

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

In the Matter of
Full Commission Business Meeting

San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

Friday, June 24, 2011

Reported by:
Debra Aubert

Foothill Transcription Company, Inc.
2893 Sunrise Blvd., Suite 102
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742
(916) 443-7400

APPEARANCES

Commissioners Present:

Maria Blanco

Peter Yao

Connie Galambos-Malloy

Michael Ward

Stanley Forbes

Cynthia Dai

Vincent Barabba

Michelle DiGuilio

Gabino T. Aguirre

Angelo Ancheta

Jodie Filkins-Webber

M. Andre Parvenu

Jeanne Raya

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Gilbert R. "Gil" Ontai

STAFF PRESENT:

Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel

Nicole Henderson, Q2

Janeece Sargis, Commission Liaison

ALSO PRESENT:

PUBLIC COMMENT:

INDEX

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Page

Proceedings.....2

Commission Policies.....6

Discussion of Los Angeles Districts.....26

Discussion of Los Angeles and Long Beach Ports.....67

Discussion on Beach Cities.....78

Discussion on Southeast Los Angeles Cities.....103

Direction to Q2 Regarding Visualizations.....172

Adjournment.....226

Transcriber Certification.....227

--o0o--

P R O C E E D I N G S1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioners, all right.

It is June 24th of 2011. This is a business meeting of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. This meeting is being held at San Joaquin Delta College in Stockton, California. I will briefly run through today's agenda for the business meeting, and then from six to nine o'clock tonight we will be holding an input meeting here in the same venue in the City of Stockton.

A couple of notes. We're starting a little bit late. We had to redo some of our -- rewire some of our audio and visual. And another thing for the viewers and those following is that we will not have the transcript of this business hearing posted for four to five days. We're going to send it through our service that takes the audio and transcribes it. So, we apologize for that inconvenience, but that's the way we have to proceed today.

We will be working through lunch and with some breaks, and then having a dinner break from five to six o'clock. This is how we have, in consultation with the Vice-Chair and the folks who have been taking the lead on the work plan, this is what we'd like to do today. We're going to -- We have our Q2 team here, and we're going to do some initial visualizations, post first draft, that

1 will take into account a lot of the testimony that we've
2 read and heard since our maps came out concerning the LA
3 Region, and as much as we can on Southern California.

4 When we finish with that, you know, if we finish
5 with that, and hopefully we will, we will take about 35
6 minutes to have all the Commissioners identify the --
7 some of the issues that you've identified through reading
8 the public testimony for the areas to which you were
9 assigned, you know, the whole State, so that we can leave
10 this meeting having asked Q2 to take a look at some
11 options, given what you've identified are some of the
12 considerations that came up through the public testimony
13 test maps.

14 So, that's the agenda, and I would like to hear
15 from my fellow Commissioners if that is okay with
16 everybody. Okay. I know it's a little funny to have the
17 folks behind us, but this is actually a great screen and
18 should be very helpful.

19 Before we start the mapping, and I can say a
20 little bit how we're going to do that, we had tasked our
21 chief counsel yesterday with doing some research and
22 making a presentation and some recommendations to us
23 about some of the concepts that we have used in drawing
24 districts where we either had to have had no testimony,
25 conflicting testimony and, you know, some of us have --

1 we've used several concepts. Sometimes in congressional
2 districts we'll look at federal issues related to an area
3 wherein sometimes we've done the concept of share of the
4 pain where we -- if a community wants to stay whole, and
5 we can't do it in both the congressional or the assembly
6 and the senate, we sort of do it in alternative
7 districts.

8 We've had a series of things like that that have
9 evolved as Commissioner policies, and we've asked him to
10 sort of look at those and give us a presentation as to
11 the consistency of those. So, that's how we'll proceed,
12 and I'll have Ms. Sargis do a roll call.

13 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Aguirre.

14 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** Here.

15 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ancheta.

16 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Here.

17 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Barabba.

18 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Here.

19 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Blanco.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Here.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Dai.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Here.

23 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** DiGuilio.

24 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Here.

25 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Filkins-Webber.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Here.

2 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Forbes.

3 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Here.

4 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Galambos-Malloy.

5 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Here.

6 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ontai. Parvenu.

7 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Here.

8 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Raya.

9 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Here.

10 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ward.

11 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Here.

12 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Yao.

13 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Here.

14 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** You have a quorum.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you. All right.

16 Mr. Miller, we are attentive.

17 **MR. MILLER:** Thank you.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** No, you need a mic.

19 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Here.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** You can grab one, and I know
21 that the voice level -- They'll tell you whose -- You're
22 probably the most (inaudible).

23 **MR. MILLER:** I'll sit down so it doesn't look
24 like I'm going to sing. I've thought a lot about the
25 issue that we tried to address yesterday, which I would

1 characterize as including in the Commission's
2 deliberations softer factors or trying to create a sense
3 of equity among competing districts. And in thinking
4 about how a court would examine that approach to making
5 decisions, what keeps coming back to me is this.

6 I think that each set of maps, congressional,
7 legislative, etcetera, will be judged separately and will
8 be judged -- and will be judged on its merits against the
9 constitutional criteria. So, to the extent that another
10 factor is present in decision making, I don't think the
11 Court will be sympathetic to the use of other criteria.
12 I think it will give deference to the Commission,
13 recognizing the difficult challenges in making competing
14 choices among the criteria within each class, if you
15 will. But I don't see an additional way to reconcile on
16 an equity basis, a fairness basis among the different
17 types of maps the Commission is charged with preparing.

18 So, I guess the short answer to that is, I think
19 you must deliberate in such a way that delivers a set of
20 maps for each office based solely on the criteria
21 associated with each office.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Questions? Comments?

23 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** So we need to backstroke a
24 little bit? In other words, review the decisions that we
25 have made in the past few weeks, and try to undo some of

1 the decisions that we have made based on the share the
2 pain concept?

3 **MR. MILLER:** Well, to the extent that you can
4 identify them and believe that you would have drawn a map
5 differently if you weren't using that approach, I would
6 say yes. It is also the -- It is also potentially true,
7 however, that in your -- simply your ongoing work of
8 looking at each set of maps, you know, you need to be
9 satisfied independently on each set that the criteria are
10 met. Now, that -- it may be -- I would hope it might be
11 possible to do that on a prospective basis without having
12 to go backwards, but you need to be -- you need to have
13 that in mind. And, of course, that's always (inaudible).

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I have Commissioner Ancheta,
15 Commissioner DiGuilio and then Commissioner Dai.

16 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Thank you. So, I think
17 the scope of your opinion this morning are -- or
18 (inaudible) this morning --

19 **MR. MILLER:** Today.

20 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Today, is regarding of a
21 more specific question, which, again, has been sometimes
22 the share the pain principle. And I believe yesterday I
23 sort of identified or, as examples, other sort of non-
24 formal or non-State Constitutional criteria that we often
25 do invoke. I think your opinion is to not invoke the

1 share the pain for the reasons you've stated.

2 I don't know if you have any specific opinions
3 regarding other principles, because I think there are a
4 number of instances wherein, for lack of a better term,
5 tie breaking situations or instances where there may be
6 some other principle that is applied. Again, it may not
7 be an equity principle. Again, identified a federalism
8 principle, which has been used to justify say a boarder
9 district, as an example. Clearly not in the State
10 Constitution. But does the scope of your opinion extend
11 to other areas or other examples to the extent that
12 you're thinking about, again, what might be called tie
13 breakers? In other words, other things being equal and
14 in compliance with all criteria, but you are left with
15 sort of two choices, and you have to draw the line
16 somewhere.

17 And, again, the share the pain was an attempt to
18 sort of build that in. Again, it may not have been
19 applied consistently. It may have led to some
20 potentially discriminatory and arbitrary results. That's
21 one of the problems with it, but typically we do bring
22 other principles into discussion which are not formally
23 in the Constitution. How should we look at those?
24 Should we address them on a piece by piece basis or
25 simply look at the legitimacy as we get to them and --

1 **MR. MILLER:** Well, I would look at it this way.
2 I think it's fair to analogize the criteria in the
3 Constitution to a set of jury instructions. And if a
4 jury were to deliberate on matters outside of the scope
5 of the Court's instructions, that's an improper
6 deliberation. The decision is to be made on the law that
7 the jury is given, right? Not what they would like the
8 law to be or on some other factors.

9 In this case, the Constitution has said to the
10 Commission, these are the factors against which districts
11 are to be created. So, I think to the extent that the
12 Commission adds others in, those are suspect down the
13 road.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Does -- Commissioner
15 DiGuilio. Unless -- I really want us to flush this out.
16 So, Commissioner Ancheta, if you want to go forward with
17 just finish that train of thought that's fine.

18 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah, because there are a
19 number of principles that I think we have been applying,
20 which I think are legitimate, legally legitimate. I
21 think that from what I can gather have been applied non-
22 discriminatorily, non-arbitrarily. For example, I think,
23 for example, the federalism principle, where we might
24 look at a congressional district somewhat differently,
25 and assuming full compliance with all criteria to a

1 certain point, there is a certain choice to be made where
2 we might draw one district differently because of a
3 particular set of representational interests. I think we
4 have --

5 **MR. MILLER:** What does that mean?

6 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Well, for -- Well, I think
7 the common rationale, as I understand it, is that if you
8 were saying we might draw a border district, is that on
9 the -- for the congressional district, the rationale to
10 differentiate that district from, say, how we might draw
11 a similar senate or assembly district, is that the scope
12 of federal concerns and representation of particular
13 concerns are not unique but are highly federalized, in
14 the sense that border policy is a federal policy, versus
15 what might be a State interest revolving around other
16 non-federal interests. It could be any number of things.

17 **MR. MILLER:** Doesn't that sound similar to a
18 community of interest problem, though.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It is.

20 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** It is, and let me give an
21 example, then. Because one thing the Commission has also
22 done, which is, again, not in the Constitution, it says
23 in the Constitution we should strive to maintain local
24 communities of interest. There is a particular
25 definition of local communities of interest.

1 **MR. MILLER:** Right.

2 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** However, in looking at a
3 number of the districts, there are attempts to link what
4 either might be cities or counties or local communities
5 of interest in a broader way with an assertion by the
6 public, let's say, that there are commonalities, a
7 mountain range, a coastal area. Those probably would not
8 be considered local communities, but they're quite large.
9 So, they're not local communities of interest, but the
10 Commission can justify its decision on a principle that,
11 well, other things being equal we think they have enough
12 in common that they ought to be together. Right? That's
13 an extra Constitutional principle, is it not? So --

14 **MR. MILLER:** I --

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** There are things that go
16 beyond (inaudible).

17 **MR. MILLER:** I would actually not characterize it
18 as an extra Constitutional principle, as you describe it.
19 What I hear you saying is that you're taking -- the way
20 you're defining local is more broadly than it might be
21 defined. That's what I hear in the example that you
22 gave. And I think you're better off characterizing it as
23 how the Commission views local, something that is already
24 in the Constitution, as opposed to introducing a new
25 term, perhaps to describe something very similar.

1 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay. Let me give you one
2 more example then. We have a compactness criterion, and
3 there is a Constitutional definition relating to not
4 bypassing (inaudible) by populations. Every now and then
5 we look at a particular map and say, well, fix that line
6 over there or fix that -- straighten that out, let's say,
7 or move it down to the south or make some aesthetic
8 adjustment. I don't think that's necessarily a
9 compactness issue. There is no people nearby. It's
10 cleaning up the map. That's not in the constitution
11 either.

12 Now, would anybody sue over that? I doubt it,
13 but, again, it's an example of where there might be some
14 principle that isn't strictly in the Constitution, but
15 the Commissioners are exercising some judgment based on
16 some underlying assumption about what a map ought to look
17 like. And I'm raising the question. Are there --

18 **MR. MILLER:** Well --

19 **COMMISSIONER ARCHETA:** Are these all legitimate,
20 is the question.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think before -- I know --
22 I suspect others are going to raise concerns that you'll
23 have. I'll give you a chance to explain how you view
24 this. So, I'd like to, instead of just engaging more on
25 this, go to Commissioner DiGuilio and then Commissioner

1 Dai.

2 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** My comment kind of goes
3 back to, I think, a question that Peter had raised
4 earlier, but I do just want to say, I think there is a
5 time the conversation before is that we do -- we're
6 applying the Constitutional criteria, but there is times
7 when once we've done all that there is still decisions
8 that have to be made. So, that's where we've had this
9 discussion about share the pain or tiebreakers once
10 everything else has been applied. So, I do think there
11 is a time when we -- as long as we do that consistently,
12 that there will be times where we have to, as a
13 Commission, make that determination.

14 But I think, going back to Peter's original
15 question about having to go back and recreate a lot of
16 the record, I think we're kind of on a tandem path where
17 as we move forward some of these districts may change
18 significantly. So, we have to be very good about
19 documenting about what we're -- the assumptions we're
20 making, how it fits into that criteria. That's partly
21 where those -- the review by the pairing teams has come
22 into play so we could have a head start on that.

23 So, as we move forward -- And then I think there
24 is also an element that, being in communication with Q2,
25 they have done some of this documentation for where we've

1 been. So, for those districts that maybe don't change
2 significantly, we'll be able to add that to the record as
3 well too, and that's something that will be an ongoing
4 aspect for the report, that all that documentation which
5 Q2 is prepared to explain how we have met those
6 Constitutional criterias in each of the maps that we have
7 done. As I understand it, they've had a system in place
8 to be able to do that. So, both in terms of what we've
9 done so far and as we move forward it will be a good
10 point to keep in mind.

11 **MR. MILLER:** You know, just to, I think, affirm
12 what I understood you to say is that each map in each
13 district will be able to stand alone with integrity based
14 on the criteria. And I think that's what you just said,
15 and that's the standard we should seek in these maps.

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Is that -- I'm assuming
17 that's the case.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I don't know if
20 Ms. Henderson would like to --

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, so --

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'd like to see if,
23 Ms. Henderson, we'd -- I'd like her to respond.

24 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yes. We've been keeping notes
25 about the different decision points that are going into

1 the various district configurations.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Commissioner Dai.

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Thank you, Chair. So,
4 Mr. Miller, would it be fair to say that there are
5 actually a number of principles that we've been using
6 that are not explicitly called out in the Constitution.
7 However, most of them, I believe, are related to
8 communities of interest. For example, we have talked
9 about natural boundaries, such as mountain ranges and
10 rivers and, in some cases, freeways. And that's not
11 specifically called out, but I think the Commission
12 recognizes that these things actually help -- are highly
13 correlated to a community of interest. I mean, if you're
14 in a certain kind of topography it defines, in many ways,
15 your community of interest. So, it's really a
16 characteristic of a community of interest. You know,
17 we've also considered things --

18 **MR. MILLER:** I've just -- If I could say, I think
19 that's correct.

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay, good.

21 **MR. MILLER:** To the extent that you're using a
22 river or a freeway as part of the totality of defining
23 the community, I don't feel that's introducing a new
24 principle to the process.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Excellent. So, that's one.

1 The other thing that where I think, and this is maybe
2 where the share the pain concept came up, and that may
3 just have been a very flippant way and a sound bite way
4 for us to explain to the public this idea, but this -- I
5 said this yesterday, that we are dealing with tradeoffs
6 in areas that have very complex, overlapping communities
7 of interest, and, ultimately, we will have to make
8 choices between these communities of interest. And
9 that's all in the same criterion, criteria number four.

10 So, within that criterion, we're having to make
11 choices between different communities of interest, and,
12 you know, what's the basis for our choices, because we
13 talk about having to balance the needs of all
14 Californians, so we've kind of thrown out the share the
15 pain. But the reality is that, depending on the kind of
16 map we're drawing, since we're using a different unit,
17 you know, of analysis for each one, it may be easier or
18 more compatible with other regions for us to keep certain
19 communities of interest whole in a certain configuration
20 of the map. We may not be able to do it in another
21 configuration of the map, but we are keeping a different
22 community of interest whole.

23 So, in all these cases it's not necessarily
24 inconsistent with the application of the ranked
25 constitutional criteria. So, maybe we should be using

1 the term share the pain. But we're, you know -- In
2 effect, we're always balancing these different
3 (inaudible) --

4 **MR. MILLER:** Okay.

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- that are conflicting.

6 **MR. MILLER:** And you are, and that's what makes
7 this hard. And that's where I think you get some
8 deference is making judgments on objective criteria.
9 And, as you describe that process, that sounds like the
10 correct process to me.

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Good.

12 **MR. MILLER:** I think the danger is in describing
13 it differently --

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Describing it as sharing the
15 pain.

16 **MR. MILLER:** -- than what you just described.

17 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

18 **MR. MILLER:** And characterizing it that way.
19 What you described to me is what I think I'm talking
20 about, which is each map on its own has integrity.

21 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

22 **MR. MILLER:** And --

23 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, we should try to describe
24 it in some other way?

25 **MR. MILLER:** Yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We've been kind of using that
2 shorthand way to kind of explain it to the public, but
3 the reality is we're dealing with a different number in
4 each map, and so that allows for us to maintain certain
5 communities in certain maps and not in other maps. But
6 we may be able to maintain a different community in a
7 different map.

8 **MR. MILLER:** Yeah. I think you would be better
9 off describing it to the public as balancing difficult
10 facts and objective factors and trying to reach the best
11 judgment you can on a district by district basis.

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay.

13 **MR. MILLER:** At the end of the day, I think
14 that's what you're doing.

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** That is what we've been trying
16 to do.

17 **MR. MILLER:** And you'd be better off --

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I don't actually think we've
19 been inconsistent about that. You know, we've had to
20 make hard decisions, and we sometimes have spent, you
21 know, an hour and just ended up saying we can't do it.
22 We cannot, you know, maintain this particular community
23 of interest, but, by the way, we were able to maintain
24 these other ones.

25 **MR. MILLER:** That's right. And remember, the

1 Constitution doesn't require you to maintain every
2 community of interest in the manner the public would like
3 it maintained.

4 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

5 **MR. MILLER:** It's hard to tell the people in
6 front of you that it wasn't possible, but, in fact,
7 you're discharging the responsibility correctly in some
8 instances --

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

10 **MR. MILLER:** -- when that occurs.

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, there are two other --
12 there are two other examples I want to give you, and I
13 want to ask if this is, you know -- at what point do we
14 kind of consider the higher mission of really achieving
15 fair representation, which is ultimately what we're
16 about. That is what we're trying to do here, as a
17 Citizens Redistricting Commission.

18 So, there are a couple of factors that I -- two
19 examples I can think of that are, again, not specific
20 principles but items that we've talked about when we've
21 had to make hard choices, particularly in congressional
22 where we have to get, you know, population deviation down
23 to one person. So, one of these is the matter of where
24 do we make the split? Like sometimes we have a choice of
25 where to make the splits. And, for example, we've talked

1 about not splitting very small cities, because they're
2 probably already marginalized because of population, and
3 then if we split them in half or in three then they're
4 completely marginalized in their districts. So, there
5 are sometimes where there is a choice and we choose to
6 split a larger city instead, because we figure they have
7 enough people, you know. They're not going to be happy
8 about being split, but, you know, they at least have a
9 bigger critical mass to be able to do something in their
10 new districts. So, that's kind of, you know, one thing
11 that we've considered.

12 The other thing that I would throw out is we've
13 -- and the public has brought this up. We've considered
14 access to representatives. You know, this was brought up
15 yesterday in terms of this might be related to
16 compactness in terms of, you know, how long it takes to
17 get from one end of the district to another. So, we've
18 considered roads, for example, is there a road there, you
19 know, if we have to add a piece. I think we can probably
20 relate that one to compactness. But I have a question
21 about kind of splitting small cities, which, you know,
22 that's always hard for us to split.

23 **MR. MILLER:** The Constitutional criteria don't
24 tell you what to do about that, but what the whole
25 process asks you to do is to make factual determinations

1 against objective criteria. And baked into that is the
2 assumption that you will make hundreds of individual
3 judgments along the way, the totality of which add up to
4 at least what this Commission views is the best set of
5 maps against objective criteria that can be developed. I
6 think those are simply examples of the kinds of things
7 that inevitably come up, and when treated objectively, as
8 you just described it, for example, we are not linking
9 anything to incumbency or to party registration, that
10 your judgment about what makes sense in that district is
11 the best that anyone can expect to be done.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Do I have any other comments
13 on this? I would like -- Commissioner Ward.

14 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Yeah. In listening to your
15 guys' -- I noticed that you keep using a term objective
16 criteria. And I've struggled with this through the first
17 round of maps because much of the what we call COI
18 testimony, you know, in my opinion, is subjective
19 testimony. And I'm not hearing you address that very
20 well here this morning, as that seems to be one of the
21 biggest sticky points for me. So, I was hoping you could
22 help better define as we're looking at these maps
23 individually. And like Commissioner Dai said, you know,
24 obviously, the objective is fair representation. Not
25 fair by me, but fair by sticking to the criteria that the

1 voters have said they want to see the Commission
2 accomplish. How do you factor in sticking to the
3 objective criteria, but then also factoring in the
4 subjective criteria of COI testimony?

