and schools. Arleta was identified as most similar to Panorama City, Mission Hills, Pacoima, and North Hills.

North East San Fernando Valley has a strong group advocating that the region be kept whole. The community members have organized an official coalition and have identified the boundaries for the North East San Fernando Valley as encompassing many of the COIs identified above. The group has voiced their concern of having a district grouped with regions that are not similar to their communities of interest.

San Gabriel Valley

The cities of **La Puente, El Monte, South El Monte, and Baldwin Park** form a COI because of commonalities in education levels, income, their Latino CVAP, and culture. Communities here share a lifestyle preference including shopping areas and recreation areas. Another COI identified by community members were the cities of **Azusa, Covina, Irwindale, and Baldwin Park** because of similar income levels, education levels, ancestry, and transportation corridors. Other COIs in the San Gabriel Valley include the Southeast Glendora and Covina areas. These regions share relatively similar numbers of high school graduates, similar median income, linguistic isolation, and a large percentage of residents that rent property. Finally, residents of **San Gabriel Mountain foothill communities** asked that cities and unincorporated areas at the base of the San Gabriel Mountains be grouped together to form their own COI. This would allow federal lands to be in the same districts with the communities that recreate in them. In addition, speakers from San Gabriel expressed concerns regarding VRA districts and representation issues for the Asian American and Latino communities. In the San Gabriel Valley, the Asian American community is concentrated in the Western areas as the Eastern area of Walnut, Diamond Bar, and parts of San Bernardino County.

Los Angeles Metro

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 29

The Boyle Heights neighborhood has identified themselves as a community of interest. Their children all attend the same schools, they frequent the same churches, and shopping centers. The residents of Boyle Heights also share a common language, Mexican American ancestry, and income level and community history. The community of Boyle Heights has worked to improve the region and today their community amenities include a farmers market, the historic Mariachi Plaza, a community center and public transit.

The Latino Redistricting Roundtable has identified a COI in the Pico Union/Salvadoran corridor. The community known as Pico Union has a strong Central American community. Annually it is host of the largest Central American festival. The growing Central American community now resides in neighboring Koreatown and South Los Angeles. The community shares a common language, income level, cultural celebrations, and has worked together for many years to establish a stronger community presence.

Finally, MALDEF also received Los Angeles County community of interest boundaries from the Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC) for Koreatown, Chinatown, Little Tokyo, Thai Town, and a Cambodian community in Long Beach/Signal Hill.

Region 6 - Central Valley

One community of interest links the cities of Bakersfield, Lamont, and Arvin. This community of interest is delimited by Columbus on the North, by Arvin and Lamont on the South end, by Freeway 99 on the West, and finally East by the mountains. The community members of this community of interest are largely Mexican-American, Oaxacan, and Puerto Rican. Agriculture is the main industry for this region and most people work for the three largest employers of the area—Greenhouse, Bolthouse, Gimara. Most of the residents' average income in this area is less than \$30,000 per capita. The residents in this community of interest have developed a strong network that has been developed through wide participation in cultural and sporting events like the Oaxacan festival and soccer leagues that combined allow for the participation of over 150 soccer teams. This community of interest also has a strong commercial core at the Mercado Latino, a highly popular and extremely large shopping complex within the Latino community located in Eastern Bakersfield. They recently have also been making big investments in the area as well. Additionally, this community is strongly tied by the Kern High School District. All students attend this school district. Another factor that ties this community together is that there is only one public transit line, the Kern Regional Transit. It is the only one that goes through all three cities.

Other community members also expressed an interest to keep Bakersfield, Arvin, and Lamont together, and included other small farming towns such as Weedpatch, Delano, McFarland and Wasco on the premise that they are all small farming towns, highly Spanish-speaking, Latino populated, immigrant communities. They expressed the need for these communities to be kept together with Bakersfield since they lack basic local community services and utilities. Being in a district with Bakersfield will allow these

communities to access to the social, educational, and health resources/ services that lack in their communities due to lack of representation.

Community members also mentioned their unhappiness with a portion of Bakersfield's current congressional district being paired with San Luis Obispo. They feel that San Luis Obispo is a coastal city that has very little in common with Bakersfield, an agriculture city.

Fresno

The Fresno community of interest identified was East of the 99, which would be its Western border extending east towards freeway 41. The Northern boundary is Clinton Ave. and the Southern boundary is Manning Ave. This community is heavily Latino, Spanish-speaking, and largely farm/ agriculture workers, and immigrants reside in this region. This community shops in the same big food chains Food 4 Less, El Super, Food Co. It encompasses Fulton Mall, which is a big Latino shopping center and Latino small commerce hub. Primary employment is in agriculture and farming, as well as in warehouses, and factories. This community shares community needs, such as jobs (most workers can only obtain seasonal jobs in the fields due to lack of job skills and legal residency status). The community would like access to better education in the schools. There is a lack of adequate funding and resources in the local schools.

Another community of interest is **Selma, Sanger, and Flower**. These cities are smaller agriculture towns. These towns are located east and along freeway 99. They are highly Latino populated (Mexican-American), and lacking in political representation.

Residents of the **Fresno Foothills** expressed they would like to be in their own district, since they feel they have no commonalities with other nearby communities.

MALDEF also received a Hmong community of interest boundary from the Asian Pacific Islander Legal Center (APALC).

Modesto

Community members identified the whole of Modesto as a community of interest. Their wish is to keep Modesto whole as one district without including Ceres. Southwest Modesto is a big farming area. A lot of field workers reside in the area, low wages, and high unemployment is abundant.

Region 7 - Santa Cruz/Monterey/San Benito

Community members expressed their desire to keep Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito counties together as their community of interest. These regions share strong agricultural communities. Additionally, residents in both areas share similar incomes, lifestyles, and desire to improve their communities. Elected officials in these three

MALDEF California Statewide Redistricting Plans for State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. House of Representatives

May 26, 2011

Page 31

counties have established working relationships to troubleshoot cross county issues. There are also official professional associations that identify these three counties together.

Residents of Monterey County expressed a special concern that they should be kept with their neighbors San Benito and Santa Cruz. Community residents in Monterey are aware of their historical experience prior to Section 5 status being granted to their county. They would like to maintain a strong protection for their community members so that they can continue to elect candidates of their choice.

MALDEF also took into account the information presented by the Coastal Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE).