

Date of Hearing: April 10, 2019

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING

Marc Berman, Chair

AB 849 (Bonta) – As Amended March 14, 2019

SUBJECT: Elections: local redistricting.

SUMMARY: Revises the criteria and process to be used by local jurisdictions when they adopt or adjust the boundaries of the electoral districts that are used to elect members of the jurisdictions' governing bodies. Standardizes the criteria and process so that it is generally consistent across all levels of local government. Requires local jurisdictions to comply with substantial public hearing and outreach requirements as part of the process for adopting or adjusting boundaries. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires counties, cities, special districts, school districts, community college districts, and county boards of education, when adopting or adjusting the boundaries of districts or trustee areas within the jurisdiction, to develop districts that comply with the following criteria:
 - a) Requires the districts to be substantially equal in population as determined by the census, as specified. Prohibits inmates of a state correctional facility from being counted in the jurisdiction's population except for those inmates whose last known place of residence can be assigned to a census block in the jurisdiction, as specified.
 - b) Requires the districts to comply with the United States and California Constitutions, and the federal Voting Rights Act (VRA).
 - c) Requires the district boundaries to be established using the following criteria in the following order of priority:
 - i) Requires districts to be geographically contiguous to the extent practicable, as specified.
 - ii) Requires districts to respect the geographic integrity of local neighborhoods and communities of interest to the extent practicable, as specified. Provides that the term "communities of interest" does not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
 - iii) In the case of counties and special districts, requires districts to respect the geographic integrity of a city in a manner that minimizes its division, to the extent practicable.
 - iv) Provides that district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents, and requires such boundaries to follow natural and artificial boundaries to the extent practicable, as specified.
 - v) Requires district boundaries to be drawn to encourage geographical compactness, as specified, to the extent practicable and where doing so does not conflict with higher-ranked criteria.
 - d) Prohibits districts from being drawn for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against a political party.

- e) Requires districts to be assigned numbers or letters in a manner that results in the greatest number of residents possible ending up in a district that shares the same number or letter as the resident's old district area number or letter, except as specified.
- 2) Establishes the following timelines and deadlines for local government agencies to adjust district boundaries in the year following the decennial census:
- a) Prohibits a local jurisdiction from adjusting district boundaries before August 31 of the year following the census. Permits hearings or workshops to be held prior to August 31, provided that the boundaries of new districts are not adopted before that date.
 - b) Requires district boundaries to be adjusted no later than 151 days before the jurisdiction's first regular election occurring after March 1 of the second year following the census (i.e., a year ending in the number "2").
- 3) Requires the chief legal officer of a local government agency, if an entity fails to adopt district boundaries by the deadline, to petition the superior court in the county for an order adopting district boundaries. Permits a resident to petition the court if the legal officer fails to do so within five days after the deadline.
- a) Requires the court to adopt boundaries using the criteria specified above. Requires the new boundaries to be used in the agency's next regular election. Permits the court to order the adjustment of deadlines as necessary to implement the new boundaries.
 - b) Requires the court to hold at least one public hearing before adopting district boundaries.
 - c) Permits the court to appoint a special master to assist the court in adopting boundaries. Requires the agency to pay for the cost of the special master.
- 4) Requires a local government agency that is transitioning from at-large to district-based elections, or when adjusting district boundaries following the federal decennial census, to comply with the following public hearing requirements:
- a) In local governments with a population of fewer than 50,000 residents, a minimum of four hearings, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) At least one hearing before the agency draws a draft map of proposed district boundaries, and at least three hearings after drawing a draft map;
 - ii) At least one hearing must be held in a different geographic area; and,
 - iii) At least one hearing must be held on a weekend, or after 6 p.m. on a weekday.
 - b) In local governments with a population of 50,000 – 99,999 residents, a minimum of six hearings, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) At least two hearings before the agency draws a draft map, and at least four hearings after drawing a draft map;
 - ii) At least two hearings must be held in a different geographic area; and,