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And can I just add to that?
6 I think this is the heart of the issue. And going back
7 to your example of jury instructions, you have jury
8 instructions, then ultimately you have jurors making
9 decisions about credibility. And that's nowhere in the
10 jury instruction, and that's why you have a jury and not
11 a judge, because you have a jury of your peers,
12 basically. Being asked to apply that law, and taking the
13 testimony, and in a highly subjective way, in a sense,
14 determining the credibility of those who have testified
15 and then applying the law. So, I think we have a similar
16 blend of objective, factual criteria that we're supposed
17 to apply, and then we are the citizens who also have to
18 look at the non-jury instructions, the non-factual
19 criteria that are laid out and decide on its application.

20 And I go back to after the voting rights and the
21 contiguity and the population, the heart of the matter in
22 criteria four, which is the whole section on communities
23 of interest and neighborhoods and socioeconomic, and it
24 ends up saying that this should be for purposes of its
25 effective and fair representation, so that all of this

1 criteria that's not about voting rights, that's not about
2 population, and that makes sure that things are
3 contiguous are all set against a standard of effective
4 and fair representation. And so I see that as being
5 inside the criteria. And, in a sense, that's where we
6 get into some of these decisions that we instinctually, I
7 think, try to deal with. I think we all know that at
8 some level the higher purpose of this is not just
9 rearranging deck chairs by numbers, but that there is the
10 deep policy or the high level policy in all of this is
11 about effective and fair representation, and that's why
12 you're trying to match and keep communities -- like
13 communities together so that their representative
14 represents their interests.

15 So, I guess I would just differ slightly with you
16 that we do have an element that is discretionary that is
17 actually allowed for in the Constitution, because at some
18 point the purpose of all this is for fair and effective
19 representation. And that's the latitude we're given
20 there.

21 **MR. MILLER:** Well, I don't think we're
22 disagreeing, though, in response to both Commissioner
23 Ward and yourself. If I could just stick with the jury
24 analogy for a second, it is up to the jury to judge the
25 credibility of witnesses. Who do you believe and who do

1 you don't? And I think that analogy works pretty well
2 for your public interest testimony, which is just as you
3 were saying. When you get a long line of people coming
4 in who you essentially believe were collected by a
5 representative to protect that person's vested interest
6 in representing a particular area, I think you tend to
7 give that group less credibility than what appears to be
8 a much broader based group of people talking to different
9 aspects of community interest.

10 I'm not trying to take away, in any respect at
11 all, the Commission's discretion to make those kinds of
12 judgments. And the community of interest objective
13 criteria, if you will, is less objective than, let's say,
14 population. You don't have the same discretion with a
15 numerical number. Here you do. You do have discretion.
16 I think the challenge -- I think, in fact, the Commission
17 is using the words, the tests, the descriptors that are
18 contained in number four, and are making the kind of
19 judgments that are contemplated by that right now. I
20 think the only risk is inferring that you're doing
21 something more different than that. But I don't think
22 anybody has really described, other than the share the
23 pain concept, anything that isn't contained in the
24 Constitution now. So, I don't think we're saying
25 anything different.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Other comments? I don't
2 think that this requires a vote or a decision of any
3 kind. I think it is good to I think come out of this
4 with a sort of refocused idea of what we're doing when we
5 are in criteria number four, to remember that probably
6 most of what we do, you know, other than the voting
7 rights act and the population, is in this -- is involved
8 in criteria number four. And I think what would be
9 helpful is if we don't use shorthand when we are doing
10 what we're doing with the individual districts, and,
11 instead, we try as much as possible to relate to this
12 criteria. I think it's actually fairly broad when you
13 look at it, especially with that language about effective
14 and fair representation. We are given, you know,
15 discretion based on -- or discretions led by and
16 supplemented by a lot of public testimony.

17 **MR. MILLER:** Okay. I would also just -- You
18 know, we've talked about this from time to time, but I
19 think it's worth reinforcing because you hear from so
20 many people every evening or every afternoon. And the
21 desire to be responsive to them is substantial and
22 natural. But I think this is the area where a court
23 would also give you the most discretion, having listened
24 to it, digested it, thought about it, reached a
25 determination here in number four. I think you are

1 entitled to and will receive more deference around these
2 decisions, which inevitably means agreeing with some
3 people and disagreeing with others as part of the
4 decision making process.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, unless some other
6 Commissioner wants to discuss this further or seek
7 further clarification, I think this is helpful. It kind
8 of refreshes, you know, our understanding of this area,
9 which is something we talked a lot about in the
10 beginning, and now I think we need to come back to it
11 again with the second set of maps. So, thank you.

12 **MR. MILLER:** Thank you.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. It is 12:20.
14 What I'd like to do now is have Commissioners Galambos-
15 Malloy and Ancheta, and I don't know if this also
16 involved Commissioner Barabba, I leave it up to you guys,
17 how you want to make your presentation now on LA. We're
18 going to start with Los Angeles. We were sent last night
19 some visualizations, and we received them. I think
20 they've been posted on our website. They're public
21 documents. And the purpose here is to see in the
22 congressional districts in Los Angeles whether given the
23 post first draft testimony that we've received, and the
24 previous testimony as well, whether we can help resolve
25 some of the problem areas that were expressed to us by

1 the public or that were first expressed to us as
2 communities of interest in our first round. So, with
3 that, I'm not sure who is taking this.

4 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** If I could just start.
5 And, again, just as a reminder, both to the Commission
6 and the public, what we, as part of a larger task of
7 looking at VRA issues and alternatives to what we put
8 together in the first draft map, we were looking at not
9 Los Angeles County but a number of areas outside this
10 region to look at alternatives for sections two, and look
11 at some section five districts as well. Those will come
12 in due course as we hit the areas. What we wanted to do
13 here, because it does fit in with a more specific
14 discussion we're having this afternoon around LA County,
15 is to highlight the -- what we looked at in LA County.

16 So, one of the concerns that revolves around Los
17 Angeles County in our current district is that there may
18 be a problem of vote dilution that results from packing.
19 And, again, packing is where you have an over-
20 concentration of minority populations within a district
21 where you might be able to have a lower percentage or
22 shift a population to a second or even a third district
23 in order to have -- still have an effective minority,
24 majority population. But, again, you can have more
25 districts rather than fewer.

1 So, the concern with LA County was that in
2 identifying Latino concentrations, looking at the census
3 data, looking at some alternatives, other than offered by
4 groups and individuals in the public, we thought that it
5 would be possible to draw a fourth district and drew some
6 support from some examples that were in other proposals.
7 And the reason we did a visualization, compared to some
8 other parts in the State where we won't have
9 visualizations, is that the ripple effects would be quite
10 significant in trying to do a fourth district.

11 And we started with an initial attempt to draw
12 four based on Latino concentrations, and we thought that
13 could work and we could have -- we would have compact
14 districts that also aligned with various elements of
15 public testimony. And we'll highlight those first, I
16 think. And then as we were doing that, we realized in
17 subsequent meetings that you really had to look beyond
18 that significantly, and there was a lot of other effects
19 that are going on through the region, particularly moving
20 to the -- well, to the northeast. But the ripples go in
21 all directions, actually.

22 So, and I believe -- Excuse me. I need my
23 glasses. And Commissioner Barabba can also bring these
24 in as well. I --

25 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I just want for the

1 members of the public, if I may, just clarification,
2 these are congressional district maps that you have asked
3 Q2 to put together in your working group; is that
4 correct?

5 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Correct.

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay.

7 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** We had an interactive
8 session on Tuesday where we were at Q2's offices and we
9 said, well, can we do a fourth map or a fourth district,
10 rather? We did look again at some other examples where
11 four districts were drawn in this core, four Latino
12 majority districts, and we didn't replicate them. We
13 thought, well, maybe there is a way to do that that would
14 be more compact. And we tried this, which you'll see.
15 And, again, there are a number of ways you can go,
16 actually, but the major question was, can you actually
17 have a fourth district so that you wouldn't have a
18 packing problem? That's the basic idea here. And we
19 thought, yes, you could, and that would relieve the
20 packing problem.

21 And we felt, and this was also done with, you
22 know, obviously, Gibson Dunn has been in consultation
23 with us, that these districts, by themselves, would work
24 as section two districts. And, again, there are other
25 sources of support for drawing them these ways. Again,

1 there are -- and there was some attempt to create
2 visualization in the surrounding districts, but we need
3 to focus on these four to make sure that they make sense,
4 because if they don't make sense then we shouldn't worry
5 about ripples, because the ripples are irrelevant at this
6 point.

7 But the -- just to highlight, one of the bigger
8 changes was trying to move -- Let me start with -- Back
9 up a second. The districts that are fairly close to what
10 we have in the first draft are the Pico Rivera Whittier
11 Area. We created more of the fourth district by looking
12 at changes in what's the Compton Carson District, and
13 then what is sort of the downtown moving into East LA,
14 Boyle Heights Area. So, if you look at that, we
15 basically tried to create a majority Latino District
16 where we didn't have one before for downtown. And the
17 Southern -- like the Compton District is the one where we
18 pulled in additional population to the west and south.

19 One thing we did -- in this particular
20 visualization, we did not include Wilmington. There is a
21 sizable Latino population in Wilmington. That's another
22 place you could look that would be less compact. So,
23 that's another way to look at it. The other thing to
24 note is that I think we're only at 48 percent CVAP on
25 this Compton one, the lower southwest one. If you

1 included Wilmington, you could definitely go above the 50
2 percent mark. I think that's a choice one could make.
3 There may be a compactness issue because of the distance
4 and whether there are clear linkages between minority
5 communities within the district.

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I'm sorry. I have
7 one question before you get into some of those specific
8 details. I just want to have a better understanding of
9 your underlying premise for the manner in which you have
10 drawn. So, you had mentioned before that you were trying
11 to unpack some of the districts. I don't have a specific
12 recollection off the top of my head as to us having a
13 problem with a potential packed congressional district in
14 Los Angeles, but so I just want to understand what the
15 underlying premise is for drawing these four districts,
16 and if you were trying to look to see if there was a
17 section two area for Latinos in Los Angeles, and if that
18 was on advice of counsel. Because I don't -- obviously,
19 I don't recall us getting any list of their
20 recommendations under section two on a congressional
21 level in Los Angeles, even though it's not an issue that
22 we're ignoring, of course. And so I just want to
23 understand your underlying premise for the districts that
24 you've created here before we get into an analysis of
25 whether it matches with COI testimony or whether we might

1 have to consider a vote on these districts if we can have
2 the underlying basis for the work that you've done here.

3 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Sure. And these are
4 assumptions that were made all throughout the State in
5 terms of looking at alternatives and whether there might
6 be vote dilution either by what's known as cracking or
7 fragmentation, and then packing or over-concentrations.
8 So, we did have a conversation with Mr. Brown regarding
9 LA County, and he gave the go ahead to try to look at
10 this, in other words (inaudible) approve these. They're
11 looking at these now over the internet, but to simply try
12 to explore whether we could try to unpack. And
13 unfortunately I don't have my notes in front of me of the
14 actual CVAPs for the first draft congressional or if Q2
15 has them.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, this is why I had asked
17 staff to hand out this packet, that I know is not very --
18 it's kind of gray and not defined, but it has our
19 districts that we drew with the CVAP, and that was my
20 hope is that we could use those as comparison to inform
21 this conversation.

22 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Again, if someone does
23 pull them up, I'll keep talking. Let's just say they
24 were significantly higher with three districts rather
25 than four, particularly, I think, in the Pico Rivera

1 Whittier Area. So, given that high percentage we thought
2 we could shift things around a bit. And, again, there
3 are multiple ways you can do this. So, and, again, we
4 were trying to align that with some community of interest
5 and other testimony that linked particular cities or
6 groups of cities together. And the downtown area, again,
7 was an area where I think in the first draft we hadn't
8 really tried to think about that as forming a potential
9 section two district. So, if you unpacked the most dense
10 area, you would go to another area of less densely packed
11 Latino populations, and you could -- Again, when you got
12 to the end of the day, you could get closer to 50 percent
13 or so.

14 Now, you're still actually pretty high in some of
15 these areas, but you -- in essence, you've run out of
16 populations to unpack to. In other words, you don't know
17 where to go at that point, and you sort of go, well,
18 there is a very high Asian population there. You could
19 try to unpack in that direction. You could move towards
20 the east. As you move toward the east, you're going to
21 have another area where you're going to start butting up
22 against another Latino concentration, so that's another
23 issue regarding the Inland Empire.

24 Anyway, those are the underlying assumptions that
25 we made.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. Thank you.

2 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** And, again, there are --
3 I'm sure there are many combinations here I think one
4 could draw.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Ward.

6 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** I think just to follow up on
7 Commissioner Filkins-Webber's question that would help me
8 is, so was a determination made by Mr. Brown that we had
9 a packing problem that needed to be addressed? I'm just
10 wondering, I'm hearing words like packing and cracking
11 and all that, and I'm wondering is our VRA lawyers made a
12 determination that these are issues with our first draft
13 that need to be addressed?

14 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** There are general
15 concerns, including packing, about Los Angeles County at
16 all levels that were expressed. So --

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I have just a couple of
18 comments. One, I think putting aside for now the packing
19 issue, one thing I know that was of great concern to me
20 after hearing a lot of testimony and reading a lot of
21 testimony was looking at our criteria number four was
22 that downtown district that we had that ran from Pico
23 Union to Beverly Hills and Pacific Palisades. So, I
24 think there was no doubt in my mind that we had to do
25 something with that congressional district. So, and

1 really, both for the sake of the folks on the more
2 coastal regions, we heard from them, and we heard from
3 the folks in the downtown Pico Union Area that we had
4 really misapplied the number four criteria.

5 So, I know that one of the hopes I had that the
6 team would look at was what that area -- Now, when you
7 pull back and you just start looking at that, trying to
8 address communities of interest, I think you do get into
9 a situation where you have, if you look at this map and
10 you look at the density levels, you have both a
11 population density and then, obviously, you have high
12 groups of -- a high concentration of Latinos. So, to me,
13 looking at the issue of representation, I worry once you
14 have -- I do look at -- I don't know what counsel said,
15 but I am concerned if we have -- if we don't look at this
16 and look at the neighborhoods, and try and really not
17 just put people together but actually try and put people
18 in the neighborhoods that they discuss with us.

19 If that turns into unpacking, so be it, but I
20 really think that we have -- that's one of the things we
21 have to do in LA is really look carefully at how we deal
22 with existing long established neighborhoods, and you
23 can't, in a sense, do that without unpacking, is my sense
24 of LA. You can't just have sort of lines that look
25 always compact or whatever. You have to look at some of

1 these neighborhoods.

2 I do have some concerns about this map, not
3 because of -- I like the way that LA, the downtown area
4 has shifted. I do have some concerns here, and I do
5 appreciate the Long Beach District, because I think we
6 got a lot of testimony about Compton and Carson, and I
7 don't think this includes Signal Hill, which was in the
8 testimony. Maybe it does. But I know that Compton,
9 Carson, Long Beach was something we heard a lot about.
10 So, I think that's very helpful there as well. I think
11 in our previous district it didn't look like that, and we
12 had also put Southgate in with Inglewood, which we had a
13 lot of testimony, again, from both different communities,
14 saying that they would prefer not to be together, that
15 there was not that much of a relationship.

16 Well, I just want to say, do people have -- I am
17 going to -- I want to make sure, do people have -- we got
18 sent to us last night the dropbox files with this. So,
19 if it's not on the screen, you should be able to have it
20 up on your computer, everything we're talking about, just
21 to double check on that. So, the only other thing I
22 would say, and we can get back to this discussion, on
23 this visualization I am concerned that we got a lot of
24 testimony about the cities in the southeast LA. And I am
25 familiar with this area, very much so, because of work

1 that I do at the community foundation. And I know that
2 the last redistricting they were split up tremendously
3 because bits and pieces of them were taken to sort of
4 create very gerrymanderic districts down in that area,
5 and we've now again split them into three in this map,
6 and I am going to want to, you know, probably deal with
7 that maybe today.

8 But those are my observations, really, on -- I
9 don't know how much of it was unpacking, but I can tell
10 you that I think we've solved a couple of big issues that
11 we got a lot of public testimony about, which was that
12 downtown area and that Long Beach Area.

13 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** So, if I could just
14 interject, because I think just to make sure the
15 Commission and the public were clear on what we were
16 doing versus what the discussion (inaudible) revolve
17 around, which is -- I don't think we want to actually get
18 around to drawing districts, but we tried to, again,
19 identify the possibility of or avoid any section two vote
20 dilution problems by trying to see if it could be done.
21 We think it can be done, but, again, there are -- And I
22 think Commissioner Galambos-Malloy can highlight some of
23 the adjacent districts.

24 We think we can address the unpacking problem
25 here, but the full Commission -- And, again, there are

1 variations that one can work with. But the Commission
2 will have to, in a more general way, focus on the region
3 and try to figure out how all this works. But we feel
4 that this is a good way to try to at least address what
5 would be a likely section to problem by trying to go from
6 three districts to four districts.

7 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Commissioner Blanco, this
8 is Commissioner Forbes down here.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

10 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I was in the
11 queue.

12 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Oh, I didn't see you.

13 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Okay. All right.
14 So, I'm in the queue because I wanted to provide a little
15 bit more of the ripple effects and the kind of tradeoffs
16 that we started to see that were happening in the
17 immediately adjacent areas. And I will -- I guess I'll
18 start kind of north going to northwest. We used, in
19 order to just kind of go through this exercise, we used
20 both the first round COI, the second round COI, pre-map
21 and post-map, both for the testimony from the hearings
22 that we've had, and then the voluminous written comments
23 that we've been getting, which in some places conflicted.
24 And I'll talk about some of those tradeoffs.

25 I think one of the things I would say on the

1 front end is that both on the west side of LA and in the
2 San Gabriel Mountains, we have been getting comments, and
3 I'm sure we'll get into these more later when we talk
4 regionally, that the general concepts around
5 environmental communities of interest related to the
6 foothills and related to the beach cities, they had some
7 validity, but we essentially took the concepts too far.
8 For example, in the foothill mountains, we tried to
9 create a foothill district, but really at the expense of
10 the cities, and we saw too many city splits. And so
11 we're going to need to explore some other options there.
12 There may be foothills districts, but shorter east to
13 west and longer north to south so we actually get closer
14 to some of those main transportation corridors like the
15 210 or the 10.

16 On the west side of Los Angeles I think we heard
17 something similar, particularly as it related to Santa
18 Monica and to Venice, that really if we're thinking about
19 doing some sort of a beach cities corridor that we went
20 too far north with those southern areas. So, if you look
21 at the area, let's take a peek at the Inglewood District.
22 We heard really overwhelming COI testimony on the post-
23 map front regarding this connection between Inglewood and
24 some of the adjacent cities for economic development
25 reasons, for the airport being seen as a transportation

1 and job generator for Inglewood, Hawthorne, Gardena,
2 Westchester, Lennox, Westmont. The public testimony was
3 overwhelmingly in favor for some sort of paring there,
4 more east west. I think before we had cut off -- you
5 know, Westchester was not in any sort of a district,
6 references to noise and air pollution, light rail that's
7 being extended on that east to west corridor, etcetera.

8 So, again, the purpose is just to kind of explore
9 some of the things we've heard, and does it work in terms
10 of populations and communities of interest? So, what we
11 tried to do was to pair, again, these communities of
12 interest that had come up and really take a step back
13 from some of these southern beach cities, and group them
14 in a way that they actually made sense based on the COI.
15 So, as you get down farther into the south bay coastal
16 area, we have COI that Torrance should be paired with
17 Palos Verdes, beach cities, Lomita, Rolling Hills and
18 Estates.

19 Now, in this visualization we still have the
20 ports, both ports in this district. That is definitely
21 not, I think, what the COI suggests, but really the
22 purpose is to look at kind of these coastal pairings and
23 whether they make sense. We did group the Compton,
24 Carson and Northwest Long Beach Area together. It does
25 not, at this point, include Signal Hill. I think there

1 is definitely COI there to support that. Again, that was
2 based on educational institutions. They have economic
3 transportation ties, socioeconomics. They mentioned some
4 challenges in the area regarding gangs and city policies
5 regarding how to address that. And so, that kind of
6 influenced this grouping.

7 I think it's interesting to go back and really
8 review the COI in detail, because in the pre-map hearings
9 that we had and public comment, we really heard keep Long
10 Beach whole. And the post-map comment has been
11 overwhelmingly -- and there was some of this, but to a
12 lesser extent in the first round, Long Beach really is a
13 tale of two cities, and West Long Beach, particularly
14 Northwest Long Beach, is very different from East Long
15 Beach and moving over towards the Orange County Area.

16 So, some of the tradeoffs that we can begin to
17 see, I think it was challenging as we were looking at
18 this coastal area. Torrance is a city that has been -- I
19 think is one that could go either way. We've gotten COI
20 that both pulls it up towards the north and that pulls it
21 down to the south. Torrance as a city, the city
22 boundaries actually take it all the way west to the
23 ocean. And the way that I explored this was to actually,
24 if we're creating a coastal district, to use PCH as a
25 kind of boundary around Torrance to maintain the

1 contiguity of that coastal area. I think it's a
2 challenge. We're going to have to look at that and
3 figure out what to do.

4 The COI has also been overwhelming in support of
5 having San Pedro attached wholly to the port, and
6 figuring out what district we want the LA Port to be
7 connected to. I think that's one step, and then the Long
8 Beach Port. But you can begin to see there are pieces of
9 this that seem to work well and naturally, and pieces
10 that, you know, we have to weigh. For example,
11 Wilmington, I think it could go a couple of directions,
12 and as you get down in that southwest corner, as well,
13 you only have so much population to work with. So, I
14 don't know if Commissioner would have anything to add.