- iii) At least two hearings must be held on a weekend, or after 6 p.m. on a weekday.
 - c) In local governments with a population of 100,000 residents or more, a minimum of 10 hearings, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) At least four hearings before the agency draws a draft map, and at least six hearings after drawing a draft map;
 - ii) At least three hearings must be held in a different geographic area; and,
 - iii) At least three hearings must be held on a weekend, or after 6 p.m. on a weekday.
 - d) Requires hearing buildings to be accessible to persons with disabilities. Specifies that where practicable, hearing buildings should be located within walking distance of free parking and public transit.
 - e) Requires a hearing to be noticed for and to begin at a fixed time if it is consolidated with a regular or special meeting of the governmental agency that includes other substantive agenda items.
- 5) Requires a local government agency that is transitioning from at-large to district-based elections, or when adjusting district boundaries following the federal decennial census, to comply with the following outreach, language assistance, and public notice requirements:
- a) Requires the agency to encourage residents, including those in underrepresented and non-English speaking communities, to participate in the process, including the following:
 - i) Providing information in English and other languages in which the jurisdiction is required to provide language assistance pursuant to state or federal law, as specified.
 - ii) Providing information through good government, civil rights, civic engagement, or community groups or organizations that are active in the jurisdiction, including those active in language minority communities.
 - b) Requires the agency to arrange live translation of any public hearing or workshop into a language in which the jurisdiction is required to provide language assistance, as specified, if a request is made at least 72 hours before the hearing or workshop.
 - c) Requires the agenda for any public hearing or workshop to be published on the internet at least five days before the hearing or workshop.
 - d) Requires the first version of a draft map of district boundaries to be published on the internet at least seven days before being considered at a hearing. Requires a draft map that is revised, as specified, to be published on the internet for at least seven days before being adopted by the agency, unless there are fewer than 165 days until the jurisdiction's next regular election, in which case the draft must be published for at least three days.
 - e) Requires each draft map prepared by the agency to be accompanied by specified demographic information that the agency has about the proposed districts.

- f) Requires the public to be permitted to submit testimony or draft maps in writing and electronically.
- g) Requires all hearings to be audio- or video-recorded, and made available on the internet within 72 hours of the hearing.
- h) Requires the jurisdiction to create and maintain a website during the districting or redistricting process, and for at least 10 years thereafter. Requires the website to include or link to the following information:
 - i) An explanation of the redistricting process for the jurisdiction, in English and any other languages in which the jurisdiction is required to provide language assistance.
 - ii) The procedures for public testimony during a hearing, and for submitting written testimony to the agency, in English and other languages in which the jurisdiction is required to provide language assistance.
 - iii) A calendar of hearings and workshop dates.
 - iv) The notice and agenda for each hearing and workshop.
 - v) The audio- or video-recording, draft minutes, and adopted minutes of each hearing.
 - vi) Each draft map considered by the agency at a hearing.
 - vii) The adopted map of district boundaries and the report that explains how the body made its decisions in achieving compliance with the required criteria.
- 6) Provides that if the boundaries of a city or special district expand as the result of the addition of new territory, the new territory shall be added to the nearest district without changing the boundaries of the other districts. Permits new boundaries to be adopted, notwithstanding the general prohibition on mid-decade redistricting that would be created by this bill, if both of the following conditions are met:
 - a) There are more than four years until the next scheduled redistricting; and,
 - b) The population of the new territory being added is greater than 25 percent of the jurisdiction's population, as specified.
- 7) Prohibits a county, city, or special district, after districting or redistricting, from adopting new district boundaries until after the next federal census except as follows:
 - a) If a court orders the jurisdiction to redistrict.
 - b) If the jurisdiction is settling a legal claim that its district boundaries violate the United States Constitution, the VRA, or relevant provisions of state law.
 - c) If the boundaries of the jurisdiction change by the addition or subtraction of territory.

- 8) Establishes the following deadlines for a city or special district to adopt district boundaries, if the jurisdiction has legally committed, as specified, to adopt new district boundaries:
 - a) If the commitment was made more than 180 days before the jurisdiction's next regular election, the jurisdiction must adopt boundaries at least 151 days before that election.
 - b) If the commitment was made between 180 and 151 days before the election, the jurisdiction must adopt boundaries at least 125 days before the election.
- 9) Requires the body responsible for adopting boundary lines to issue a report within two weeks of adopting the lines that explains the basis on which the body made its decisions in achieving compliance with the criteria specified in this bill.
- 10) Provides, in the case of a county, city, or special district, that this bill generally shall not be interpreted to limit the discretionary remedial authority of federal or state courts, or to limit a court's ability to fashion a remedy that conflicts with the provisions of this bill.
- 11) Provides that the following provisions of this bill do not apply to a charter city, as specified:
 - a) The criteria for drawing districts, if the city has redistricting criteria in its city charter.
 - b) The deadlines for redistricting, if the city has adopted a different deadline by ordinance or in its charter.
 - c) The provisions governing the adjustment of boundaries when a city adds territory, if the city has adopted a different standard by ordinance or in its charter.
 - d) The provisions governing mid-cycle redistricting, if the city has adopted different rules for mid-cycle redistricting in its charter.
 - e) The provisions governing situations where a city fails to redistrict by the deadline, if the city has adopted in its charter a different method for adopting district boundaries when it misses a redistricting deadline.
- 12) Makes corresponding and conforming changes.

EXISTING STATE LAW:

- 1) Establishes rules that counties, cities, county boards of education, community college districts, and school districts must follow when they adopt or adjust the boundaries of electoral districts used to elect members of the jurisdictions' governing bodies, as follows:
 - a) **Criteria** – Generally requires districts to have equal populations. Permits, but does not require counties, cities, special districts, and county boards of education to consider topography; geography; cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and communities of interest when establishing or adjusting district boundaries.
 - b) **Mid-Decade Redistricting** – Permits most types of governmental entities, after adjusting district boundaries following the decennial census, to adjust those boundaries again before the next decennial census, subject to certain conditions.

- c) **Deadlines** – Establishes varying deadlines for a jurisdiction to adopt district boundaries following the decennial census, depending on the type of governmental entity. State law generally provides that jurisdictional boundary changes must occur at least 125 days before an election in order to be effective for that election.
 - d) **Failure to Redistrict** – Specifies varying remedies in situations where a jurisdiction fails to adjust district boundaries by the required deadline following the decennial census, depending on the type of governmental entity, including electing governing board members at-large, instead of by districts. For some governmental entities, existing law does not specify a remedy if the jurisdiction fails to adjust district boundaries as required.
 - e) **Public Hearings** – Requires most types of governmental entities to hold at least one public hearing on a proposal to adjust district boundaries prior to the hearing at which the jurisdiction votes to approve or defeat the proposal.
- 2) Requires the Secretary of State, by January 1 of each year in which the Governor is elected, to determine the precincts where three percent or more of the voting age residents are members of a single language minority and lack sufficient skills in English to vote without assistance. Requires county elections officials, for each specified precinct, to provide a facsimile ballot and related instructions in the specified language or languages, as specified.
 - 3) Requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to furnish information to the Legislature and the Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC) about the last known pre-incarceration place of residence of inmates incarcerated in state correctional facilities on the day of the decennial federal census. Requires the Legislature, in coordination with the CRC, to ensure that the information provided by CDCR is included in a specified computerized database that is used for redistricting. Requests the CRC to use this information to deem each person incarcerated in a CDCR facility as residing at his or her last known place of residence, rather than at the institution of his or her incarceration, when carrying out its redistricting responsibilities.

EXISTING FEDERAL LAW:

- 1) Requires a state or a political subdivision of a state to provide voting materials in the language of a minority group when that group within the jurisdiction has an illiteracy rate that is higher than the national illiteracy rate, and the number of the United States citizens of voting age in that language group within the jurisdiction meets at least one of the following:
 - a) Numbers more than 10,000;
 - b) Makes up more than five percent of all voting age citizens; or,
 - c) On an Indian reservation, exceeds five percent of all reservation residents.
- 2) Defines language minorities or language minority groups, for the purposes of the above provisions, to mean persons who are American Indian, Asian American, Alaskan Natives, or of Spanish heritage.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. State-mandated local program; contains reimbursement direction.

COMMENTS:1) **Purpose of the Bill:** According to the author:

Redistricting is of crucial importance to local democracy. How county supervisor, city council, school board, and other local government election districts are drawn can help determine, for the next decade, whether or not a community will be represented at their closest levels of government...

AB 849 would reform California's local redistricting laws to improve criteria, transparency and public engagement. AB 849 demonstrates our State's commitment that representative and inclusive democracy matters at all levels of government, including local. These reforms will result in a redistricting process that is fairer to California's diverse communities, more transparent, better organized, and more consistently-applied across all local governments.

AB 849 would specifically:

- Strengthen the criteria for local redistricting and minimize the possibility of gerrymandering by prioritizing keeping neighborhoods and communities intact;
- Bring new voices into the redistricting process, by requiring public engagement that includes engaging non-English-speaking communities that are otherwise all-too-often overlooked;
- Improve transparency by requiring local governments publish draft maps online for 7 days before they can be adopted; and
- Adopt logical redistricting deadlines that expand opportunities for public participation and set up consistent and fair remedies for when those deadlines are missed.