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah. And just to note, I
16 think in some alternatives we looked at they would --
17 they did include Wilmington. I think we looked at a
18 Wilmington variation. Again, it could -- it's another
19 way to go. I'd simply note that. But, again, there is
20 some issues around compactness if you go that far south
21 and whether the populations. Again, they don't have to
22 be contiguous, but there is a general compactness issue,
23 and you want to make sure that the voting interests have
24 aligned in terms of the, you know, polarized voting
25 analysis.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Yao.

2 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** During very early testimonies,
3 before we released the map, the --

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm sorry. No, no, no. I
5 have Stan, Commissioner Forbes and Commissioner DiGuilio.
6 Sorry. It's really hard to look down the all the way, so
7 you're going to have to help me. Commissioner Forbes.
8 Sorry.

9 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Yeah, just a couple. One
10 question, this was just an add question, you put the --
11 In this map you put both ports in one district?

12 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** And I referred to
13 that, that that was not the long term intention, that we
14 -- to make some --

15 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** That's where we are?
16 That's where we are now?

17 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** -- decisions of,
18 you know --

19 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Okay.

20 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Again, we were
21 wanting to explore options, but knowing we, as a
22 Commission, need to look at all these pieces and decide
23 what directions we wanted to go. So, I think, you know,
24 clearly we need -- My sense from the COI is that we do
25 need to divide up the ports, and which districts we

1 connect them to is the next question we need to answer.

2 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Okay. My two original
3 questions were, if you have this, I could probably
4 calculate it myself, but you might know it offhand, how
5 much packing have we actually undone by this set of maps?
6 What were the previous numbers and what numbers do we end
7 up with? How much benefit are we getting, is, I guess,
8 the question? That's my question.

9 The second question is, in these new potential
10 districts, what has been the impact on the African
11 American population? I mean, have we -- And I don't know
12 this, but have we diluted the African American population
13 to the extent that they've been marginalized?

14 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Well, I'll weigh
15 in with the parts that I feel most comfortable with. I
16 would say that in the Inglewood District and in the
17 Compton/Carson District, those are areas where the, you
18 know, very preliminary groupings overwhelmingly reflect
19 the COI, which, in the case of our hearings that we've
20 had in that area, has largely been coming from the
21 African American Community. I think another area that we
22 need to explore further that may have an impact on the
23 African American Community is the area around Culver
24 City, and so that may be something that Commissioner
25 Parvenu would want to weigh in on. That is an area that

1 I did not, and the other Commissioners involved in this
2 exercise, that we did not focus on specifically.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner DiGuilio.

4 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I just -- I guess I kind
5 of have a step back question here in terms of the process
6 as we're moving forward with these visualizations,
7 because I'm trying to balance with now that we have this
8 information how are we going to move forward in our line
9 drawing with this, whether we -- you know, do we just
10 take these and work with them? Do we have to wait to get
11 our VRA counsel officially weighed in? I feel like had
12 they been at these -- had they been at these meetings
13 they could have already had something to say about them.

14 But I guess part of the -- and the other aspect
15 of that is where are we going to go with them from here?
16 But the other thing is going back to Commissioner Blanco.
17 I'd also like some additional direction with where these
18 falls in terms of the requirement for us to draw these
19 for section two versus the -- you know, being respectful
20 to COI testimony, and how we can balance those, because I
21 guess I'm looking at this in terms of section two as a
22 higher issue on the criteria for us. So, to the extent
23 -- How much can we incorporate the COI testimony and
24 still meet the criteria of section two, because, you
25 know, there is a lot of COI testimony.

1 Let's say the Central Valley, for example, where
2 some of the areas don't want to be grouped the way they
3 are, but based on section two issues, we can't respect
4 all COI testimony and meet the obligations of the VRA,
5 whether it's section five or section two, for that
6 matter? So, I guess I'm looking for some balance as to
7 as we move forward with this, how much ability will we
8 have to be able to incorporate COI testimony to change
9 these districts, or are we kind of set with what they
10 have to be in order to meet the section two requirements?

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Yao and then
12 Commissioner Barabba.

13 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** As Michelle said, the VRA is a
14 much, much higher priority than the community of
15 interest, and we just simply don't want to draw districts
16 around strictly the VRA if it doesn't, to some extent,
17 satisfy the community of interest. In other words, if it
18 totally violates the community of interest, then we may
19 want to take a second look at it. But in terms of now
20 having the information on the -- on the potential, I
21 mean, don't call it a section two, but what else can I
22 call it? Because it hasn't been declared as a section
23 two. I think we need to explore it until such time that
24 we find it not to be -- not to be the case.

25 The original remark that I was going to make was

1 the 710 corridor was one of these community of interest,
2 saying that they want a say in terms of where the traffic
3 coming out of the port impacting their community. But,
4 again, that's strictly based on a community of interest
5 as compared to a section two requirement. So, I think
6 for the time being I can't see any other way out of there
7 saying foregoing that and resolve the potential section
8 two issue. Otherwise, we're not following the criteria
9 that have been given to us.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Barabba.

11 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Yes. My feeling on these
12 -- this effort that was put forward is that, again, these
13 are visualizations that give an indication of what could
14 become section two districts. That does not mean those
15 are hard lines. That's just simply a visualization of
16 it. So, the COI testimony, in essence, related to these
17 could change those -- the way those lines were drawn, and
18 but as long as we realize that when you start changing
19 the lines you just kind of keep your eyes on the numbers
20 as to whether which one is -- and we know which one has
21 to prevail, which is the VRA. And at that point you
22 could actually do a better job of listening than to the
23 COI on top of that. But it's in the priority in which
24 they're presented, which I think is the value of these
25 visualizations.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm going to ask you to be
2 honest here, because I can't see the order. So,
3 Commissioner Filkins-Webber, then who else is down here?
4 I need your help, Commissioner Yao. Yeah. Okay. So,
5 hold on. Raya, Aguirre. Who is down there? Parvenu?

6 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Parvenu. Okay.
8 Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

9 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Thank you. I'm a
10 little concerned about this. I think this answers a lot
11 of questions, and some of these lines might very well be
12 based on some COI. What my concern is is that even -- we
13 need to think about what our attorneys have told us about
14 what really constitutes a section two, because -- And
15 Commissioner Angelo, you certainly can answer this
16 question for me. Because if these areas don't have a
17 history of racially polarized voting in the districts,
18 then we really don't have a section two, which then calls
19 into question of why we're drawing them other than for a
20 concentration of a Latino population because we've heard
21 threats from MALDEF that we're not creating enough,
22 quote, unquote, Latino districts.

23 So, I just want us to just pull back for a little
24 bit and just say, okay, are we -- has Gibson Dunn looked
25 at this to say bring in Mr. Barretto to actually do a

1 racially polarized voting analysis so that these could be
2 districts that we should identify as section two so we
3 could have them in there, and then we can make all of the
4 other decisions around it.

5 But certainly we had some testimony of community
6 of interest between some of these areas, but I just want
7 to make sure that we're -- I think we're walking a fine
8 line here. I just want to make sure that if we -- based
9 on your review of the community input if that we're just
10 taking a look at this for, you know, maybe a possibility
11 of the section two if Barretto is supposed to do it. But
12 otherwise, I really just want to make sure that this
13 meeting and the description of these districts is based
14 on what you understand to be solid community of interest
15 testimony or robust testimony, as Mr. Brown has
16 recommended, rather than just being looking at the
17 certain population of different ethnicities.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. I'm going to --
19 I have -- Yes, I'm going to let Mr. Ancheta --
20 Commissioner Ancheta answer this, but then I'm going to
21 go back to the order.

22 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Right. So, to directly
23 answer the question, we got a signal from Dr. Barretto
24 based on his -- what he knows about existing research,
25 both some of his research and others that he is aware of,

1 that even without having done the studies that he's
2 working on now to complete, that there is evidence of
3 polarized voting in Los Angeles County against Latino --
4 involving Latino voting. But, but, and this is the issue
5 of course, if we wait this is a problem because of the
6 timing of everything. We can say, no, there isn't, until
7 we find out there is, and then we go with it, or we can
8 work on certain assumptions.

9 One assumption, which -- and this is what I asked
10 him as we were setting the (inaudible) is give me
11 something to work with, because the Commission has said
12 do we go forward -- given the timing of this can we go
13 forward, at least, or should we just hold back and wait
14 until you give us studies. His sense was that for at
15 least for LA County in this core there is literature out
16 there and analyses that have been done that would suggest
17 that --

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** In this core?

19 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** In this core, yeah, the
20 Latino core of Los Angeles County. I think we'll get --
21 we have to get more, obviously, in the next week or so,
22 but do we have the study in front of us? No. Do we have
23 to kind of take a risk a bit in terms of our timing and
24 what we need to work on as assumptions? Yes. I think
25 what I heard from him was enough to say, well, let's at

1 least try to work on this and see if -- You know, we can
2 drop these altogether, if you think --

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, I didn't know
4 what he said.

5 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah, he said he'd get --
6 And I think I mentioned this at an earlier meeting, but
7 when Mr. Brown and I first talked with Dr. Barretto about
8 the schedule and the need to actually hit certain
9 timelines, we needed to know, given that we wouldn't have
10 anything until the 30th at the earliest, well, can we just
11 go ahead with things, because otherwise we're stuck until
12 the 30th on a lot of these districts. And the signal was,
13 yes, there is. He's going to work on it some more. But
14 I think as a working assumption we should say that there
15 is -- that element is there.

16 The other thing to note, and, again, some of
17 these numbers are high, and I think a lot of what's going
18 on here also involves some attempt to look at community
19 of interest testimony. And there are, of course, our
20 specialists who have been looking closely at it. You
21 know, where we looked at certain areas, you know, toward
22 the north and towards the east and towards the south,
23 those percentages can easily change to go down certainly,
24 and we want to just sort of put these out there for the
25 Commission and the folks who really have taken a deep

1 look at the testimony kind of confirmed these things.

2 And there may be inconsistencies or maybe we just
3 got it wrong because we hadn't looked at the most recent
4 database. So, we're hoping that can be filled. Because
5 I think that -- I'm still thinking the numbers are still
6 too high on a number of the districts, and we should try
7 to address that.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Raya,
9 Commissioner Aguirre and then Commissioner Parvenu.

10 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Okay. I hope this is close
11 enough. Looking at these visualizations, I think, has
12 provided an opportunity to see where some very necessary
13 corrections have been made based on COI testimony. And
14 I'm looking at notes from conversation with Mr. Brown at
15 a time when COI testimony was still relatively broad.
16 And he talked about the fact that communities may
17 overlap. And as we got more testimony, areas like what
18 you're looking at here could be defensible because they
19 can be clearly grounded in COI testimony, and just a lot
20 of factors that common sense and familiarity with LA
21 County would tell you. So, whether you want to hang your
22 hat on section two or not, it doesn't change the fact
23 that all these people live there and share, you know, a
24 number of economic, social, educational, transportation,
25 environmental issues. I think, you know, whether this is

1 the ultimate map or not, you know, anything close to it I
2 think is very defensible.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Aguirre and
4 then Commissioner Parvenu.

5 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** Yes. Thank you, Chair.
6 My observations are that, once again, that there were --
7 there are clearly some issues of packing or violation --
8 a VRA violation of packing as in some of the maps that we
9 have drawn. So, I think that's part of the reason that
10 motivated the direction to this team to look at some
11 potential modifications to accommodate the neighborhoods
12 in this particular area. I recall Mr. Brown telling us
13 that certainly COI testimony was very important in
14 drawing districts, but that there were other things
15 besides COI testimony that included looking at other
16 sources of data on a neighborhood level on the census
17 track level that would indicate the density of particular
18 ethnicities living in particular areas.

19 As Ms. Raya just point out, last week, as I
20 deliberately drove through these neighborhoods last week,
21 and it was clear to me that they're primarily low income
22 areas. Looking at the signage, there was Spanish
23 speaking areas. There were transportation corridors and
24 bus lines that operated within these areas. So, there
25 were a lot of social needs and other structural factors

1 that indicated to me that these were -- that these were
2 cohesive communities that needed representation in their
3 own right. So, thank you.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Parvenu.

5 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Hi. This is the area I'm
6 most familiar with, so I wanted to comment on a few
7 things. First of all, I think it's a considerable
8 improvement from what we've seen before, and I agree with
9 the Chair, Chair Blanco, that getting rid of that broad
10 west to east district truly changed the appearance
11 considerably, and it cost us to make other decisions
12 around it.

13 I have so concerns, though, with the district
14 that's northwest. I have some concerns about the
15 (inaudible) Park, Baldwin Hills Area being mixed with
16 Brentwood and Malibu and some of those communities, but
17 the one thing they do have in common is broad open space
18 areas. For example, the Topanga Canyon Area in Pacific
19 Palisades, Highlands, that area, there is the Cheviot
20 Recreation Park in West Los Angeles, a large open space
21 area. And, of course, you have the Baldwin Hills and the
22 Kenneth Hahn Park that's all in the same district, as
23 well as the Balloona Marshlands and Wetlands down by
24 Marina del Ray. So, a strong environmental candidate has
25 those -- that's a very strong area in terms of

1 environmental issues and concerns.

2 But in terms of socioeconomic comparisons, it's
3 broadly diverse. You have primarily a Caucasian
4 population in the Northwest Area. You have a pretty
5 affluent area there with Beverly Hills, of course, mixed
6 with an affluent -- relatively affluent area of the
7 Baldwin Hills and View Park and Windsor Hills Area, an
8 affluent African American Area. To the southeast of that
9 district you have a less affluent area of Latinos and
10 African Americans mixed in what could be -- I'll call it
11 what it is, South Central, a portion of South Central Los
12 Angeles and the Crenshaw District. So, that area has its
13 tradeoffs.

14 But to the South, in terms of tradeoffs, I think
15 it's a vast improvement, according to COI testimony, that
16 Westchester and LAX was included with that Inglewood
17 District. Because, as we know, there is a lot of
18 developing along that Century Boulevard corridor. So, I
19 think that's been appropriately addressed. Let's see.

20 And Westchester also, there is a difference
21 between Westchester to the south and Marina del Ray to
22 the north. There is actually an incline that the
23 elevation is actually different. As soon as you travel
24 north and south along Lincoln Boulevard it's apparent
25 that there is a difference. So, that's been addressed.

1 And Torrance and to the south, and Lennox, I
2 think that's a good blend. I think that I still have
3 some concerns to the south as we go further south about
4 the port area, as well as the Alameda corridor. And the
5 question is, I guess, is is that area better represented
6 by one strong congressional advocate, meaning the port,
7 both the ports, Long Beach and LA's Port, or is it better
8 represented by two strong congressional advocates?

9 Same with the Alameda Corridor. There is
10 certainly environmental issues and transportation and
11 congestion issues traveling north and south from
12 Wilmington and San Pedro. We've heard a lot of
13 testimony, COI testimony from San Pedro about keeping it
14 whole, and they're intricately involved with the port
15 from a business perspective, but from a residential
16 perspective, San Pedro has a lot in common with Rolling
17 Hills and Palos Verdes Estates. So, from a cultural and
18 human geographic perspective they have a lot in common
19 with the west, but from an environmental perspective, a
20 physical geographical perspective, there is strength with
21 San Pedro with the corridor from north to south.

22 So, that's a consideration that we'll need to
23 make some consideration as to what to do with those
24 ports, the LA Port and the Long Beach Port. Do we split
25 them in half, two congressional representatives, or do we

1 have it remain as it is and have one? And I'm pleased to
2 see that Northwest Long Beach has been placed in the
3 district that's with Carson. That's a good mix. And
4 we've heard them and we've answered and we've responded.
5 So, I think that's an improvement from what we've seen
6 earlier.

7 Still, there is an issue with if we make any
8 considerable changes to the southern area, this coastal
9 area, that's going to cause, again, Commissioner Ancheta
10 is absolutely right, a ripple effect with the southeast
11 cities. And as a former Southeast Area team planner for
12 the MTA, I know that these cities have very strong bonds
13 and ties with Chamber of Commerce meetings, interactions.
14 There is even coalitions that -- It's a longstanding
15 relationships that those southeast cities have. And I'm
16 not quite sure if we adjust this further or sharing -- I
17 won't say sharing the pain any longer, but if they've
18 been divided in the past and it appears that some of
19 those cities that have close relations have --

20 The question is, if this is going to be the
21 vision, is this the less painful division, I mean, if
22 there must be a division? Can other alliances -- can
23 they still -- it looks like congressional -- that area
24 has three congressional representatives. Does that
25 strengthen the region or does it make it weaker? That's

1 ultimately the question. Downey is kept whole. We've
2 heard that Downey wanted to be kept whole. Norwalk seems
3 to be whole, and some of the other cities. We kept Watts
4 and Willowbrook whole.

5 And I would like to, at some point, we don't have
6 to take the time to do it now, but at some point could
7 you zoom in so I could see exactly where the streets are.
8 Again, I don't want to take too much time to do this now.
9 This is not the time to go through this exercise, but I
10 would like to, at some point, see exactly where these
11 streets are so I could use my expertise working with
12 neighborhood counsels and counsel offices in other cities
13 to see exactly where these lines are, to see exactly what
14 streets they are on. In fact, let's go right there to --

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Ward -- I'm
16 going to stop you.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay. All right.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I don't want to get into
19 that level of detail today --

20 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay. Okay.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- Parvenu, because I think
22 that's -- What we're trying to do is capture some of
23 these larger -- I think, you know, we can go back and we
24 can say, okay, you know, let's work on this. But this is
25 sort of --

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right, right.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- trying to look at whether
3 we've been able to capture some of the testimony. I
4 don't want to get into that --

5 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right, right.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- fine grained analysis,
7 please.

8 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes, yes. I agree. The
9 only reason I say that is because earlier when we had
10 iterations and visualizations, we split like Thai Town,
11 and --

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

13 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** -- all we had to do was go
14 two blocks up and would have avoided that.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

16 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** So, our comment would have
17 been -- from the public would have been totally
18 different.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm going to take one more
20 round on LA, including myself in the queue, and then
21 hopefully we can move on. Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

22 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Just a few
23 highlights of areas of concern. If you could just pull
24 -- I guess go down and pull back a little bit, just so we
25 could see the area. My one area of concern, I see that

1 you have Artesia in there, and I was wondering, just
2 looking at a swap of colors, if there might be some
3 ability to keep Artesia and Cerritos together. And I
4 think if you went closer to the top part of Montebello
5 you might be able to do an even swap there, because I'm
6 still concerned with that COI testimony.

7 The other interesting idea, if you pull back to
8 the ports, if you split that coastal area, just as a
9 potential general idea for direction, I mean, we haven't
10 really talked about -- we've said we probably don't think
11 that having both ports in there would be good, but I
12 think we might get into a population problem on the Palos
13 Verdes side, which we might have to consider maybe
14 splitting a little bit of Torrance.

15 But one idea, because we are going to crunch Long
16 Beach to the east, is if we do have to cross that county
17 line -- Based on the testimony, and my familiarity with
18 the area as well, we had received a lot of testimony from
19 Los Alamitos and Rossmoor that wish to stay in Orange
20 County. Seal Beach is very connected. You see all those
21 little inlets right there? I mean, there is all kinds of
22 piers and restaurants. I mean, the two between there,
23 Seal Beach and Long Beach, right in that area, might be
24 some idea that if we needed to pick up some additional
25 population from Orange County, which the ripple effect is

1 we might be able to save Dana Point and try to pull up
2 San Clemente and San Juan Capistrano in the larger
3 picture to keep them in an Orange County -- South Orange
4 County district.

5 So, this really does have an impact potentially
6 on trying to maybe move up those other cities, if we can
7 push a little bit. So, that's just a general concept
8 that I wanted to raise as we're looking about splitting
9 the port. But that other issue is going to be to the
10 west with Torrance.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm going to put myself in
12 the queue. I just want to address some of the concerns
13 about why we're doing this. And I want to refer to back
14 to two of our maps before that I think one I've
15 mentioned, and Commissioner Parvenu has mentioned,
16 created a lot of the problems that we got that resulted
17 in a lot of the criticism that we received about dilution
18 of vote by Latinos. And one I've addressed, which is the
19 downtown that stretched out, and basically, you know,
20 took -- put two communities that had nothing to do
21 together. And in the process of doing so diluted the
22 Latino vote, which is a section two concept. It's not
23 just a concept of maximizing districts. The concept of
24 dilution is a section two concept, and I believe that our
25 maps were very vulnerable in that area when we connected

1 people (inaudible) to Beverly Hills.

2 The other area that I think had caused us
3 problems is we had a district, and this goes to the sort
4 of the -- I don't know if you want to call it packing,
5 but we had a district that because we took that downtown
6 district and went all the way west, we then had a
7 district that started way up in the valley, Glendale,
8 went out to South Pasadena, bordered Monterey Park, took
9 in some of downtown and went down to Southgate. It was a
10 very district that ended up being population was 71
11 percent Latino, and CVAP was 57, almost 56 percent. I
12 think that putting that district in two districts,
13 exactly what the Commissioners did, and I really think
14 that makes a difference. We have talked about trying to
15 have compactness, and we really had put a lot of voters
16 in that district that really could make up two districts.

17 And I just want to say that just because MALDEF
18 pointed out something doesn't mean they're wrong. In
19 fact, they know this area very well. We may have
20 concerns about other parts of their maps they submitted,
21 but I submit to you that they know Los Angeles extremely
22 well and know those communities extremely well, and that
23 we actually had put communities together that, one,
24 didn't belong together, and, two, we had put some
25 districts and over concentrated Latinos, and in doing so

1 actually diminished the number of elected
2 representatives, not for just Latino representatives.
3 These communities then had less representatives for their
4 communities of interest, because it's not all one
5 community from -- you know, from where we had it all the
6 way down to the beginning of Southgate. So, I think that
7 having adjusted that very large district we did that was
8 very packed, and having adjusted that downtown has really
9 created both a situation where we have more
10 representation for more communities. We've kept
11 communities of interest where they should be.

12 And my only concern, really, is, one, is the
13 ports. I don't believe that two ports should be
14 together. I like the fact we've put San Pedro together,
15 and that we've put Wilmington and San Pedro with the
16 port, because a lot of the people work there. I am very
17 concerned about the southeast cities. I have looked at
18 this area on the map. I did my own little calculations.
19 It is so densely concentrated there that I think you
20 could do some swaps that keep together communities of
21 interest, like you could put, you know -- I don't want to
22 get into it, but, you know, there is things with
23 Southgate and Bell and Maywood, you know, that could at
24 least keep larger portions of the southeast cities
25 together instead of splitting them in three. And it's so

1 dense there that I think you could do it and minimize the
2 splits there. But I think this represents a big
3 improvement from what we had in terms of giving more
4 representation to more communities and cleaning it up.

5 Do you want to have more conversation? Do we
6 want to go into the part of LA that's the San Gabriel
7 Valley or San Fernando? Yes? No?

8 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Yeah, we could go
9 north.

10 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Break.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Break? Oh, sorry, break.
12 Yeah.

13 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** We could go north after
14 break.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** How long do you need for the
16 visual? Fifteen minutes? Okay. Then we need to do an
17 adjustment to the maps as well, so -- to the visual feed.

18 **(Off the record)**

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you. We are
20 reconvened. So, here is how we're going to proceed.
21 I've spoken to Vice-Chair and to our folks who have been
22 working in this area and to Q2. I think what we want to
23 do is actually go ahead and, I take back what I said,
24 Commissioner Parvenu, we're going to go in there. And
25 we're actually going to -- some of these concerns that

1 people have raised about the port or about Cerritos,
2 etcetera, etcetera, we're going to go in. Let's see if
3 we can fix what we need to do. Let's do some mapping,
4 and then we're going to save that visualization.

5 We're going to ask you to save that
6 visualization, and then we're going to -- Commissioner
7 Ancheta will work with our attorneys. We'll show them
8 the visualization and see if they agree that it does not
9 violate the Voting Rights Act. But I know that you
10 wanted to clarify something for us, Commissioner Ancheta,
11 about this part of the process with our counsel.

12 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah. So, a couple of
13 points, and counsel is observing right now. First of
14 all, if we're going to start actually firming this up, we
15 need to be clear what our basis is. And, again --

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I agree.

17 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- the visualization that
18 was put up was, you know, designed to look at -- And I
19 think, actually, I took a closer look at my notes, there
20 is actually an issue both of potential packing and what
21 might be potential cracking in the southern -- If you go
22 back in, it's sort of the southern area.

23 But the point or the thing we should do, which is
24 what we always have done, and, again, this is simply
25 based on -- And I think we need to have the full

1 commission as well as the folks who have looked at this
2 area is, that we do have to make sure this is consistent
3 as well with the community of interest testimony. And I
4 don't want to say that this is right in that way. In
5 other words, we should confirm that these districts, or
6 some variations of these districts line up, and then
7 counsel, who is reviewing this, will say, well, yes,
8 that's okay under section two.

9 Because I think our predicate is always making
10 sure that this isn't merely a section two, that there is
11 -- And I think, again, as you can tell, some of these
12 numbers are not necessarily lower than what we had
13 before. And there were attempts to pull in certain
14 neighborhoods based on our understanding. And we need to
15 confirm now that that's correct, because we may have some
16 of the COI testimony incorrect or that may be an
17 incorrect assumption that we made in terms of moving in
18 certain directions. And that needs to be checked off and
19 approved by the full commission in terms of once we're
20 sort of locking in certain types of configurations.

21 And, again, I think, at this point, Gibson Dunn's
22 basic advice is make sure you've got the backup. This is
23 not them saying this is a section two configuration. Do
24 it. It's our drawing maps that we're feeling are
25 supported by the record, and they will say, yes, that

1 violates section two, or, no, that doesn't violate
2 section two. And, again, we are working off what our,
3 again, very preliminary assumptions regarding polarized
4 voting. And we don't have those formally in. So, you
5 have to understand that we want to make sure that that
6 comes in, and it's not necessarily based on anything
7 that's already been decided. So, those are to just
8 clarify a few things.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

10 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Before we drill
11 down, I just had a suggestion. Could we work one
12 district at a time if we see issues, instead of bouncing
13 from the port up to downtown, to the east to the west?
14 You know, because I've got some ideas that I might want
15 to comment on the downtown. So, if we could just focus
16 on one district and maybe take comments or suggestions,
17 and then go one by one.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. I'm going to make an
19 executive decision here, though, that we start with
20 separating the ports, because that drives a lot of other
21 decisions. And I think that's something that we heard
22 loud and clear. And let's separate it and see how that,
23 then, affects things. I'm just thinking that's just a
24 crucial decision for this that I don't want to do too
25 much around all this and then come back and go, uh, the

1 port. Does that makes sense to folks? Okay.

2 All right. So, on that -- along those lines, if
3 you could take us to that coastal district that comes
4 down through Palos Verdes, where we heard a lot of
5 testimony, which was interesting that they felt very
6 connected to the port and to that area. And then the San
7 Pedro testimony about not being divided, and the
8 Wilmington testimony about the fact that they work at the
9 port. So, that district that starts, I guess, below El
10 Segundo, is that right? The question is, I guess, how
11 would we -- if you just take out, and I think the map
12 showed usually where the division is between the two
13 ports, if you just literally take out -- come down
14 Wilmington and the edge of Wilmington and separate the
15 port, what happens?

16 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** How much population
17 is there?

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. Well, that's -- I
19 mean --

20 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Or what you would
21 be taking out?

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. Let's just -- We're
23 separating the ports.

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Chair?

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** May I make a suggestion, just
2 because I know we're very short on time? Can we just
3 give Q2 some general guidelines and let them play with
4 this offline? Because this is going to take a very long
5 time, and I'm sure that everyone has comments on each one
6 of these districts.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm getting
8 conflicting desires here, because what I think our
9 assigned team wants to do is having something that we can
10 send as a package for LA as a visualization to the
11 attorneys. So, if we just give general, we won't come
12 out of here with what we need to give to the attorneys.
13 So, I --

14 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Maybe we could
15 start with core and make some recommendations regarding
16 core, and then follow up with some of the periphery areas
17 and give more broad direction around the peripheral
18 areas.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would agree with that,
20 okay? Because we do need to get going on this and give
21 something to them concrete. Okay. Yes?

22 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Let me raise the question as
23 to the COI on separating the port. I know the districts
24 are separate, but I'm not sure I have -- I recall a lot
25 of COI testimony in terms of wanting to keep the ports --

1 Los Angeles ports and Long Beach ports in separate
2 congressional districts. Can somebody refresh my memory
3 on that?

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's a good point. I know
5 that there -- I think that may be a Commission assumption
6 and not necessarily a COI assumption, and I know they
7 currently are together. So, do -- what do we -- let's
8 discuss that.

9 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, based on --

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm going to take -- I'm
11 going to -- We're going to go in order here. Okay.
12 Commissioner Barabba.

13 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Well, the reason they're
14 together in the existing, not our first drafts, but the
15 existing, is they went all the way from Orange County to
16 the Palos Verdes Peninsula, and they needed to capture
17 both ports to get over from one part of the -- of the
18 peninsula over to Orange County.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

20 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** It was very clear that
21 when we were in Long Beach they said, you know, they
22 really should be separated, and that Long Beach felt that
23 it would be better if the port was tied into a Long Beach
24 district. And then the whole issue of LA being separate
25 from Long Beach made a lot of sense, it seemed.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Raya, Dai,
2 Galambos-Malloy.

3 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Yeah, I also -- I'm looking
4 at my Long Beach notes, and there was testimony about the
5 governance of the two ports being under two different
6 cities. So, you know, that would have a definite impact.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Dai.

8 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah. I was wondering if it
9 would be useful to have the Commissioner pair that's
10 supposed to look at this area maybe summarize the public
11 comments for us very quickly. So, that would be
12 Commissioner Parvenu and Yao were supposed to look at
13 this whole area and read the public comments.

14 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** As I said, when we got to the
15 ports I don't recall any COI or any e-mail suggesting
16 that we need to separate them.

17 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I actually recall
18 differently, and I'm looking at the public comments that
19 we received post draft maps. I think it has not -- all
20 the public comments has not been exclusively for keeping
21 them apart or exclusively keeping them together. We've
22 gotten, for example, I have an e-mail saying, you know,
23 my recommendation was to keep the two ports together.
24 You know, that's what we want to do. And we've seen
25 others that say split it. I think there have been more

1 on the splitting it from my read of the e-mails that have
2 been coming in than there have been for keeping them
3 together.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

5 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Does it matter --
6 This is on the congressional level. So, to me it might
7 make sense to have both ports together on a federal
8 level, homeland security issues, etcetera, versus
9 respecting a potential division given the different
10 regulations that might exist for Long Beach and Long
11 Beach Port on a more State level. So, I'm not certain --
12 We're looking at two different, you know, factors. So,
13 maybe it's not that important to separate them on a
14 federal level if we find that the areas to the north are
15 better situated to stay together based on COI.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Commissioner
17 DiGuilio.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I just had a question
19 about in something like this where it's not really clear,
20 and this is kind of where we go back to a little bit of
21 our tiebreaker, I guess, is it appropriate for, let's
22 say, those commissions that are from this area to look
23 into the historical trends of these being kept together
24 or not at a federal level -- I mean, a congressional
25 level, or if there is any justification for keeping them

1 or splitting them? Can the Commissioners look into -- I
2 mean, not just the pairing, but can any Commissioner look
3 into this in more detail about the plusses and minuses of
4 splitting versus keeping them together? What is the
5 logistical --

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think that's in keeping --
7 I know that we've been talking about the Stockton
8 situation, and Mr. Brown has said, you know, it would be
9 interesting to know if that was just part of a
10 gerrymander. Then, you know, that whole conversation,
11 then maybe it's not as important that it be -- you know
12 -- and if Commissioner Barabba's assumption is correct,
13 that one of the reasons they're together in the current
14 maps was to create that long district that went over to
15 Orange County, which was clearly a political partisan
16 decision and not a COI decision, and if we were to see
17 the 1991 masters and they're separate, then I think that
18 tells us something that is legitimate for us to look at.

19 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Some of the
20 feedback that we've gotten from the public as to why to
21 keep them separate has been that the port industry
22 actually has stronger representation by having two
23 separate elected officials. I think another thing that
24 comes to my mind from being in the environmental planning
25 filed is you have these transportation corridors that are

1 related to the ports that are connected, then, to any
2 number of air quality issues, noise pollution issues.
3 And separating them allows you to connect the ports to
4 the communities on a north, south axis that are most
5 impacted by the port industry that's passing through
6 their community on a daily basis.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's very interesting.
8 So, for example, if you had a congressional district that
9 had the Long Beach Port, that congress person could be
10 looking at all the environmental impacts of that instead
11 of having that be the person that's on the west instead
12 of the corridor.

13 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Exactly. I say
14 this because I live right next to the Port of Oakland
15 within a couple miles. So, you know, it's issues we deal
16 with on a local level as well.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Ward. I mean,
18 sorry, Commissioner Parvenu. I keep looking down there
19 and I just see -- I just see a hand. You know, I've got
20 to put my glasses on. Sorry. I just see the hand.

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I'd be glad to look into
22 this a little -- into the history of this a little more,
23 because that's one of our City Council districts. And I
24 know that in the past the past congressional person felt
25 a sense of ownership with the Port, because the

1 headquarters, the headquarters building itself was in the
2 western previous foreign congressional district. So,
3 that individual served as an advocate, as well as the
4 other district that extended, as Commissioner Barabba
5 says, to the east. The Port itself proper, the actual
6 facility was in the other district. But I think that,
7 again, that all of the -- all of the activity from that
8 port extends in a northern direction, of course, with the
9 Alameda corridor being here. And it looks like it's
10 split along that divide. But this area, as soon as you
11 go west because residential and the whole complexion of
12 this or the whole zoning of that area becomes incredibly
13 more different. And then we have the issue here with
14 Wilmington and a high Latino population, and what that
15 does along that corridor.

16 I think the testimony that I read was that those
17 who were previously in this area wanted to go extend
18 south to this area. I don't know if that's fixed or if
19 -- I think that would, of course, cause us to do
20 something here in this Long Beach Area that would be far
21 -- look a little different than what we see here now.
22 So, that would, again, have a ripple effect, so --

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would like at this point
24 if we could just look at not doing the north south, but
25 keeping the direction that we have there and keeping that

1 district, that visualization with Compton and Carson, the
2 way it is and just see what happens with the separation
3 of the port --

4 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I agree.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- in terms of population,
6 and then let's -- Is that okay? So, what is that?

7 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I agree.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can we --

9 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, that section that's
10 highlighted and kind of an aqua color, the population
11 within that is 119,694.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's taking out the LA
13 Port?

14 **MS. HENDERSON:** That goes down to the LA Port.
15 That includes Wilmington and --

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, no, no. We're talking
17 about literally the division between the LA Port and the
18 Long Beach Port.

19 **MS. HENDERSON:** No. We're confused what you
20 would like us to do.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Separate -- Don't put the
22 two ports in the same district.

23 **MS. HENDERSON:** So you --

24 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Take out the --

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Just keep everything that --

1 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** -- area east of the aqua
2 region.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

4 **MS. HENDERSON:** So --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** The district that was
6 visualized, keep it the way it is with the east -- with
7 the Palos Verdes going up to Wilmington, but just take
8 out the portion that includes from the Long Beach Port
9 going south, or whatever you want to call that, east.

10 **MS. HENDERSON:** East. Okay. We're doing that
11 now.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** If when I was playing around
13 with that, what that allowed me to do was to put Signal
14 Hill and Compton Carson.

15 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** We had a lot of
16 COI testimony to that effect.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And, you know, and we had a
18 lot of testimony about that.

19 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** There is a significant
20 Asian population there (inaudible).

21 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, that area there that's in
22 aqua now is 267,017 people.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

24 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, it's going to under-populate
25 the beach cities district.

1 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Significantly.
2 So, could we, from this one, swing over west and look at
3 that beach cities district?

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. So, look at the beach
5 cities, and one idea there that I had thought about when
6 I was looking at this without the port was actually it
7 would put Torrance back in the coastal instead of in the
8 Inglewood, Hawthorne. So, it would go -- it would have
9 Manhattan Beach, Torrance, Lomita, all in there. And we
10 did get -- we did have testimony, I remember, from
11 Torrance saying that that was, you know, the whole --
12 that that was a community that all those folks in that
13 area had been in the aerospace industry.

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I think El Segundo was
15 part of that too, though.

16 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Well, yeah. El
17 Segundo we have feedback that it could go a couple of
18 different directions.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

20 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** That whole airport
21 area, that it could go along the east west corridor, or
22 it could go along the north south corridor. I like in
23 this, if we take Torrance into the beach district, then
24 we're also -- there had been some -- I think there is a
25 cultural hub for the Japanese American community there

1 that we heard a lot about.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

3 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, I had some
4 concern about the idea of splitting Torrance because, you
5 know, that may have an impact on that -- those
6 neighborhoods.

7 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** And Commissioner Parvenu,
8 wasn't it Torrance with Gardena for the Japanese
9 community?

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes, that's correct.

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, in order --

12 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** That's the eastern part of
13 Torrance.

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- to keep it whole, you'd
15 have to put it with Gardena.

16 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. If you keep Gardena,
18 then the Inglewood district is very difficult.

19 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** But the western portion of
20 Torrance has fewer Asians than the central area and the
21 areas closest to Gardena.

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, you would have to split
23 Gardena.

24 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Or Torrance.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Or split Torrance. One of the

1 two.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, what does that give us?

3 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, it's still under-populated by
4 100,156.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. Now, if you go up
6 and you pick up El Segundo, I mean, in mind I had
7 actually gone all the way. I had included the airport
8 and gone right above the airport, and that gave me the,
9 you know, sort of -- But that's -- Okay.

10 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Can the population of the
11 -- is the population of the airport on the eastern side
12 of the airport? I mean, where are the people in the
13 airport? Not that I like the idea of linking what
14 Commissioner Blanco said with the north. Well, yeah.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And --

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Through an airport. But
17 I guess you could if the population was on the eastern
18 side, right? Then you would tie -- Well --

19 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I think the
20 feedback that we got about the connection between the
21 airport and the east west corridor was that it wasn't the
22 population that was so significant. It was the jobs, the
23 employment connections.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, then, that's our

1 assumption is that that's kind of the line that we want
2 to link with the other communities. And I'm assuming we
3 have to start looking back down south --

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

5 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** -- or in the eastern
6 portion, right?

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

8 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** That's what's left.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** You have to go below --
10 higher up towards Carson.

11 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** And this is where
12 I think this is important for us as a Commission to
13 start, you know, tracking some of these. That if this is
14 kind of what we're going to do and we say that that's the
15 important aspect is to link the airport to the east,
16 then, I mean, that's -- I don't mean to make it sound so
17 definitive, but that's kind of a hard line that we're --

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

19 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** -- going to work
20 with one of our assumptions.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

22 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, then, let's
23 look at the other options. This is where it's important
24 to start laying them out.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, I'm going to do that.

1 Does everybody agree that given the testimony we heard
2 and received about the airport and the Inglewood
3 population that the airport and Westchester should stay
4 with Inglewood?

5 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I certainly agree.

6 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yes.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes? Okay.

8 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, my question is, we've now
9 split the Japanese community that was together with
10 Torrance and Gardena, which is a very traditional
11 community that we got testimony about?

12 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Can we connect
13 Gardena down to the south end? Because I also have some
14 concerns regarding the district immediately north of
15 Inglewood, and I'm wondering if the Inglewood district
16 actually moved up a little farther north it would pull in
17 some similar populations.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, can we at least maybe
19 address Commissioner Dai's first, which is to link
20 Torrance and Gardena? But it looks like you'd also have
21 to include Alejandro Park, maybe. I'm not sure if
22 (inaudible).

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I don't know.

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Not necessarily. It's
25 contiguous.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think you could put
2 Gardena in, and I think that Commissioner Galambos-Malloy
3 is right. You have -- if you go north there is a large
4 African American population I know in the north area
5 there. Commissioner Raya.

6 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Is this -- I recall in the
7 testimony about, I don't know, I think it was in Gardena,
8 talking about one part of the community center was in one
9 district and one was in another. I know that was not in
10 the congressional, I don't believe, but, nonetheless, is
11 this an example of where kind of a little more street
12 level knowledge might help us make a division that makes
13 more sense in terms of keeping that COI intact?

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, I just want to make
15 sure we, again, capture that the --

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

17 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** -- reason we're putting
18 Gardena and Torrance is to keep the community together
19 (inaudible).

20 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Can we look at an Asian --
21 oh, I'm sorry.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

23 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** The Asian population
24 distribution for this area to make sure that we capture.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So --

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Because I know that
2 Torrance has (inaudible).

3 **MS. HENDERSON:** I don't think that's going to
4 break down into specifically letting you know where the
5 Japanese community is.

6 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, where do we want
8 to go from here folks? Yes. Commissioner Ward.

9 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Just a process question. If
10 for the second round, as we make determinations as a
11 Commission for what hard lines might or might not be,
12 should for documentation sake, how would you recommend
13 that we go about documenting why we make those decisions
14 for report sake? In other words, should we define
15 exactly what community of interest input we're using to
16 make whatever line a hard definitive thing or what would
17 you recommend?

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would recommend that Q2,
19 as it's tracking these decisions for their database, that
20 we be explicit that when we have a hard line what the
21 basis of it is. So, I think on the airport -- Yes,
22 Commissioner Barabba.

23 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** You asked the question
24 about 1990 and the special masters?

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. So, let me just

1 finish my thought. So, I think there seemed to be a
2 consensus that we heard overwhelming testimony that the
3 employment relationship between the airport and the
4 surrounding area of Lennox and Inglewood and Hawthorne
5 meant that that was a good important community of
6 interest to keep together. So, I think that's what we
7 would say why that would stay with the east west district
8 rather than the coastal district.

9 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** May I say -- may I --

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Hold on a minute. I want to
11 hear from Commissioner Barabba.

12 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** In 1990, the 38th
13 Congressional District was primarily Long Beach, and then
14 it included both the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of
15 Long Beach.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

17 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** And it looks like they
18 grabbed a piece of San Pedro as well, from what I can
19 gather.

20 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But just a piece of
21 it. Yeah.

22 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** This is in the Statewide
23 database, by the way.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And that's congressional?

25 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Yes.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And can you say what -- they
2 did an assembly?

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** They -- just a
4 second.

5 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** You got it?