2) **Local Redistricting Requirements:** State laws governing redistricting for local agencies vary depending on the level of government: for instance, different rules apply to school districts and community college districts than apply to cities. Similarly, different rules apply to counties than to special districts. Notwithstanding these differences, many of the local redistricting rules are similar: the criteria required to be used when drawing district lines is very similar for counties, cities, special districts, and county boards of education, for example. Similarly, most local jurisdictions are required to hold at least two public hearings when adjusting district boundaries. Other local redistricting rules vary much more significantly. For example, a variety of different deadlines apply for local jurisdictions to adopt boundaries.

While the Legislature has approved bills in recent years to permit local jurisdictions to create redistricting commissions (see "Previous Legislation" below), the rules that govern the redistricting process itself generally have not been changed in years or even decades. The criteria that must be used for drawing county supervisorial districts, for example, has largely been unchanged since at least 1947 (the only notable change since that time was an update to state law to require that supervisorial districts comply with the VRA).

This bill updates the rules that apply to local redistricting and provides greater standardization of the rules that apply to different types of local governmental entities.

- 3) **Public Engagement Requirements:** Existing law requires most local entities to hold at least one public hearing on the topic of adjusting district boundaries before the hearing at which boundaries are adopted. Additionally, jurisdictions that are transitioning from at-large to district-based elections generally must hold at least four public hearings—at least two before drawing any draft map of districts, and at least two after releasing a draft map.

This bill imposes significant new public hearing, outreach, notice, and transparency requirements. Under this bill, jurisdictions with populations of 100,000 or more residents would be required to hold at least 10 hearings, including at least three on weekends or after 6 p.m. on weekdays, and at least three in different geographic locations. Jurisdictions would additionally be required to provide live translations of hearings—if requested 72 hours in advance—into any language in which the jurisdiction is required to provide language assistance under specified provisions of state and federal law.

These requirements could be challenging to meet. Los Angeles County, for instance, would be required to offer live translations in as many as nine languages other than English; Fresno County in as many as eight languages; and as many as seven languages in Alameda, Sacramento, and San Diego Counties. Other potentially challenging requirements for local governments include public notice requirements that exceed the rules in the Brown Act and a requirement that the agency prepare a report that explains the basis on which the body made its decisions in achieving compliance with the required criteria.

Notwithstanding the goal of standardizing redistricting procedures and requirements, the author and the committee may wish to consider whether the one-size-fits-all approach embodied in this bill is sufficiently flexible to provide a workable solution in every local government jurisdiction in the state that is divided into districts, and thus that will be required to adjust district boundaries after each federal decennial census. While the bill does contain different requirements on the number of hearings that are required depending on the population of the jurisdiction, this bill nonetheless imposes significant restrictions governing the hearings in all jurisdictions, regardless of population. These requirements may be especially difficult for local governments with small staffs, and for governmental bodies that meet only occasionally, to meet, regardless of the population of the jurisdiction.

- 4) **Transitions to Districts and Suggested Amendments:** Most of the provisions of this bill apply both to situations where a local government agency is redrawing existing district boundaries, as well as when an agency is transitioning from at-large to district-based elections. Over the last 12 years, more than 200 local government bodies have transitioned from at-large to district-based elections. Those transitions largely have been driven by the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

The CVRA, which was enacted through the passage of SB 976 (Polanco), Chapter 129, Statutes of 2002, was designed to address racial block voting in at-large elections for local office in California. In areas where racial block voting occurs, an at-large method of election can dilute the voting rights of minority communities if the majority typically supports candidates that differ from candidates preferred by minority communities. In such situations,

breaking a jurisdiction up into districts can result in districts in which a minority community can elect the candidate of its choice or otherwise have the ability to influence the outcome of an election. Accordingly, the CVRA prohibits an at-large method of election from being imposed or applied in a political subdivision in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class of voters to elect the candidate of its choice or to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgement of the rights of voters who are members of the protected class. In an effort to increase the likelihood that attorneys would be willing to bring challenges to at-large elections, the CVRA permits a prevailing plaintiff party to recover attorneys' fees and litigation expenses.