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah. Go ahead.
7 I'll let you know.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

9 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Let me just pull it
10 up.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. I mean, it's
12 just important, because all these things that we're doing
13 over here we wouldn't have to do if we made the decision
14 to keep the ports together. Commissioner Raya.

15 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** I just found a note from the
16 Culver City testimony that the majority of the Japanese
17 community was in Gardena south of Rosecrans, wherever
18 that is, but, I mean, I know more or less where it is,
19 but to actually pick it up on the map, that would
20 probably help us to --

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, that's interesting.

22 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** -- make a cut.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes, this is the woman who
24 said her husband -- one of the centers was named after
25 her husband down there. Okay. Do you see it? Oh, I see

1 it. Yeah. So, south of Rosecrans. Is it possible -- I
2 know that the Asian data is not in subgroups, but could
3 we look at just overall Asian data for that Aqua
4 district?

5 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's what's showing right now.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

7 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Just on another
8 note, the assembly district, it was Assembly District 54,
9 and it included both ports. It went from Palos Verdes
10 all the way down, included San Pedro, the Los Angeles
11 Port, the Long Beach Port, went all the way over into
12 Long Beach, captured Signal Hill and went north.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'm sorry. How far north
15 did it go? I'm just curious as to how we merge that with
16 some of the testimony we got about the north south. Like
17 how far was it able to go up?

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** On which side?
19 East or west?

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** North.

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** North?

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** (Inaudible) district like
23 in terms of being able to capture those communities that
24 are impacted by the ports?

25 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No, it did not. It

1 literally just got the port. I don't even think
2 Wilmington -- maybe a little part of Wilmington was in
3 there. There is not much detail in this, but it did not
4 go that far north.

5 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, there --

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Just above the
7 port.

8 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, theirs was just to
9 capture the ports together, not necessarily the --

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Surrounding areas, yeah.

11 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yeah, trying to balance.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

13 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Of course, they didn't
14 hear COI testimony.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

16 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Well, and also remember in
17 assembly the population is way down too.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. I mean, that's 20 --

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Correct.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thirty.

21 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** (Inaudible).

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, there is a big growth
23 there.

24 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** For senate did -- Well,
25 probably did break ups together.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, let's -- We've
2 got the airport. Yes, Commissioner Parvenu.

3 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I just while we're
4 talking, I don't want to keep talking ports, airport,
5 ports, airport, but with regard -- regarding the airport,
6 too, another justification for that east west orientation
7 is that the Century Boulevard Development Corridor, we
8 heard testimony regarding planning and development along
9 that corridor. And, also, it would be perceived as that
10 coastal region would be capturing two incredible assets,
11 the airport as well as the port. So, that's something
12 that we've heard considerable testimony about,
13 distributing economic resources and assets equitably
14 among districts. So, that's another consideration.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

16 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes, can you tell us what
18 we're looking at?

19 **MS. HENDERSON:** A question, first of all. So, we
20 were just listening -- we looked into Rosecrans as a
21 dividing line for Gardena. Do you want it divided or do
22 you want to include Gardena in its entirety?

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Well, what we wanted to see
24 was if in Gardena there seems to be an Asian population
25 more than in the south than in the north. Assume -- And

1 it's a huge assumption that then we would know something
2 about the Japanese American population there, which is
3 what we had --

4 **MS. HENDERSON:** We do --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- heard testimony about.

6 **MS. HENDERSON:** We do have some voter
7 registration data in that area.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That surname?

9 **MS. HENDERSON:** Surname matched, yes.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Do you guys want to look at
11 that?

12 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Voter registration?

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

14 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** I don't think so.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Surname for Japanese?

16 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** I don't think so.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** For --

18 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** I don't think so.

19 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** No.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Our counsel had said
21 that we could do that in order to look for ethnicity.

22 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Is our chief legal
23 counsel still here with us today?

24 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Oh, excuse me. Which
25 registration? Are you talking about last names or are

1 you talking about --

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, last names.

3 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Oh, I have no problem with
4 that.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

6 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** It's the surname in the
7 database.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Surname.

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, I mean, it seems like we
10 got public testimony from someone who represented the
11 Japanese community who gave us that line, and you can see
12 that pretty much matches with the --

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, I mean, but we could
14 actually have the actual numbers, I mean, besides one
15 person's testimony.

16 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** We may or may not. I go back
17 to my original concern about this -- that particular data
18 is that it just doesn't take into account people who have
19 married across names.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Married names.

21 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, CAPAFR provided us with
22 very details maps for the Japanese community.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

24 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** It sounds like
25 this is one of those issues that we may not be able to

1 delve --

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. All right.

3 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** -- into today, but
4 we can do some research --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

6 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** -- in time for our
7 next business meeting and line drawing session.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, I'm going to ask for
9 another decision like the airport, which is the port.
10 What we want to do with one port -- the port in one
11 district or two. Because this is what's driving a lot of
12 this now beginning to, you know, move these things
13 around. Commissioner DiGuilio.

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Well, I think if, again,
15 it goes back to where if we're going to pick up -- if
16 we're going to pick up population and we've set the top
17 as a boundary. And I'm assuming some of the Carson --
18 some of those other districts north of the one we're
19 looking at, if -- unless Commissioners feel like we can
20 move upwards in there in the northern part, then we have
21 to go into the port is my -- To me, it seems like those
22 are the assumptions. If we're building upon each one of
23 these assumptions, then the outcome is to move into the
24 ports.

25 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Commissioner

1 Parvenu, could you speak to some of those communities
2 immediately north of the Inglewood district?

3 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Sure. Be glad to. If you
4 could zoom in, please. Okay. A little more. Okay.
5 Immediately north of Inglewood.

6 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** And other
7 Commissioners who are familiar with the area.

8 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Sure. Sure.

9 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I think
10 Commissioner Filkins-Webber and others.

11 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I think primarily the --
12 that the central African American community here is,
13 let's see, around -- Leimert Park is the traditional hub
14 of the cultural arts, entertainment. It's just a central
15 area of Los Angeles for the African American population.
16 This whole stretch, the Crenshaw district, is the core of
17 the African American community. That's where it's
18 primarily situated.

19 Here you have a mixture of African Americans and
20 Caucasians, but primarily African American affluent
21 individuals. You've got Baldwin Hills too here. Then
22 you have Culver City, which should be kept whole, and it
23 looks like that it is. And Palms and --

24 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I don't know. You
25 have a little bit of bias there, Commissioner Parvenu.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Do I sound biased? Yeah.
2 And here you have along the Fairfax Area you have a
3 traditional Jewish, Ethiopian community. As you go
4 further north, it becomes more and more Jewish. And
5 along the Pico area also. I don't see it here, but
6 Palms.

7 What I can say is that this area here has very --
8 this is a map that has the previous iteration, not the
9 one that we are working on -- we were working with since
10 last night which extends this area far to the northwest
11 along Brentwood and Malibu. And it's like night and day.
12 It's definitely -- And so, we had to clip off a piece
13 here to add it to this Inglewood district somewhere along
14 this line. Mid city has a lot more in common with this
15 area. This whole area here I would consider to be a
16 community of interest. As you go further towards Palms
17 and West LA, that's more West LA proper.

18 I think a good distinction between West LA and
19 the other parts of LA is somewhere around La Cienega.
20 Fairfax is another -- If you had to -- if you were
21 traveling from east to west, once you past Fairfax you
22 get the sense that you are entering West LA. But
23 certainly once you past La Cienega, which many people
24 know takes you right down to the airport, as you go
25 further that way you're in West Los Angeles proper. And

1 but I think that this area could be shifted south -- if
2 you need population -- south, and it's a better fit with
3 the Inglewood Area than it is, certainly, with Westwood
4 and points further northwest.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Now, Commissioner
6 DiGuilio has pointed out that we -- I know what we're
7 doing here, but we really need to stay with the district
8 we were in, and if -- and fix the other part. So, I'm
9 going to take us back down to the port. I want to make
10 that decision about whether we want to keep the existing
11 map with the ports together or not, because if we don't
12 then what we have to tinker with is quite a bit of
13 population we have to gain.

14 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner --

16 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** As the person who
17 worked on this visualization, it was never my long term
18 intention to keep the ports together. Based on the
19 testimony that we received, I think we heard ongoing
20 concerns, even from our earlier pre-draft hearings,
21 around the ability of the communities that are connected
22 to the ports by the transportation corridors and by air
23 quality corridors to be able to actually have their
24 representative advocate on their behalf. And so, I am,
25 actually, concerned about the idea of having the two

1 ports together and essentially cut off from some of the
2 more northern cities that actually are heavily impacted
3 by the flow back and forth into the ports in the goods
4 movement arena.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I have Commissioner
6 Filkins-Webber, Commissioner DiGuilio and Commissioner
7 Parvenu.

8 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** One thing we did
9 here, and what I'm a little bit familiar with, let's just
10 go back a little bit. I looked at the 80s, I looked at
11 the 90s, I looked at the current federal, again, just on
12 a congressional level, and all of them have both ports
13 together. And when they did have both ports together
14 there are certain trust funds that exist for the air
15 population issues along the 710 and the 110. So, they
16 have accomplished a lot with the representative that
17 they've had. And they have obviously paid attention to
18 those communities that are -- that are, you know, further
19 to the north.

20 If we really want to respect these districts, the
21 yellow one that we have there, and we really want to
22 consider, you know, the possibility that then we may have
23 some section twos, I think that we may have to just keep
24 the ports together at the federal level, and then we
25 don't have to cross the Orange County line, and then we

1 respect all the northern communities. And then we can
2 take a look at the split at the State level. We've got a
3 lot of legislation going on in the State of California to
4 work on air quality and green jobs and all of that that
5 gets closer to the people at that level and the State
6 level.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

8 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** So, just looking at
9 history, if we're stuck here, and we don't have a lot of
10 testimony to justify splitting the port at the federal
11 level, we might be able to work this out and really pay
12 attention to the COI, and the district says you have
13 above, so we don't have as much manipulation --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- and we still are
16 working with a district that has existed for probably the
17 last 20, 40 years.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio
19 and Parvenu.

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, just very quickly
21 I'll summarize. It sounds like the decision we've done
22 is then we've had the LAX hard line, we have the
23 Inglewood that we're not going to push into Inglewood, we
24 are not going to push into the Compton Carson Area, and
25 based on those that we really have to move that line into

1 Long Beach and take the port. So, the question, then, is
2 is just continue to take the Long Beach Port until we
3 reach the population, unless there is some testimony that
4 specifically suggests where we should do that. And I'm
5 not sure with what we have how under populated we are,
6 how far in we'd have to move.

7 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** They already drew
8 it.

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, they already drew it.

10 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, let's go back to the
12 visualization they had. So, let's just go back to what
13 we had, and then we don't mess with Gardena either.

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** That's what I'm saying.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I would like to go back
17 to that one.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. So, let's go back.
19 Okay.

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, you just --

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** But this is good that we --

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Because these, again,
23 this is what we have to capture.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** This goes back to what

1 our counsel, Mr. Miller, was saying. We have to have a
2 justification for each district.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

4 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, these are the
5 parameters we're initially setting.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

7 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** If there is a problem
8 with another district later, we can come back and refer
9 to our own assumptions and say, do we need to break any
10 of those? But for this district, those would be the
11 assumptions where we did go into Gardena a little bit to
12 maintain -- it was a Japanese community, correct? And
13 then we also say the Carson Compton is set, LA airport is
14 set. Then we're going to go in and combine the airports
15 based on what Commissioner Filkins-Webber said.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I have Commissioner
17 Parvenu. Are you going to speak on this issue?

18 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** No, I'm done. I was just
19 going to say let's go back to the original.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. All right.

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** That's good.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, do I have a consensus
23 that we're going to proceed with the original
24 visualization with the ports together in the
25 congressional, and that we will revisit in the State

1 legislative districts the idea of the ports together?

2 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Separate.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Separate. Separate.
4 Okay.

5 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Can I clarify one
6 thing with this? So, then, the Commission is aware that
7 in this visualization that Torrance is split, and that
8 Torrance is split along the PCH, Pacific Coast Highway
9 lines to maintain a coastal congressional district.

10 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Yes.

11 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** And there may be a
12 better place -- If we consider we may need to split
13 Torrance there may be a better place to split it. That
14 was, you know, my first (inaudible).

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner DiGuilio.

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I just had a
17 clarification. So, are we going to stick with that
18 initial visualization or we did have some discussion
19 about bringing Torrance in and then dealing with the
20 consequences up north? We're not going to do that?

21 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** No.

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think we're saying let's
24 stick with this one on this region, this -- the PVEBC.

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Palos Verdes East -- What is
2 that? Okay. All right. Beach Communities. All right.
3 I -- If folks don't mind, I would like to go in and look
4 at how to potentially clean up those southeast cities.
5 Commissioner Barabba?

6 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** I haven't quite figured
7 out what happens through that eastern part of Long Beach.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** You mean in the original
9 visualizations that we have?

10 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Yeah, that right there.
11 Yeah.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** There it is.

13 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Yeah. That's --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And I think that is very
15 much the testimony that we received about East Long
16 Beach, no?

17 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Well, but I'm (inaudible)
18 what the numbers are.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It's not? Okay. Let's talk
20 about it. Okay. Let's --

21 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I think we did
22 need to -- I agree this is an area that needs some work.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

24 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** But have we gotten
25 what we needed from the Central LA districts yet?

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's why I'm suggesting --
2 I know we have incredibly strong testimony about those
3 southeast cities, and that's where there is a lot of
4 population that's very concentrated, that as you move one
5 street everything happens. So, I'm -- I'm suggesting
6 that we try and go into those southeast cities and try to
7 align them more with our community of interest testimony.
8 And that will create ripple effects down towards East
9 Long Beach and out to Orange County, etcetera, that we
10 might as well deal with now, because everything is going
11 to radiate out of there. Commissioner Ancheta.

12 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** And, again, getting back
13 to the point that -- and this is counsel's advice about
14 how we're drawing things. I think lacking formal data on
15 racially polarized voting at this date we should fully
16 document, if we're going to move forward, the community
17 of interests and city integrity basis for doing this.
18 Again, we can reconfirm at a later date when we get more
19 appropriate data for section two that these might also be
20 section two basis. However, again, on advice of counsel,
21 who is playing it very safe, right, in this kind of
22 matter, make sure that we're documenting thoroughly, I
23 think, all non-racially based predicates for this kind of
24 drawing.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. And along those

1 lines, I just want to -- Commissioner DiGuilio has made a
2 good point. As we sort of close out one district that we
3 summarize our assumption for it, we've stuck with the
4 Inglewood district for now, based on the testimony, or do
5 we feel that we've only covered the coastal, and
6 Inglewood we haven't really looked at yet? Now, this is
7 -- We're going back to the original maps. We don't need
8 population.

9 The question is are we -- We've only looked
10 really essentially, actually, I think, Commissioner
11 DiGuilio, we've only technically looked at that coastal
12 one.

13 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** That's (inaudible).

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. All right. Okay.
15 So, we can either look at the Inglewood one now. I would
16 -- I, again, I would recommend we look at the southeast
17 cities where we have, I think, three splits of a
18 community of interest that we got a lot of testimony
19 about. Okay?

20 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Cudahy, Bell, all
21 that area.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, I will list off what I
23 believe -- I mean, I have it in my notes, but others
24 probably have it as well. The cities that are usually
25 considered the southeast cities of LA are Commerce,

1 Vernon, Maywood, Huntington Park, Bell, Bell Gardens,
2 Cudahy, Southgate, correct?

3 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yes.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And now we have those in
5 three districts. Go ahead, Commissioner.

6 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Chair, may I request a
7 population count on those just to see where we are?

8 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** This was the area
9 that I think is very challenging, because I also have it
10 very clearly documented from all of the e-mails we've
11 been getting, the in person COI that we've received, that
12 these groups do self-identify as a community of interest.
13 They had numerous different examples of I think
14 partnerships between -- the formal partnerships between
15 the city governments, etcetera, and at the same time if
16 you look at that cluster I think it, to me, smacks of a
17 really dense over concentration of the Latino community,
18 and it causes me to pause and reflect are we actually
19 decreasing these communities' members ability to have
20 effective representation in the way they might if there
21 -- if we had maybe smaller subgroupings of some of the
22 southeast cities, but in, you know, maybe two or three
23 separate districts?

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Ancheta.

25 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay. Here is an

1 important legal point to make. Counsel has -- Gibson,
2 Dunn and Crutcher has advised us to take a much more
3 conservative approach regarding how we approach these
4 types of districts. All right? And at this point there
5 -- if you were predicating it on section two, where you
6 would look at a packing question, that's a section two
7 VRA argument. Right? And if you predicate -- I mean,
8 there may be some other counter revealing COI testimony,
9 which suggests (inaudible) and if it's there we can go
10 with that, obviously.

11 But we have to make a choice here because it is
12 -- if you're saying it's a section two predicate, and,
13 again, counsel doesn't like us to do that, but --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm not -- I'm talking about
15 this strictly as a community of interest.

16 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Right.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

18 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** No, but I'm saying, and
19 this is going to Commissioner Galambos- Malloy's point,
20 is that, and her argument is an unpacking argument,
21 right? If I take it correctly that's how she's --

22 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Well, I don't --
23 You know, I'm not a lawyer, so in my mind it's not
24 regarding the legal concept of packing. But if I, from a
25 common sense perspective, am trying to think about

1 communities of interest and how to ensure effective
2 political representation across communities of interest,
3 this is an area that gives me cause for some concern.
4 And maybe legally it is a packing issue, but that's not
5 the framework I was working to approach it.

6 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay. So, let me pull
7 back, then, because I think if this is -- these are
8 contradictory approaches, right, or they lead to
9 different results. So, I think obviously Commissioner
10 Blanco's is here a core community, the southeast cities.
11 And I think Commissioner Galambos-Malloy is suggesting
12 that as a representational matter it's okay to divide or
13 try to increase the representation across the community
14 in terms of the number of districts? Is that --

15 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** That we may
16 consider subgroupings, like within those large grouping
17 of southeast cities there may be, say, two or three of
18 those cities that have much stronger ties and stronger
19 working relationships. So, it may not mean that we need
20 to keep all six, seven, eight of them together, but that
21 there would be some smaller pairings.

22 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay. Because, again,
23 part of this counsel's advice to not -- to not be
24 explicitly racial. And I think if it's not a packing
25 argument it goes to a representation point, which, again,

1 is one of those tiebreaking principles, right, which is
2 not in the Constitution formally, but we can make -- I
3 think we can make that decision.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Raya.

5 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Okay. If we're looking,
6 excuse me, at COI, the testimony in Rio Hondo was that
7 they're currently divided among three congressionals.
8 So, and there are some additional cities that were cited
9 in the testimony, including Lynwood, Florence Grand and
10 parts of Downey. I don't know if you included Walnut
11 Park.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Walnut Park is not in there,
13 but --

14 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Okay.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- that is part of that
16 region.

17 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** So, there -- what I'm
18 suggesting is that there may be a little broader area
19 that we're talking about which might address some of
20 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy's concern. Maybe there is a
21 way to spread this out a little bit, so to speak, but
22 still keep groupings.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

24 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** And maybe you get them down
25 to two splits instead of three.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

2 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

4 **MS. HENDERSON:** Back here. Just to answer the
5 question of population.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

7 **MS. HENDERSON:** This area, 294,194, and you can
8 see some other statistics there. This area is -- has a
9 Latino CVAP of 89.92 percent.

10 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Call it what you
11 will. I'm still concerned.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Well, I mean, I appreciate
13 the instinct, but, you know, I'm sure that you could go
14 into parts of LA that are 80 percent White, and we don't
15 necessarily consider that packing. So, it's just a
16 neighborhood. You know, West LA is probably 80 percent
17 White. It's the neighborhood. So, I mean, I think it's,
18 you know -- Yes. Commissioner DiGuilio.

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I guess I'm just
20 concerned that at 300,000 it being almost 90 percent
21 Hispanic or Latino, that's still a lot. But I guess kind
22 of going back to -- going back to the issue of can we --
23 It's still at 300,000. You're going to need to pick up a
24 lot of population, even if this remained a district. So,
25 one question would be, if that was the case, where would

1 we go to pick up population? The other thing is, if we
2 do decide to split this, I'm just trying to think that
3 there is obviously this core here of testimony.

4 So, what do we do with it? If we have to split
5 it into where would those two go, what would link those
6 -- the split to the other areas around it, looking at the
7 larger regional, because I think if this is the starting
8 place then we have to find a home for these, whether it's
9 in two separate regions or with one. So, I'd like to see
10 if we have a discussion about that.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Commissioner Raya.

12 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** I would suggest somewhere a
13 split kind of down the middle.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** The 710?

15 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Sending some people east,
16 some people west would not -- would, I think in terms of
17 economy and probably, you know, other community type
18 issues would not be irrational. And I think what could
19 align some of those communities in the right way. Maybe
20 Commissioner Parvenu has a different take on that.

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** No, I agree with that.
22 I'd like to see the city -- Does this map show the city
23 boundaries?

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And the thing is, these
25 cities, I think a lot of you know, are unincorporated.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And so they, you know, it's
3 one of the reasons they have such a strong identity as
4 between them because they're not part of the city.

5 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And I've heard repeated
6 testimony about Downey on keeping Downey whole onto the
7 southeast, but Downey has a lot in common with the other
8 cities to the immediate northwest.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. Downey has always
10 kind of been -- And it's been -- It is a city, and it's
11 kind of been changing over the years. You can see it
12 there. Yes, Commissioner Barabba.