In recent years, the Legislature has taken steps to establish more formal mechanisms for prospective plaintiffs and local jurisdictions to address at-large election systems that are potentially unlawful under the CVRA prior to litigation being filed. Notably, AB 350 (Alejo), Chapter 737, Statutes of 2016, required that written notice be provided before an action can be brought against a political subdivision under the CVRA, and capped the amount of attorneys' fees that a prospective plaintiff could recover from a political subdivision under the CVRA if the subdivision promptly transitioned from an at-large to a district-based method of election upon receiving such a written notice. To take full advantage of the cap on attorneys' fees, a jurisdiction has a maximum of 135 days after receiving the written notice to adopt district-based elections and finalize the district boundaries, unless the person who sent the written notice agrees to a longer period of time.

Jurisdictions that elect governing board members by districts know that they will need to adjust those district boundaries following the federal decennial census, so they are able to plan for that process in advance and develop timelines accordingly. By contrast, a jurisdiction that conducts at-large elections can receive a written notice described above at any time, without any advance notice. Given the short period of time that a jurisdiction has to adopt district boundaries in order to take advantage on the cap on attorneys' fees, it may be unreasonable to expect a jurisdiction that is transitioning from at-large to district-based elections to comply with the extensive public outreach, hearing, notice, and related public engagement requirements included in this bill as a part of that transition. Accordingly, the author and the committee may wish to consider amendments to exclude jurisdictions that are establishing districts for the first time from these public engagement requirements.

Additionally, this bill requires a city or special district that makes a commitment to transition from at-large to district-based elections at least 151 days before the jurisdiction's next regular election, as specified, to adopt district boundaries in time for that election. As noted above, state law generally provides that jurisdictional boundary changes must occur at least 125 days before an election in order to be effective for that election. As a result, a jurisdiction could have as little as 26 days to complete the entire process of enacting district-based elections and adopting district boundaries under this bill. Such a timeline seems inconsistent with the public engagement requirements both in this bill and in existing law. Accordingly, committee staff recommends that this bill be amended to delete the provisions that set deadlines for cities or special districts to adopt district boundaries when transitioning to district-based elections.

- 5) **Broad Court Authority and Suggested Amendment:** Various provisions of this bill provide that state law governing local redistricting "shall not be interpreted to limit the discretionary remedial authority of any federal or state court, or to limit a federal or state

court's ability to fashion a remedy that conflicts with” specified provisions of state law.

If the author and supporters of this bill believe that the remedies that are available to courts under existing law and this bill are insufficient, the appropriate way to address that concern is to consider amending state law to allow for additional remedies. The language in this bill, by contrast, appears to give courts unfettered discretion to adopt remedies that conflict with the standards and best practices that this bill seeks to codify, potentially even including remedies that were considered and rejected as part of the legislative process. Accordingly, committee staff recommends that this bill be amended to delete these provisions of the bill.

- 6) **Court-Adopted Boundaries:** This bill requires the superior court in the relevant county to adopt new district boundaries for a jurisdiction when the jurisdiction fails to do so by the 151st day before its next regularly scheduled election. State law requires jurisdictional changes to occur at least 125 days before an election in order to be used for that election. Although this bill allows a superior court to order the adjustment of electoral deadlines as necessary to implement the new district boundaries in the next regular election, practical considerations will limit the ability to adjust many deadlines by more than a nominal amount. Elections officials, for example, need time to establish precincts and provide for candidate filing before ballots can be finalized for an election. Under state law, ballots start being mailed out to overseas and military voters on the 60th day before an election. Given these tight timeframes, the deadlines in this bill may make it difficult for a court to adopt a jurisdiction’s redistricting plan in time for the next election.
- 7) **Prison Inmates and Redistricting:** The United States Census Bureau's policy for counting people in correctional facilities on census day is that those individuals are to be counted at the facility of incarceration. As a result, census data, which typically is the basis for redistricting, shows people who are housed in correctional facilities as residing at those facilities. Due to concerns that this policy artificially inflates the political influence of districts where prisons are located at the expense of other voters, state law requests that the CRC deem individuals who are incarcerated in state prison as residing at their last known residences for redistricting purposes, rather than the institutions of at which they are incarcerated. State law also provides for the state’s redistricting database to be adjusted accordingly. This bill generally requires local governments to use the adjusted data that reflects the last known residences of individuals who are incarcerated in state prison, rather than considering those individuals to be residents of the prison.
- 8) **Technical Amendment:** Committee staff recommends the following technical amendment to correct a drafting error in this bill:

On page 39, line 34, strike out “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

- 9) **Arguments in Support:** One of the co-sponsors of this bill, Asian Americans Advancing Justice-California, writes:

How local election district lines are drawn in 2021 and 2022 will help to determine which communities will be represented – or potentially ignored – for the next decade in California. This next redistricting will take place against a backdrop of already severe underrepresentation in local government for many California communities. For example, while Latinos are nearly 45% of

California's population, they represent only 10% of county supervisors and 15% of city councilmembers, according to a 2016 NALEO study. It is therefore critical that the 2021 local redistricting cycle, and subsequent redistrictings, promote – and not impede – the goal of fair representation for all of California's diverse communities.