13 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** When these visualizations
14 were created, they were created primarily by city, so
15 there is very little splits there.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. So, let me ask a
17 question. If these communities were kept whole, and
18 together with, let's say, another, if we worked outward
19 from them, you know, and put them in another -- together
20 with some other communities for a congressional district,
21 the question is, what would that -- how big the impact
22 would be, right, on some of these surrounding districts
23 that you've drawn? It's sort of in the middle of -- it's
24 the intersection, right, of like three districts there?

25 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** For those that are
2 really familiar with this area, what directions would you
3 advise that we would go? I think most of the public
4 testimony that's related to the southeast cities had
5 really talked about the southeast cities, not necessarily
6 the surrounding communities and which ones made sense to
7 link them with.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Well, I know Lakewood is
9 definitely out of there, so you've got that right. I
10 mean, people don't talk about Lakewood. I think Commerce
11 could go out. I think Commerce could easily be either
12 with East LA or Montebello. When you drive through there
13 on the 5, Commerce is kind of on the other side. So, I
14 think Commerce could go out.

15 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** And Commerce is Commerce more
16 than --

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

18 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Yeah, more than other kinds
19 of communities.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Vernon has 100 people in it,
21 so I'm not too worried about it, 157 or something, 112.
22 So, you could, you know --

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, I had --

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And it might not be a city
25 soon.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** What about I
2 thought somebody had mentioned the Florence Firestone,
3 because when you're looking to the west I had a little
4 bit of concern with that district and how far north it
5 went into Koreatown. And so I was a little concerned by
6 its elongation and going all the way up there, and I was
7 concerned whether there might be a split of Koreatown.
8 Some of the testimony that we got, I don't know that
9 anybody really supported putting all of those areas
10 together, but -- Oh, that's the neighborhood? Okay.
11 But, again, where is the connection between Koreatown and
12 Florence and South Park and Central.

13 And so if we wanted to -- If you wanted to build
14 out from this, which I don't necessarily agree with, but,
15 you know, if you're looking for similar areas it would be
16 to the west, probably in Florence, and less similar with
17 the Koreatown in that district to the north.

18 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I certainly agree.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And what's the part you
20 don't agree with?

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I don't agree with
22 the Florence being with Koreatown.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, okay.

24 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** So, if this
25 district were to build out to the west --

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I thought you weren't
2 agreeing with the build out.

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No, I don't. I
4 don't agree with identifying a COI and building from
5 there, because it's completely contrary to everything
6 we've done before, and we haven't done that previously.
7 So, I just -- I agree with --

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, you don't think --

9 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- this concept,
10 really, of what we're doing, because I'm looking at the
11 district as it existed before, and we did have splits.
12 We didn't recognize what this is, I guess, or maybe we
13 didn't get sufficient COI testimony previously, but we
14 had split this area at the assembly level, at the senate
15 level, and now maybe the community is coming back to
16 correct that. I understand that, but I've never known us
17 to actually build from a COI and try and create
18 districts, especially when you're talking about, what did
19 you say, 80 percent Latino?

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, I'm not trying to -- I'm
21 just saying it's a community of interest that should be
22 kept together. I'm not like trying to build out of it.
23 I'm saying keep it together and then we --

24 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, the question
25 was, which way do you go, east or west, and --

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. So, I'm not trying
2 to build out, I'm just -- keep it together and then where
3 do you put it. That's my point. Not building out of it.
4 It's just keep it together. We've kept a lot of places
5 together. Commissioner DiGuilio.

6 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Well, I'm wondering if
7 that is -- that's one COI. I'm just wondering if the
8 Commission wants to discuss it as a whole and make a
9 decision about whether we agree in putting this entire
10 COI together, because that --

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's right.

12 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yeah. So --

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It's just a discussion.

14 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** And so maybe the first
15 step isn't so much where do you put it. It's whether we
16 have it.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. Right.

18 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Okay. We also had testimony
19 from the Mayor of Southgate that you could do a split at
20 the Alameda corridor. That may give you some sense of
21 where to --

22 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** The Alameda corridor could --

23 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** (Inaudible) Alameda
24 corridor is west.

25 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** -- be defined as the 60

1 Freeway and not so much by the 710.

2 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Well, that's not much help,
3 is it?

4 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Yeah, it's not going to be
5 much help one way or the other.

6 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, can you -- the
7 Alameda corridor -- It's been a few years since I've
8 moved from Southern California. Remind me which freeway
9 that refers to.

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Well, it's actually a
11 transit route, a major transit route that follows the
12 old, I believe, Burlington Northern or Santa Fe railroad.

13 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Oh, it's the
14 railroad track?

15 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** It's a combination
16 trucking lane, high speed trucking lane, dedicated truck
17 route as well as a rail line that comes straight from the
18 port north to Vernon and then it stretches eastward along
19 that area.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can we look at -- I think
21 this is a very large -- What was it, 200 and something
22 thousand people? It's a very large community of
23 interest. We do have -- We've kept a lot of them
24 together, but this is, you know, quite a large one to
25 keep together. I mean, mainly, not geographic, it's just

1 dense, but it's not, you know -- It's compact, but it's
2 dense. So, when you keep it together, I think in
3 people's minds it's easy to keep it together because it's
4 in an area that's so bounded and so obvious, but I don't
5 think that people understand the density of population
6 there.

7 So, I know that it -- people have -- I think
8 people mentioned they were all together in the 1991
9 masters map. I'm kind of curious, if it wasn't, where
10 they split it. You know, although that's grown so much
11 over the last, you know, 20 some years. Yeah, that area
12 has changed.

13 So, okay. So, folks, are you saying that you --
14 we don't keep this together? We have -- Because it
15 creates too much disruption? And we haven't really
16 defined what the disruption is. Commissioner Ward.

17 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Yeah. I'm just struggling a
18 little bit with understanding how we can define multiple
19 cities like that as a, quote, community of interest,
20 just, again, with the definitions as I see them in the --
21 the guidance we've been given with the local qualities
22 and, you know, criteria that set one up. It just seems
23 to me if it spans multiple cities, you know, we're out of
24 community of interest territory.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would really --

1 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** I don't think that's --

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Raya.

3 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** I don't agree with that. And
4 we did receive testimony about the economic, educational,
5 health services. A lot of relationships among the
6 cities, it is a little bit -- I'm not sure what the
7 mileage is in there, but I think we've also had some
8 indication that communities -- separate communities could
9 be -- they can be drawn together if they are -- if there
10 is -- if there are factors of relationship.

11 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I just have the
12 1990.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. What it would be.

14 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Just for your
15 information, it looked like this area went a little north
16 to the 710 and the 5 interchange with Commerce, Vernon,
17 Maywood, Huntington Park, Bell, Florence Grand, Walnut
18 Park, Cudahy, Bell Gardens, Southgate, and then a weird,
19 funky gerrymander that went -- Oh, no. Actually, no,
20 that must be the city boundary of Southgate.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, that's the city
22 boundary.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** It's the same.
24 Yeah, that must be the same. So, that's what it did. It
25 went a little north to the 5 and 710 interchange at

1 Commerce and came down. So, it looks like --

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And kept it together.

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** It looks like they
4 pretty much did --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- in 1990.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. I mean, were there
8 another -- I mean, I don't know how else to say. This is
9 -- I can't think of a tighter community of interest than
10 these --

11 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Oh, it had Vernon
12 in there too.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- different cities.

14 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But, oh, it's 112.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner DiGuilio.

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Can I just take a step
17 back and say it looks like -- Can I look at the district
18 below the Compton Carson district, because we've taken a
19 little bit out of -- because I'm looking -- I'm trying to
20 look at it in the sense that if this is kind of a
21 community of interest, how can we -- I want to see what
22 it's bounded by on the south. So, I'm trying to put it
23 in perspective as to what we're working with a baseline.
24 What did we have, based on the last visualization. We
25 had Carson, Compton, Willowbrook, Lynwood. It included

1 Southgate, so you've taken Southgate from that district,
2 correct? The other one that we had?

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Southgate is in here in the
4 one -- their visualization.

5 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** In yours. I'm saying,
6 but it was before in the visualization that we were
7 working with was that Southgate was with Compton and
8 Carson, correct?

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, I don't think so.

10 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No.

11 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's correct.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah?

13 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yes, that's correct.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Wait, it was split.

15 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Are we talking
16 about draft one?

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'm looking at the
19 visualizations that were done.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, I see. Okay.

21 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'm sorry.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, yeah.

23 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'm looking at the
24 visualizations that were presented to us today. So --

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And where is Lynwood with --

1 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Lynwood is now in Compton
2 and Carson. You did not include Southgate as part of
3 that -- Excuse me. You did not include Lynwood in part
4 of that grouping. So, we've taken out Southgate, which
5 is 100,000 people, roughly. So, then I'm -- to me it
6 looks like we have some consensus, at least initially,
7 that Compton, Carson, we don't want to go any further
8 down there. And so either our choice is to kind of -- Is
9 Downey -- Is Downey out of that grouping?

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

11 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay. So, Downey is out
12 of that grouping. So, then, I'm looking again to where
13 -- we're looking at going a little bit further north or a
14 little further west; am I correct? And I'm thinking part
15 of the -- Yeah, so that's kind of where I'm saying if we
16 need to -- if this really is a community of interest that
17 we'd like to keep together, then we can't go south for
18 it. We can't go east. Let's see where we can do to
19 build --

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think Jeanne and I were
21 saying that we could take Commerce out.

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Out?

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I mean, that it could stay
24 outside. That if we tried to keep that community of
25 interest together, it doesn't have to include Commerce.

1 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** But we still need to pick
2 a population. So, then, you're saying if Commerce is out
3 then we're either going over to Montebello, Pico Rivera
4 or we're going over to South Park, Florence. And I can't
5 remember how far up that Carson, Compton went over there
6 to the north. I can't recall, based on the
7 visualization.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It may be too difficult. I
9 really -- You know, we may have to not -- this is why I
10 say, how does it affect the surrounding areas. And then
11 we could talk about which cities totally need to be
12 grouped together. But I think a split of three is way
13 too much to be split in three congressionals. If we
14 could think of a way to just group -- do two, and I think
15 there are some cities in there that are more related than
16 others. I do. You know, like I remember in the hearings
17 people said Lynwood could go either way. Everybody was
18 like, oh, I don't know, Lynwood, you know. I think there
19 are some possibilities there.

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Chair.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Given Commissioner Filkins-
23 Webber's suggestion about Koreatown not really being
24 related to Florence Firestone, I wonder if we could put
25 Florence Firestone into the Lynwood district instead, and

1 that might allow us to put -- to swap out, you know, the
2 Southgate and see how many people in there.

3 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** You have 100,000 people
4 between Southgate and (inaudible).

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** That's pretty dense.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It's so dense there.

7 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Is there a way to go north,
8 though, from the Watts district and capture similar
9 population? Maybe Commissioner Parvenu has some thoughts
10 on this. And then we might be able to just make that one
11 split, as you mentioned.

12 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I have no thoughts right
13 at the moment, but I --

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Because we did have -- we had
15 several pieces of testimony from Huntington Park wanting
16 to be with Bell and Cudahy, with being more iffy about
17 Bell Gardens.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I was -- I think you could
19 take out Bell Gardens, actually, potentially, and keep it
20 on -- keep it with Commerce. Yeah. I think that's
21 actually, you know, something that people would
22 understand. It's on the other side of the 710.

23 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** You know, one of the things,
24 too, just talking about the economics, you know, Bell
25 Gardens and Commerce have casinos, so, they're financial

1 situation is different from the other cities.

2 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Can I just make one quick
3 observation, because this has become our assumption. If
4 we take the Southgate and the Walnut Park, again, out of
5 the Compton Carson, that's 100,000 people. So, we will
6 have to pick up 100,000 people in Compton, which I think
7 goes into Long Beach, then. So, just for consideration
8 later, because I think -- I don't want to mess up --
9 We're looking at this district, how to fix this other
10 problem. But --

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, I said to go north.

12 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** No. Yeah, but I'm saying
13 that if you take out Southgate and Walnut Park from the
14 Compton Carson, you're saying --

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Then you could go north to
16 Florence Firestone. That was what my suggestion was.

17 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay. I thought you
18 meant to put that into Inglewood.

19 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I would defer to
20 Commissioner Parvenu as well, but you probably have that
21 entire area up to the 10 Freeway.

22 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Would you agree?

24 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I would agree.

25 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Could you bring the map
2 down a little bit, please? I agree with --

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Because that would
4 be like a natural border. Those neighborhoods south of
5 the 10 Freeway and south of downtown, that whole area is
6 probably a little bit more similar to the -- it might be
7 a little stretch, but if you needed to pick a population,
8 that was where I would think it would make more sense.

9 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right.

10 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But I'll defer to
11 Commissioner Parvenu.

12 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And I agree. I'm bothered
13 by the Koreatown connection, and the areas north of
14 Koreatown being connected with the district there. At
15 some point below Wilshire, I wouldn't cut it off at
16 Wilshire, because that's certainly a community of
17 interest --

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah.

19 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** -- going south of that
20 line -- Yeah, that line beneath. Okay (inaudible).
21 Somewhere -- Well, let me see where. Somewhere in there
22 that could be a split, but not having -- not having --
23 somewhere in there there could be a split, thereby
24 allowing more population to be obtained southeast --

25 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** -- without actually
2 splitting, keeping Pico Union intact, and possibly moving
3 towards the downtown area, Pico Union towards -- That
4 area, Pico Union, could be shifted over as well, thereby
5 allowing enough population to be obtained in the
6 southeast area or places further south that has more in
7 common with those cities if the intent here is to gain
8 population.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Ms. Henderson, and then I
10 think we have to think carefully. We had a lot of
11 testimony about Pico Union and downtown. We've got to be
12 really careful there. We had a lot of testimony.

13 **MS. HENDERSON:** Just for the Commission's
14 information, this magenta highlight is based on the
15 outline of Koreatown that we received in public
16 testimony.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay. I see. I see.

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** So, that's why I
19 thought the limit was the 10.

20 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay.

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** If we go -- if you
22 added population, you could probably just get it all
23 south of the 10 right there and then still preserve Pico
24 Union with -- Except there was Pico Union Exposition
25 Park. That's a COI.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, can we see how much
2 population is in that area north, the Florence Firestone
3 Area?

4 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Start from the
5 south and just move forward and see where we get the
6 population exchange.

7 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, starting at Florence
8 Firestone?

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, that's the border there
10 that you have. So, if we added Florence Firestone into
11 the Willowbrook -- into the Compton district, basically,
12 and took out Southgate and Walnut, right, where would you
13 have to go to replace that population. Yeah, this is
14 pretty dense too, right?

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It's so dense.

16 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, but I think that would
17 get us to -- would that still get us to one split?
18 Because we have Commerce and Bell in the East LA
19 district. So, I just want to check with the rest of the
20 Commission here. What's happening with Huntington Park,
21 Bell -- The testimony I was reading had Huntington Park
22 with Bell and Cudahy with a separation, you know, not as
23 close a relationship to Bell Gardens.

24 **MS. HENDERSON:** Okay. So --

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** That's pretty good.

1 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yeah.

2 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay. So, if we -- I think
3 the other thing is if we moved Bell and Cudahy into its
4 other neighbors west of the 710, then -- Can't do that?

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, Bell and Huntington Park
6 and Maywood are all like one neighborhood.

7 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, that's what I'm saying.
8 Right now it's not together. Right now Bell and Cudahy
9 are with the Bell Gardens district.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, I thought we had moved
11 the Bell Gardens out.

12 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Look at the shaded area.
13 It's only the brown area.

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right, but I'm trying to look
15 at the districts we have, and can we modify the districts
16 we have, because we know the districts we have have the
17 right population.

18 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Brown area is the
19 population, right?

20 **MS. HENDERSON:** The brown area is the community
21 of interest that Commissioner Blanco identified. Those
22 are the cities she identified in her list, plus Walnut
23 Park.

24 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** What (inaudible)
25 Florence Firestone areas?

1 **MS. HENDERSON:** The population on the top is
2 referring to the Compton district.

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right. That's what I was
4 saying. We restored the Compton district to the correct
5 population by pushing Southgate out of it. So, what we
6 need to do now, in order to get the brown shaded area, is
7 to put -- is to take Bell and Cudahy out of the East LA
8 district, and that would put Maywood, Huntington Park,
9 Bell, Cudahy, Walnut Park and Southgate together, which I
10 think is pretty close to testimony.

11 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** What happened to
12 the Florence Firestone?

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Florence Firestone is now with
14 Compton.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Oh, sorry. Okay.

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** And so, Commissioner Dai,
17 so we've kind of set the boundary not including Bell
18 Gardens, and we've done the Florence Firestone. So, are
19 we moving north now with this community of interest that
20 we've identified here with the Southgate Cudahy
21 (inaudible)?

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** That's right. So, now, if you
23 look at this district, it has the southeast cities, but
24 it also has Koreatown in it. So, I just want to check in
25 with the Commission on that.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I'm not comfortable with
2 that.

3 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yeah, it's currently 56,000 over.

4 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Over. Take out
5 Koreatown.

6 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah, that's right.

7 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** But are they in the same
9 district? They're not in the same district.

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah, take out Koreatown.
11 See what happened.

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I can't, because there is box
13 there. I can't --

14 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yeah, it's too hard to
15 (inaudible).

16 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** The (inaudible) box, it
17 is not covering a green line; is that correct?

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** It's not?

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Is it possible to change
20 that downtown box legend? It's in the middle of the
21 district we're looking at, by any chance? So, the
22 district goes from Southgate all the way up to Koreatown
23 the way it's currently drawn, so if we wanted to change
24 that we need to make suggestions how to change it.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, just to review what we

1 did. What we did is we reduced the splits in the
2 southeast cities to just -- you know, it's one split, so
3 it's split into two with Commerce and Bell Gardens in the
4 East LA district now, which needs to be adjusted because
5 we just took Bell and Cudahy out. But now we have all
6 the other cities are together. So, but it's in the
7 bottom of the Koreatown district.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** What was Koreatown with
9 before in terms of other non-downtown areas in the
10 visualization you guys did?

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Florence Firestone. It was
12 with Florence Firestone.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Well, that's just as
14 different.

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, exactly. That's why we
16 moved it out.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And Hancock Park is
18 nothing like Huntington Park.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, go ahead.

20 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Correct.

21 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Can I say that, I mean,
22 Koreatown, I think it's important to maintain the
23 integrity of Koreatown --

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah.

25 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** -- for first point. But, you

1 know, Koreatown is over 50 percent Latino.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, yeah.

3 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** It is a commercial district
4 about --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's true.

6 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** -- a quarter of the
7 population is Korean, and Korean businesses draw heavily
8 on Latino employees. So, if you're looking at who
9 actually lives there, it has a lot in common with the
10 other areas.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. That's helpful.

12 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** But I think it's
13 important to maintain the integrity, which is what is
14 hard is that we have to swap it out as a big (inaudible).

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Which is why I'm saying is
16 this okay? Because, actually, you know, in terms of the
17 people who live there, it's probably (inaudible).

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think you guys might be
19 right that when you look at also Central and Vermont
20 Central, Vermont Central is that large Salvadorian,
21 Central American community.

22 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right. That's fine with
23 that grouping.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** What do you think,
25 Commissioner Parvenu? You know this area a lot more.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** That area, you just said
2 it. That area, Vermont Central, has -- it's okay with
3 the cluster of cities we've just defined there in the
4 southeast. I'm still very, very uncomfortable with
5 Wilshire Center and Hancock Park. I don't know --

6 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, we need to lose --

7 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** If we can -- Let's
8 experiment. Let's experiment taking that out
9 (inaudible).

10 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We need to lose 60,000 people.

11 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Let's do a visualization
12 just to see what would happen if we take that area out.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, I think that's right.

14 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Take the numbers out that
15 we need.

16 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** I believe Wilshire Center
17 is within the definition of Koreatown; is it not?

18 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes, it is. Yes, it's
19 surrounded by it.

20 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** So --

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** In fact, some of the 6th
22 Street and 8th Street -- 6th Street and 3rd Street, that
23 whole corridor, those east west arterials are the central
24 area of Koreatown.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay, guys. LA experts, we

1 need to lose 60,000 people. Where are we going to lose
2 them?

3 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I would keep Pico Union
4 with the east, though, because --

5 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** That's what I was
6 thinking.

7 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah.

8 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** If I recall, the
9 testimony was Pico Union, Exposition Park.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

11 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** And so you could
12 still maintain -- Koreatown doesn't have to be with this
13 district, so --

14 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- even though I
16 understand you're probably going to be taking out more
17 than that 50 or 60 --

18 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** 50,000.

19 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- 50,000 people,
20 you probably could go a little bit more to the west near
21 the Vermont Square. Would you agree?

22 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I would agree.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay.

24 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I would agree.

25 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Again, separating

1 everything south of the 10 --

2 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right.

3 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- except for -- I
4 mean, actually, you could go up Exposition Park, Pico
5 Union, Harvard Heights, West Adams, University Park.
6 That's some COI testimony that if you wanted to keep that
7 together then you really could just separate them from
8 this district and then go --

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** West.

10 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- west, if you
11 have to make up for it, down at Leimert Park and Vermont
12 Square, if Commissioner Parvenu would agree.