Unfortunately, the current laws governing local redistricting are obsolete, illogical, and inconsistent with the goal of promoting fair representation. For example, unlike for state and congressional redistricting, there is no standard requiring that local governments redistrict to keep communities intact. District maps can be drafted in secret then introduced and adopted at the same meeting without first being published and shared with the public. Despite the democratic importance of this once-per-decade process, there is no public outreach requirement, including to non-English-speaking communities who are less likely to be aware of the process. And, contrary to reason and the remainder of state public policy, if a general law city misses the redistricting deadline it perplexingly reverts to holding at-large elections, which may have the effect of undermining minority representation.

- 10) **Arguments in Opposition:** In a joint letter of opposition to this bill, the California Special Districts Association, City Clerks Association of California, and League of California Cities writes:

This bill appears to be a solution in search of a problem. In 2016, Senate Bill 1108 authorized all California cities and counties to create independent citizens commissions to redraw district lines. However, rather than allow those independent commissions to be established and determine the amount of public meetings they need to accomplish their goals and meet the needs of their communities, this bill strips local control and mandates how every type of local government must outreach to their own communities.

Unfortunately, the requirements AB 849 will create unworkable confusion and implementation challenges for thousands of local government agencies, remove virtually all local discretion on essentially every aspect of how an agency can establish, adopt and [redraw] electoral boundaries— resulting in hundreds of millions of dollars of mandates which will either be unfunded or suspended by the State. For years our organizations individually and collectively have worked in good faith with the sponsors of this measure on issues pertaining to the California Voting Rights Act, California Public Records Act as well as a variety of other elections issues and transparency issues. Rather than pursue an adversarial measure that completely upends the entire process by which our local agencies establish boundaries, our organizations would be willing to work in a collaborative manner to find ways to address concerns.

Three other organizations that represent counties (the California State Association of Counties, Rural County Representatives of California, and Urban Counties of California) are opposed unless the bill is amended to (1) appropriate funding for counties to meet the obligations in the bill, and (2) revise the procedures when a county fails to adopt district boundaries by the required deadlines, as the organizations believe it would create a

“potentially-troubling conflict” to require the county counsel to petition the superior court to establish district boundaries in such a situation, as would be required by this bill.

- 11) **Related Legislation:** AB 1724 (Salas), which is also being heard in this committee today, requires general law cities and counties to establish independent redistricting commissions that are modeled after the CRC, as specified.

SB 139 (Allen), requires a county with a population of more than 250,000 residents to establish an independent redistricting commission to adopt the county’s supervisorial districts following each federal decennial census. SB 139 was approved by the Senate Elections & Constitutional Amendments Committee on a 4-0 vote, and is pending in the Senate Governance & Finance Committee.

- 12) **Previous Legislation:** SB 1108 (Allen), Chapter 784, Statutes of 2016, permits a county or a general law city to establish a redistricting commission, subject to certain conditions.

SB 1018 (Allen), Chapter 462, Statutes of 2018, allows school, community college, and special districts to establish redistricting commissions, allows local jurisdictions to establish hybrid redistricting commissions, and modifies the conditions for individuals who are permitted to serve on independent redistricting commissions.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Asian Americans Advancing Justice – California (co-sponsor)
California Common Cause (co-sponsor)
League of Women Voters of California (co-sponsor)
American Civil Liberties Union of California
California League of Conservation Voters
California League of United Latin American Citizens
Council on American-Islamic Relations – California
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
Mi Familia Vota
RepresentUs
1 individual

Opposition

Association of California Healthcare Districts
California Special Districts Association
California State Association of Counties (unless amended)
City Clerks Association of California
League of California Cities
Rural County Representatives of California (unless amended)
Urban Counties of California (unless amended)

Analysis Prepared by: Ethan Jones / E. & R. / (916) 319-2094