13 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I agree. I think Leimert
14 Park and Vermont Square, and that Exposition Park and the
15 University Park -- Well, let's see. That area right
16 there -- What you do when you separate Koreatown is you
17 keep the Asian communities of interest, Koreatown with
18 Thaitown, which is further north, if it goes into the
19 other district further north --

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah. And Filipinotown.

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** -- and Filipinotown.

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, that would be good, then?

23 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** That would be good.

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay.

25 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Because right now that's
2 not a good -- that's not a good (inaudible).

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay. So, let's take out
4 Koreatown. Let's take out the area above the 10, then?

5 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair, where should we put it?

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I just want us to -- As
7 we're doing this, I want us to -- I hope somebody is
8 looking at all that intense community of interest
9 testimony that we had about this region, which was very
10 specific.

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah. So, right now we're
12 trying to fix the Vernon Maywood district.

13 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

15 **MS. HENDERSON:** We need direction about where to
16 put Koreatown.

17 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Go north.

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But why do you have
19 to go there yet? I don't understand.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No.

21 **MS. HENDERSON:** For the Commission's information,
22 the district to the north, that's the Glendale Burbank
23 immediately to the north.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's not --

25 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Okay.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** We could go mid
2 city.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So --

4 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Go west?

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I really want us to take a
6 step back here. And we heard a lot of testimony about
7 the sort of Greater Pico Union downtown area that was
8 very specific about -- and, you know, I just don't want
9 us to forget that it was very -- they mentioned streets
10 like, you know, Western and, you know -- I mean, and so,
11 it was very specific about -- And I -- And then we had
12 Asian testimony from that area saying that they were fine
13 being with some of the -- in that Pico Union area. So, I
14 don't want to start messing around with something that
15 everybody agreed with here.

16 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, in that case, can we just
17 lose 60,000 people? Because then we would be done. We'd
18 be done with the Maywood district.

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, that would be if
20 we're taking out the aqua highlighted, we still have
21 60,000 to lose; is that what you're saying?

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No. Keep -- I would say --

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Keep Koreatown, right?

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Here is what I would say.

1 If we could go back -- if you keep it in the way it is,
2 and if we go back down to that southeast area, it's so
3 densely populated there that I'm really wondering if
4 there is, you know --

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** What about that Victoria Park
6 area, that little corner?

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- that there is not
8 something to do there. It's so dense. You take out
9 three blocks and it's, you know -- I mean, in other
10 words, you could keep your community of interest
11 together, but you might have to -- some of those
12 unincorporated cities -- or, you know, you might have to
13 do something there, because that's where you have a lot
14 of population.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I would concur with
16 that, because I went to law in Hancock Park, lived in
17 Park La Brea, which are those two little white blocks
18 directly to the west of the Koreatown area. And the mid
19 city Wilshire is entirely different from what -- like the
20 Park La Brea side and when you're getting right into
21 Beverly Hills, just a few blocks more over from there.
22 So, I would say that you could probably still respect all
23 of that COI testimony.

24 And, also, I had forgotten about it, because when
25 I lived there for four years we did receive some public

1 input on the website about the Hasidic Jewish population
2 and their social structure, their lifestyle and their
3 temples all down 3rd Street, if I'm not mistaken, at La
4 Brea and Hancock Park. So, I'm really concerned about
5 pushing that Koreatown district any further west, because
6 you really are going to start getting into some problems
7 there. So, I would look at shaving where you're shaving,
8 and maybe keep that Koreatown with the Pico Union and
9 Exposition Park, because that seems to flow a little bit
10 more rather than pushing into other COIs that we've been
11 trying to respect.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. And then let's go
13 down to the -- and then maybe we just have to really look
14 at those cities, and even though -- in the southeast.
15 And even though you keep the community of interest
16 together, maybe some of those cities --

17 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Well, I have a question, and
18 maybe Commissioner Parvenu can address it. But I know
19 that the area -- I went to USC a long time ago. It was
20 quite different from what it is now. And I know that a
21 lot of those areas, West Adams and so on, have
22 experienced a real gentrification, I think.

23 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes.

24 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** So, I don't know if it might
25 be more appropriate to continue shaving off a little

1 there. Those people might be very comfortable a little
2 to the west.

3 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I agree.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, that's interesting.

5 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I agree. There is a major
6 -- The University has expanded and has housing
7 developments, you're absolutely right, just west of
8 Vermont. And also --

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Getting close.

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** -- the new rail line, the
11 light rail line is coming down from downtown through
12 Exposition Park and heading west, linking that community
13 along Exposition Boulevard. So, there is some
14 commonality with that area.

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And the testimony that we
16 heard was that the divider was Vermont.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And --

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** When people spoke that day,
19 they actually referenced Vermont.

20 **COMMISSIONER PAVENU:** USC is a major economic
21 engine for that region two, and that's traditionally been
22 a part of the communities to the south and to the west,
23 even as far as Jefferson Park there has been some
24 investment from the USC community. And it's a major
25 employer in that area. It's the largest employer in that

1 region, actually. So, to add that to the --

2 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Just don't end up putting the
3 University in two --

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, don't split the
5 University.

6 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Let's not cut through the
7 University.

8 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, can we give
9 direction, basically, for Q2 to work on that?

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, I think we've gotten
11 close enough, I think. So the direction would be to keep
12 these southeast cities together, without Commerce and
13 Bell Gardens, and without, obviously, Florence Firestone,
14 and to go up but take out the West Adams area, which is
15 now more closely linked to the USC University community.

16 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Right.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Does that give you enough?
18 And keep the testimony that we heard about Pico Union and
19 Koreatown together.

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Chair, I think there is one
21 other issue, which is now the district that we move
22 Commerce and Bell Gardens. Well, they were actually
23 there before. We took out Bell and Cudahy.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** We didn't take out Bell. We
25 took out Bell Gardens.

1 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, it was already in that
2 district. Maybe the -- Anna, can you say what the
3 population of the district that includes Commerce is?
4 That's actually the downtown district, I guess. Is that
5 district over or underpopulated now?

6 **MS. HENDERSON:** It's underpopulated by 58,363
7 people.

8 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right, because we took out
9 Bell and Cudahy. So, we need to gain some population in
10 the downtown district.

11 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's correct.

12 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Which one -- Could you
13 highlight which is the --

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, I just.

15 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I thought we were just
16 doing downtown included everything from Koreatown down to
17 Southgate; is that correct?

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, that's not the downtown
19 district. That's the downtown district.

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Oh, she moved the box.
21 Okay. That's it.

22 **MS. HENDERSON:** And I apologize. Actually
23 scratch what I said.

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay.

25 **MS. HENDERSON:** The one that is underpopulated is

1 the East LA district.

2 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right. East LA. That's the
3 one that needs more people because we took Bell and
4 Cudahy out of there.

5 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's correct.

6 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, if we need to add to the
7 East LA district, where do we add 50,000 people?

8 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

10 **MS. HENDERSON:** Before we answer that question,
11 can I have clarification about Victoria Park?

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

13 **MS. HENDERSON:** Is that going to be in the
14 downtown district or not in the downtown district?

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I can't answer that. Can
16 somebody else answer that?

17 **MS. HENDERSON:** It was in the visualization, but
18 during the conversation we heard to take it out, so I'm
19 just trying to make sure we (inaudible).

20 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** What's the street
21 that runs down to Wellington Square? Is there a street
22 right there?

23 **MS. HENDERSON:** Just a moment.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It looks like Crenshaw.

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, that entire line

1 north south, even though it kind of juts out and back
2 around, that's -- Wait, no. Crenshaw is on the farthest
3 west, and then that next one over is Arlington? Okay.

4 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's correct.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. It is now 3:10.

6 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Could you move it to the
7 east? I mean, push it that way? I'm sorry, Chair.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, no, no. It's okay. Is
9 this helping us fix the underpopulated East LA district?

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes, I just want to --

11 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, it might if we wanted to
12 take the area that's east of Koreatown and put it into
13 the downtown district. But that's Pico Union, right?

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's -- Yeah, I mean --

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I don't think they would mind
16 being --

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** It would fit.

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, I don't think it would
19 be --

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think they just didn't
21 want -- I mean, as long as you really kept it as a
22 neighborhood and you put it to the east, I think that
23 would be fine.

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah. Oh, so there is
25 Filipinotown. I was wondering where it was. Yeah, so

1 that way you could just move it over. And then actually
2 that might solve the problem of the overpopulation in the
3 other district.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And I think Pico Union may
5 be with downtown right now --

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay, but look at
7 how --

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- or East LA right now.

9 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- you're going to
10 have this little tiny corridor right there matching --
11 that's going to join Koreatown all the way with the
12 Southgate when you take Pico Union out.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, yeah.

14 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Unless you widen it
15 through West Adams, which, then, you're adding more
16 people and it defeats the purpose. But look at how small
17 you're going to get right there at the edge of -- I mean,
18 the Southeast corner of Koreatown in its connection south
19 of the 10.

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** But at least those areas have
21 a good relation. I mean, when we -- Oh, there we go.
22 So, that repopulates the East LA district, and they can
23 adjust it. And then downtown is -- we can add some
24 population back in West Adams if needed.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, I'm going to make a

1 recommendation here. We see why LA is so hard, and I
2 think we started in the right place in terms of
3 identifying the areas that are the most problematic. I
4 would -- So, our hope had been to be able to sort of
5 finalize the core of LA and save it as a visualization,
6 and have Commissioner Ancheta and Barabba work with
7 Gibson Dunn on, you know, have them look at this. Do you
8 feel -- Let me ask you, do you think that even if it's
9 not precise that you have some concept that you can go to
10 them with, and then we can always -- Because we're just
11 trying to get ahead of the game here, and we're already
12 ahead if we get an okay from that that this general
13 mapping is the way we want to go. Or tell me here,
14 because we can go a couple of ways right now.

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Well, if the ultimate
16 question is are these are these VRA compliant, let's say
17 they can't answer it yet, right, is it consistent with --
18 The last -- is this consistent with community of interest
19 and other criteria for standards? And I think we can say
20 yes, based on our discussion today. I don't know that
21 they'll commit to more than that.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, maybe I'm asking
23 the wrong question. The question I'm asking is, do we
24 have enough here to sort of save this as a concept for
25 the core of LA that remedies the problems that were

1 identified post map by in our hearings and in our written
2 testimony?

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I think yes.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That then we obviously have
5 to go back and do some more fine tuning mapping with, but
6 do we think we have enough here.

7 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I've got a comment on
8 this.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

10 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** What was just happening
11 there is totally dividing and ripping through a community
12 of interest right there. On one scenario, this whole
13 district proposal visualization takes University Park and
14 USC out of the traditional -- that area over there, I
15 guess we're calling it CRSLP. And as we go further west,
16 just as we had a problem up north with Hancock Park and
17 Koreatown, now we have a problem with the African
18 American community, because Adams Normandy, West Vernon,
19 Vermont Square, that's -- Jefferson Park, that's a
20 significant park. Moving west just ate up and chewed up
21 a huge area of the traditional African American community
22 of South LA, south of the 10 Freeway. So, and they have
23 nothing in common with the folks across the 10 or across
24 Alameda.

25 I think once you go across Alameda, Alameda is a

1 significant north south corridor that establishes a whole
2 different set of communities. And the whole scenario, if
3 that area is linked as a congressional district, I don't
4 know. We're looking for the numbers. I don't even see
5 the numbers, and I can't even tell what street that is
6 right here by Vermont Square. I don't know what street
7 -- I don't know what that street is. I see Vermont
8 Square. I'm assuming it's -- I don't know what it is.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm going to take a
10 break here. There is obviously problems with this, so
11 we're not going to proceed with this and say --

12 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I can't (inaudible).

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, no, no. It's point well
14 taken. It just demonstrates that we're going to have to
15 come up with a better process. We are. I mean, we were
16 trying this. I think we're going to have to regroup
17 after the meeting today and figure out how we proceed
18 with this, because it's a combination of both the
19 difficulty of LA, and I think it's also we've got to
20 figure out how we're going to do this as a group. It's a
21 couple of things together that are happening here that
22 have pushed us so far into the afternoon with this.

23 And I -- we have some business items. I would
24 like to -- Here is what I would like to do. I would
25 actually like to stop this, and we can make this a part

1 of a discussion in our business meeting about how we want
2 to proceed, given that we've given this a shot, and we've
3 tried to work like this. And I'd like to hear from our
4 -- our team about, having done this today, what do you
5 think is an alternative way that would help us proceed
6 better?

7 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Well, I think you tackled
8 the toughest one first, right, frankly.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

10 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** And it's tough, and I
11 think this --

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

13 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** We have to work -- we will
14 have to work through this set of problems. If you're
15 just looking at areas again, we were comparing some
16 alternatives for potential VRA related districts. Some
17 are less complex and some are pretty -- in other words,
18 there are some areas where the maps are really -- the
19 proposals are really similar to what we've drawn, and we
20 just sort of say, well, let's go ahead with that, because
21 we don't see some looming VRA problem. And I don't know
22 how to get around this one, but, again, I think you
23 started with probably the hard -- one of the hardest
24 parts of the entire State, and we haven't fixed it yet.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That was intentional,

1 because it gives us a really -- I think it's a really,
2 really good reminder of -- it's a real reality check
3 about LA, which sort of shows why we ended up the way we
4 did last time when we had such a short time to spend on
5 LA. So --

6 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** I mean, you can always try
7 to get -- in terms of efficiency in trying to cover
8 ground, you could move to what would be, quote, unquote,
9 easier areas and just try to get them done. And, again,
10 assuming no ripple effects from that part of the region
11 or the State. And, again, the problem, of course, is if
12 you spend too much time on the hardest one, you get stuck
13 and never get to anything else. At least we could try to
14 cover some ground in other areas and revisit, realizing
15 we need to budget a lot of time for this particular
16 region.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, let me -- Yes,
18 Commissioner Yao.

19 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Since I have the Chair
20 assignment this next round, and we're going to continue
21 and pick this up on the 29th, and since we need Q2 map for
22 support, I think we may want to try to make a decision as
23 to whether we want to continue tackling this problem, the
24 congressional downtown problem, or whether we want to try
25 a different approach, not only finishing up the

1 congressional, but also start looking at the senate and
2 the assembly map. What I'm asking is important, because
3 we need the right mapper -- the right region people here
4 on the 29th. Okay? And that's the next time we get back
5 together on the map drawing.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** The -- And I think the
7 additional thing I would add is, how comfortable do we
8 feel, since we just sat here and all tried to do this,
9 with having our team keep working on LA, like this is --
10 In other words, it's an ongoing assignment, now that
11 you've gotten some instruction on the southeast cities,
12 the harbor. In other words, kind of what you did to
13 bringing us this visualization, having had the benefit of
14 our conversation, is that helpful at all? I mean --

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Well, you've expanded the
16 duties of the team in doing that.

17 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

19 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** So --

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's what I want to talk
21 about. In other words, you came to us with this
22 visualization, and then we said, huh, well, some parts
23 are great, and here is a problem area, and it did help to
24 have this. I mean, I think we remedied some real
25 problems we had in the previous draft. Now we've run

1 into another one. The question is, if we're trying to
2 get ahead of the game, is there any work that can be
3 rolling on LA while we're meeting? Yes, Commissioner
4 Dai.

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, my suggestion is we
6 already have assigned pairs of Commissioners to look at
7 different parts of LA, and my suggestion would be to have
8 those pairs work on options for those areas.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm going to say that
10 Commissioner Filkins-Webber and I are doing LA for
11 congressional. There are things that Commissioner
12 Parvenu knows.

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, you're only doing Central
14 LA. Commissioner Parvenu and Commissioner Ward -- I
15 mean, sorry, Commissioner Yao are doing the South Bay,
16 west side Long Beach area. Commissioners Raya and --

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. But this area --

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- Galambos-Malloy are doing
19 the --

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- that we were just in, if
21 I could finish my sentence, is an area that, obviously,
22 Commissioner Parvenu knows a lot about. And for
23 Commissioner Filkins-Webber and I to go into this core of
24 LA without that expertise, I think we'll be back in the
25 same spot we're in right now. So, we may have to revisit

1 some of those assignments in order to really move ahead
2 with the specific knowledge that you need of some of
3 these neighborhoods in that core area.

4 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I would not mind --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** But I think the format is a
6 good idea, that that's the next step is to go back to the
7 teams that we already created and keep working at it now
8 that we have problems, you know --

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Feel free to switch your
10 assignment if --

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** What?

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I said feel free to switch
13 your assignment if it makes more sense.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I mean, we might have to --

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- just because, you know,
17 we might have to in order to get the best knowledge we
18 need.

19 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, who is on the
20 west side? Commissioner Parvenu and who else?

21 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Commissioner Yao.

22 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** It's myself and
23 Commissioner Yao.

24 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Because I lived in
25 Park La Brea and the west side, but --

1 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** We have the entire LA outside
2 of the San Gabriel Valley, so it's --

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, you don't. You only have
4 west side --

5 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Long Beach.

6 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- Long Beach. I mean,
7 Commissioners Raya and Galambos-Malloy have the San
8 Gabriel Valley. You know, like I said, feel free to do
9 the pairing that makes sense, but there was some thought
10 about party affiliations that went into that.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No, I understand, but I
12 think one of the most important considerations is
13 knowledge of the area.

14 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And I think myself and
15 Commissioner Filkins-Webber, being a Republican, and I'm
16 inclined to say, can discuss the nuances around the mid-
17 Wilshire. As I'm recruiting you. But --

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I don't mind it for
19 the west side, but if you guys have south LA, I won't
20 touch that, based on the work we did today.

21 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** This area here --

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I can work with -- We're
23 separate -- we're different, so you and I could do the
24 core of LA.

25 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** We could do that. That's

1 right.

2 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We could do it that way.

3 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah.

4 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Just as a reminder, and I
5 think our general counsel would agree, we have to be very
6 careful about serial communications.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. No, no. I know.
8 This is just the work assignment that we agreed upon that
9 we were going to work in teams.

10 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But people have
11 already worked together, so you're already getting
12 yourselves into a serial --

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** But you and I haven't worked
14 on LA.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Oh, I've seen your
16 -- You sent me an e-mail, several e-mails. So, that's
17 the problem with the serial communication.

18 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** You know, I feel like there is
19 only so much pairing can do in terms of coming up with
20 concepts and so on and so forth. I think we just need to
21 slug through it. Maybe we basically need to program July
22 the 3rd and the 4th -- not the 4th, the 2nd and the 3rd and
23 just keep on slugging through it one square mile at a
24 time.

25 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And that's -- Can I say

1 this?

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Hold on. I mean, I think
3 that's true, but I do think that there is something -- we
4 shouldn't lose a good thing that happened today. These
5 things that were brought to us today really helped. So,
6 we didn't get them two weeks from now or a week and a
7 half from now, we got them now, and there were some
8 really good corrections to what we originally had. And
9 that -- I don't want to lose that part of the process,
10 which is what we were trying to do is not wait until the
11 last minute to sit and just slug it through. So, I think
12 we need a mix.

13 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** So, if the intent is to take
14 what we have today and complete the other districts
15 around it, if that's the assignment, I don't have any
16 issue with that at all.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And that's --

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner DiGuilio and
19 then Commissioner Parvenu.

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Maybe we could just take
21 a step back. I think, first of all, the pairings were
22 really to help us sort through the public comments.

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That's right.

24 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** And so the individuals
25 should be prepared while we're having these discussions,

1 similar to what happened with the ports, because you
2 could make some comments on it. I think another approach
3 to this, another aspect of it is that we have some
4 visualizations that have been developed between with our
5 Commissioners and Q2 and with some involvement of our VRA
6 counsels, and maybe these groups how are in these areas
7 can work with those as a starting point.

8 I feel like, again, we need to have a little more
9 progress. Some of this level of discussion is helpful
10 about maybe the neighborhoods and the small communities,
11 but I think we could get -- we could include that once we
12 get the bigger picture down. And LA is so complicated,
13 and there are a lot of nuances. I'd like to think that
14 maybe we could clean up some of those -- like
15 Commissioner Parvenu's area that he was speaking of, I
16 think that could probably be cleaned up at some point.

17 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yeah.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** But right now we have to
19 really focus on kind of these bigger shifts, really the
20 bigger shifts. And if we had the framework to start
21 with, which was these visualizations, we, as a
22 Commission, can look at those. We've been given those,
23 and then we can build out from there and not kind of lose
24 ourselves in small -- these details. Even though LA is
25 so complex, we have a whole rest of the State for

1 congressional, and we have two more significant districts
2 we really have to get through. We're trying to build in
3 more time to have these discussions, but I think we have
4 to continue to move -- We need Gil here. He was a brutal
5 time master. He just kept us going.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, I'm going to --
7 Commissioner Parvenu, and then I'm going to move this
8 along (inaudible).

9 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** And I just wanted to
10 follow up quickly and say as we are in these pairings or
11 groupings, as Commissioner Ward has reminded, that we
12 aren't actually doing mapping. We're making
13 recommendations based on our knowledge base of these
14 areas. But, also, we have to understand the nuances, I
15 mean, some of the outcomes of these districts in terms of
16 -- What we've done there just now is, we've pitted four
17 ethnic groups against one another, potentially. And I
18 know we aren't to create competitive districts, but there
19 is Caucasian, Asian, African American and Latino. And
20 we've actually -- I don't know if it's theoretically good
21 to combine those four groups together or to separate them
22 based on community of interest testimony, but what we've
23 done is create a potentially contentious situation based
24 on four communities that are totally separate with their
25 orientation. So, there it is.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm just going to --
2 The idea of the pairings was not to make recommendations
3 based on our ideas. It was a -- The way it originated
4 was that we had thousands of public comments that we were
5 saying we could not get through, and that we were
6 concerned that we weren't all going to be familiar with
7 all thousands of the public comments. The hearings we
8 were there for, but the public comments were coming in
9 fast and furious. I still believe the number one
10 function of those groups is to become intimately familiar
11 with the public comments so that when we do this we don't
12 -- you know, we can go. We can point directly and say,
13 we heard, you know, this, that.

14 So, it is meant -- it is specialization, not
15 about our knowledge, but about becoming intimately
16 familiar with what public comment we've received. So, I
17 want to remind us of that, that it's not to go even -- I
18 know it's definitely not drawing maps, but it's not even
19 necessarily making recommendations. It's becoming really
20 being sort of our experts, in a sense, with those areas,
21 because we've done the hard work of doing all the
22 reading. So, I want to just make sure that that's very
23 clear.

24 I think we -- what the other thing we got today
25 was a look at some potential dilution packing issues, and

1 as a result, we have -- that cleaned up some major
2 problems that we had. I think now we have -- we really
3 are at the point of drawing, based on communities of
4 interest, and that is where we're at in LA. I think our
5 folks who looked at this with an eye towards unpacking
6 and not diluting, like we had that downtown district,
7 have given us a skeletal here for at least a more -- a
8 better overview of the core of LA.

9 And now we are going to have to do the hard work
10 of really deciding what are the larger -- when you're
11 dealing with congress you're dealing with communities of
12 interest, supposedly, of 702,000 people, and that's part
13 of the problem here. You're not doing assembly. So, I
14 think we have to accept the fact that some of these
15 districts are big, and they -- you know, they are not
16 perfect communities of interest.

17 And this is why we had asked Mr. Brown what
18 happens in a congressional district when it's that large?
19 Are you really looking at one community of interest? And
20 he said it could be several within there, because you're
21 dealing with very large numbers. Now, that's -- I think
22 that's just (inaudible) say where I think we are.

23 I think as we go forward I think we could -- my
24 recommendation on what we just did is that I would like
25 to capture it as a visualization that solidifies the hard

1 line with the airport, includes the two ports, we try for
2 as much as possible to keep as much as possible to keep
3 that community of interest of the southeast cities, and
4 that, in a sense, those are the three main takeaways from
5 this work today, and then we have a lot to do around
6 that, if that's okay. I don't know if that's something
7 you need to take to counsel or not on section two, but
8 it's what we maybe can take away and save as our ongoing
9 work for LA. Does that make sense?

10 You know, and then it is going back and reading
11 the testimony. Commissioner Filkins-Webber and I will
12 read closely all the downtown core area testimony, and
13 everybody will continue to do the same, and the only
14 question will be when we come back next week for our
15 business meeting, if we don't want to get swallowed up
16 here again we put this aside and we start with some other
17 area. And I guess I'm taking recommendations for where
18 people want to start next time so that we know that ahead
19 of time.

20 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I also want to
21 say, I think that my personal feeling is that we are
22 running out of time. The next time we come together it's
23 going to be the end of June, and we have until the end of
24 July as our drop dead date. I am eyeing Commissioners
25 Barabba and Ancheta to see if -- I mean, if the

1 Commission does want us to explore some of the issues
2 that came up today, again, just with the idea that we do
3 some very rough configurations, maybe come back with some
4 different options, to continue moving work on the days in
5 between our sessions, I think -- I know I would be
6 amenable to doing that. I think, you know, Saturday,
7 Sunday, Monday, we're talking about four dead days out of
8 a month's worth of time that we have between now and the
9 end of July. So, I think we need to have work happening
10 on various fronts.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would really agree with
12 that. I think we even -- the fact we got what we got,
13 that was my point today, really helped us with some
14 things. And I would like us to be able to keep going
15 like that with like sort of a -- with different
16 iterations that keep improving these process.
17 Commissioner Dai, Commissioner Parvenu.

18 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yes. I'm wondering if we can
19 put in place a process for the folks who worked on the
20 other region, some of which, you know, probably are much
21 more minor tweaks, you know, like getting American Canyon
22 back into Napa. I mean, can we go ahead and write up
23 some, you know, points that we can go ahead and give to
24 Q2 to see what they can come up with, so that they will
25 be way ahead of us on the next one?

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm for that. So, the way
2 -- that was going to be the last part of this session
3 with the maps was to -- for everybody that looked at
4 their regional testimony to give highlights to Q2 about
5 the problem areas and what your thoughts are for them to
6 begin to look at them. So, we can --

7 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Can I just make one more
8 suggestion? I just -- I want to make sure, too, that we
9 all know that we're asking for Commissioners Barabba,
10 Galambos-Malloy and Ancheta is to -- you know, to work
11 with Q2 and Gibson Dunn and Crutcher, and, you know, come
12 up with some of these. That it's their job to do --

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I don't think we're there
14 yet with that decision.

15 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** With some of the -- for
16 LA or not, based on what was said?

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think we're close to that,
18 but I don't think there is total agreement on that.

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And I think what
21 Commissioner Dai was sort of taking us to another item,
22 but, you're correct, we should close the loop on that.

23 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah. And I did want to
24 clarify that work still has to be done on the assembly,
25 senate and Board of Equalization districts.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

2 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** We haven't done that yet,
3 for LA.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

5 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** So, that has to be done
6 first, I think, to -- I mean, you can reprioritize, if
7 you want, but that hasn't been done yet.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I know. I know. I know.

9 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** So, we want to work on the Los
10 Angeles on the 29th?

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Ward.

12 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Per your proposal, I just
13 have some reservations about having --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Which one?

15 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** About having smaller groups
16 continuing with any kind of mapping process in the off
17 time, and the only reason for that is just simply that
18 that's what's unique about our system is the public is at
19 the table and can see all the options that we consider,
20 why we choose what we choose, and why we choose not to do
21 what we do so that they can see that all available
22 options are considered and put on the table and can
23 follow the process.

24 So, I just think that if we start delegating that
25 out into smaller groups and come back with a visual, I

1 think that that could leave the public at the curb on
2 some of these important -- especially important areas
3 like LA.

4 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No, that's not what I was
5 suggesting.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Hold on.

7 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Well, that's what I heard
8 being suggested and I just wanted to address it.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, did you feel that that's
10 what we did today? Because I'm saying that we continue
11 doing what we did today, that people come to us with
12 these ideas and then we do what we just spent four hours
13 doing, which is saying, no because this and that and
14 that. That's the process I'm recommending.

15 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** I'm just saying I think that
16 any mapping or consideration on configurations of certain
17 areas done outside of open meeting where everyone kind of
18 watch is not consistent with what I know we're working
19 really hard to do.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, you object to
21 today's process?

22 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** I didn't know it was
23 happening. If I would have been asked prior to, I would
24 have had the same comment.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

1 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** I believe the full
2 Commission actually delegated this authority in the last
3 business meeting for Commissioners Barabba, Ancheta and
4 myself to play this role. At the time I didn't hear any
5 objection, but if there is something about the way which
6 we executed our task, that maybe could have done -- been
7 done better, I'm sure if we consider the possibility of
8 doing it again moving forward, whatever types of
9 parameters the Commission would like to restrict us to,
10 maybe it's, you know, having, you know, all of the
11 different options that we had considered in having them
12 all as visualizations to literally walk through the
13 process. I mean, we're completely open.

14 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Okay.

15 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** It's really a
16 pragmatic discussion of how do we get from here to the
17 finish line.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Commissioner Dai.

19 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, and that was not what I
20 was suggesting in terms of the pairings. What I was
21 suggesting is, you know, everyone supposedly has read all
22 of the public comments for your region, and from that you
23 ought to be able to summarize some options and some
24 problem areas. And, actually, many members of the public
25 had made very specific suggestions on how to fix those,

1 and we need to just give official direction to Q2 so they
2 can go play with it and give them some parameters, like
3 definitely don't do this, or, you know, do this because,
4 you know, a significant number of people have suggested
5 it, whatever, so that they can get going. Because it
6 takes -- As you can see, this takes a lot of time. We
7 don't have enough time left in the world to do this line
8 by line.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. So, Commissioner
10 Dai, I was going to get to that. I just say again, we
11 need to finish, close the loop on what we want to do with
12 what we just did in LA, and what we want to have done
13 with this LA region. And the options on the table are
14 that we sort of capture this as a concept, and, you know,
15 we know it took care of some -- corrected some issues we
16 had in our draft maps, and that we have people come back
17 to us. And that's, I think, what Commissioner Ward has,
18 you know, an objection to, or whether we just leave this
19 now and we schedule another session where we, as a group,
20 and having everybody read their -- you know, their public
21 comments, continue working on LA together with no work in
22 between. Those are the alternatives, as I see them, but
23 I'd like to hear if there is a third alternative. Yes.

24 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Just to clarify, I'm not
25 objecting to what was done. I'm just saying that as a

1 principled course of action I had a concern about
2 mapping, specially, and going through certain
3 visualizations and making (inaudible) decisions about
4 what would not be options presented, not without, like I
5 said, the public meeting. That's a fair concern. But I
6 did want to lend my support to Commissioner Dai's idea.
7 It seems like a very logical and valid use of the teams.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right. And that's what we
9 want to do in the next 15 minutes is the highlights of
10 the problems so that we could actually give that as a
11 group Q2, but we have not decided what we want to do with
12 LA, whether we just put it on the agenda for another
13 whole group meeting or not. And I'm -- Commissioner
14 Filkins-Webber.

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Commissioner
16 DiGuilio and Commissioner Ancheta, did you have in your
17 work plan, because I haven't looked at it for a while,
18 where you really think that there is a this drop dead
19 deadline, you know, with Mr. Barretto looking at it?
20 Because this is where we seem to be stalled out as far as
21 getting his opinion in these areas is in order for us to
22 agree on these lines that we've been talking about today
23 so that he could render an opinion, correct? Or are you
24 expecting something from him preliminarily based on what
25 you put together?

1 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** I don't think that's where
2 we're getting stalled.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. I don't think we're
4 getting stalled because of RPV.

5 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** No. And, again, I think
6 what we're doing, on advice of counsel, and I don't
7 always agree with the advice of counsel, but in this
8 situation what we're trying to do is actually rely on
9 non-section two and non-racial basis. We're just running
10 into a lot of -- we're getting stuck. And kind of -- And
11 that's the -- Was I in the queue, I guess, after --

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No. Go ahead.

13 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'll start a queue.

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** And I'm very sensitive to
16 Commissioner Ward's concern, and I think we've -- he and
17 I have discussed this, and I didn't have visualizations
18 for these other areas, because I thought, well, here are
19 some options. I'll just present (inaudible) we'll look
20 at the maps and we'll decide as a group what we want to
21 do. We went with visualizations on this one because it's
22 so hard. And that's the concern. I fully agree that we
23 shouldn't be doing mapping, and --

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No.

25 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- teams shouldn't be

1 deciding things with Q2 or -- Nobody should be deciding
2 things. But I think it is helpful to try to do this,
3 because -- and, again, LA is a particularly difficult
4 area to do. If you don't sort of look at the ripples
5 you'll get lost very easily. But I totally agree with
6 not wanting to, both for internal processes as well as
7 for public perception, make it seem like groups are just
8 drafting maps.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

10 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** That's not what we want to
11 do.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, I'm going to -- Chair's
13 prerogative. I think there is consensus on that. I
14 think we will just -- all the LA outer core, whatever,
15 we're going to just really look closely at the testimony,
16 make a -- you know, keep a list, have it very well
17 accessible when we meet, and we'll just -- we're going to
18 -- the work team, the work plan team is going to have to
19 have a really tight schedule for us for sitting down and
20 doing these things. And now we know what LA takes, this
21 is our learning -- we now know that when do this we're
22 going to -- it's going to take a really, really, really
23 long time, but all of us will have read all our testimony
24 and will have it here handy, and we'll do it as a group
25 and we'll just plow through it. Yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** So, now that I'm wearing
2 work plan team hat --

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Hat. Yeah.

4 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- specifically, and we've
5 been delegated the authority to work out scheduling
6 things --

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

8 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- should we, therefore,
9 get very specific about timing issues and work --

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

11 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- with the Chairs as we
12 come forward? Is that (inaudible)?

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That would be my
14 recommendation, that the work team now -- This is a very
15 good, if nothing else this was a very good, you know,
16 insight into what this takes, in terms of time management
17 going forward. And so, yeah, take this into account.
18 Commissioner Raya, and then I really want to do this last
19 piece where we give our highlights to Q2 of the things
20 that we've all picked up from our respective areas that
21 we want them to look at. Commissioner Raya.

22 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Okay. One observation, that
23 this is going to require all of us to maximize our
24 attendance, and when we are in attendance being in
25 attendance throughout the meeting.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. All right. So, I'm
2 going to try and take 15 minutes -- What happened to
3 lunch? It turned into dinner. To -- I would like for
4 Commissioner Dai, if you have the list of the work
5 groups, if you could go through them and have people
6 speak to, for congress, the key things that they picked
7 up that they -- in the testimony, that they saw were
8 corrections that we want them to explore. Okay?

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And I'm going to let you run
11 -- Yes.

12 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I just want to just
13 put one suggestion out here that might be a little bit
14 more construction, because what Commissioner Dai and I
15 did was, in light of the testimony, post draft testimony,
16 we actually highlighted the recommendations. So, it
17 wasn't exactly just a summary of what they said. I mean,
18 we have some ideas. I don't know if you wanted --

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Perfect.

20 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- to move it into
21 more of a constructive fashion of --

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- assumptions in
24 current districts, COIs that we've kept together, all
25 looking post draft, and then maybe just highlighting for

1 the Commission, the changes that may or may not have to
2 occur, and just highlighting them one, two, three.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think that's great, and --

4 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- let's start with you guys
6 and you can model for us.

7 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Go ahead,
8 Commissioner Dai.

9 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I was going to actually have
10 you model it for us, but one of the things we looked at
11 in the car on the way over here was that the two
12 visualizations for Pomona Valley, the Ontario
13 congressional district --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, Q2, we are now moving
15 into this section.

16 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We are moving into region two.
17 And --

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** We can just run
19 them off. You want to run them off like the
20 congressional (inaudible)?

21 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, why don't you go ahead.

22 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. This is what
23 we were taking. Okay. Let's just start with Inyo, Mono,
24 San Bernardino, INMNOSB, the COI testimony that we
25 received a quite significant amount of is the split of

1 Redlands. And if you -- I don't know if -- Do you have
2 that handy? I don't know if you have to pull that up,
3 but if you have your visualizations with you, your
4 handouts, you'll see that Redlands is split. And just as
5 a highlight, we were considering also the possibility,
6 and this might be a little bit of stretch, but taking out
7 Mono and Inyo out of this district, because this is the
8 district that runs all the way from Bishop, which is
9 Mono, all the way down to the High Desert, Hesperia,
10 Apple Valley, Victorville, all the way down to Redlands,
11 and it splits Redlands. It's a very large district.

12 So, what we were considering is let's just make
13 Redlands whole, and one other way to do that was
14 considering taking some population from Fontana, so and
15 considering Mono and Inyo, there are transportation
16 corridors. We know that the Sierra Nevadas are right
17 there. We're not geographically stupid. We do recognize
18 it, but there is High Desert, you know, there is
19 foothills, mountain, geographic. And the population, I
20 think, with those two counties is only about 24,000.

21 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Fourteen and 18, respectively,
22 in Mono and Inyo.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. So, by doing
24 that, you're going to be bringing Redlands back into the
25 SB district, and when you add the Redlands back into the

1 SB district, as just a highlight, you could push out --
2 You're still going to respect the Ebony Triangle. I had
3 asked, I think it was Mr. Watson, I think that's his
4 name, what happened to the Ebony Triangle, and that he
5 said it would be okay to add Fontana back in to the --
6 more than likely, the Ontario district. We're talking --
7 and I don't know if you have your handouts in front of
8 you, but that's where there was a pretty large split, and
9 that would still be respectful of the Ebony Triangle, and
10 you would still likely be able to have the section two in
11 the Ontario in the Fontana.

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, one slight modification,
13 is there was a lot of testimony that actually put
14 Redlands, Loma Linda, and Highland together. So, that
15 was the justification for putting it in that district.
16 And then the -- I think visualization two might have been
17 for Pomona. We left Pomona in. We took the rest of
18 Chino Hills out and put it so that can go with the
19 Diamond Bar District.

20 There is a question what to do with Upland and
21 Rancho Cucamonga, which everyone said didn't really
22 belong. And I think with visualization two, that was
23 provided from -- by Q2, actually does a better job of
24 keeping the Ebony Triangle together. It's a little under
25 the 50 percent LCVAP. I don't know if -- what the

1 consideration was over there.

2 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** But, as I recall, I
3 think one of those visualizations it looked like the
4 foothill district that somebody was working on, maybe it
5 was Commissioner Galambos-Malloy and Commissioner
6 Ancheta, or at least on something on the map that I saw
7 those foothill districts going up, running north and
8 south, I thought I saw one that might be Claremont,
9 Upland and Rancho Cucamonga, which that's how we were
10 visualizing it.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

12 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** We thought maybe we
13 could -- I think depending on what we look at, depending
14 on the option for the section two in Pomona will dictate
15 that what happens with Fontana. So, just to really
16 highlight, that San Bernardino County, where our goal is
17 to preserve Redlands, we can probably keep taking a look
18 at one of those options and we'll still be able to make
19 Redlands whole, which was significant in the COI
20 testimony. Anything else, Commissioner Dai, you want to
21 add on San Bernardino?

22 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, well, if you look, this
23 is visualization two, and you can see it goes into
24 Rubidoux, Rubidoux and, what was the other one, Glen
25 Avon.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah.

2 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** And, actually, if we put Paris
3 back in, which was a request to put Paris in the Mead
4 Valley and Good Hope and (inaudible) back into the, I
5 think it's RVMV district, then it would push out Norco
6 and Corona. And I think, actually, with that population
7 you might even get Temecula back in. So, those are kind
8 of the highlights of the shifting around, and it actually
9 repairs several COIs that were split in our original
10 maps. It also accommodates the potential section two
11 district there.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, we want to --
13 what do you -- what's the -- so, how do you want to pass
14 this on to Q2?

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, hopefully Kyle caught all
16 of that, which was keep Redlands whole with Loma Linda
17 and -- Oh, one other thing. We saw public testimony that
18 Highland could be split, so if was necessary to split
19 that Highland could be split along California 30, and so
20 that might help with the population.

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** So, the switch of
22 the population was to -- the one visualization to bring
23 back to the Commission is to make Redlands whole, and
24 when you subtract the population it's going to be on
25 Fontana. So, we'll be making up -- I mean, we'll be

1 subtracting the population in Fontana, which could affect
2 the section two options that have been proposed to us.
3 But let's take a look at it for that one option. So,
4 that's the -- one visualization that we'd like to see.

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** One other thought, to increase
6 the LCVAP of the Rialto Fontana district would be
7 actually to take some of the curly cues that -- for lack
8 of a better term, that are above the 215 actually seem to
9 have a high Latino concentration, and then also, I think,
10 it was Glen Avon that we saw that we could potentially
11 take, as long as there is not a contiguity problem with
12 Pedley going into Eastvale and Norco. And those actually
13 might push the LCVAP over 50 percent.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And this is one of the areas
15 that we are going to do the RVP --

16 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** RPV.

17 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Ontario.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- RPV for, right?

19 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yes.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

21 **MS. HENDERSON:** Chair, a question.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

23 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, Commissioners, just a
24 question. So, this is going off of the option two
25 visualization that was sent over?

1 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Correct.

2 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, are we abandoning the option
3 one?

4 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No. These are
5 options that we're asking Q2 to provide to us so that the
6 Commission can make appropriate decisions when we discuss
7 this region.

8 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We just felt that the option
9 -- that the second visualization kept the Ebony Triangle
10 together better, and we could probably boost the LCVAP
11 and still accomplish the same thing, and, also, by
12 pushing into -- pushing into Riverside, it might possibly
13 make Temecula whole.

14 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. I guess
15 we're talking about two different things. The original
16 SB district did split Redlands.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** In our draft maps.

18 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Correct. This
19 doesn't right now. I think Redlands is whole. So, what
20 my point is is if -- this is option two, correct,
21 Ms. Henderson?

22 **MS. HENDERSON:** That's correct.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. The first
24 suggestion that I had said, which was making Redlands
25 whole and SB, and pulling back in Fontana, may be

1 consistent with option one of the Pomona district for
2 section two. We don't have to pull that up right now. I
3 don't need to go in that much detail. My point is is
4 that we're asking for the option and the visualization
5 from SB.

6 Now, working from this model that you have here,
7 what we can then discuss, keeping this option two up here
8 for the section two for Pomona, is now looking at
9 Riverside County. And I'll get into this, is that the
10 testimony that we received for Riverside Moreno Valley
11 Congressional District was to add Paris, Good Hope,
12 Romoland, Nuevo and possibly Homeland and Mead Valley and
13 March Air Force Base. When you do that -- Oh, refresh my
14 recollection. How much was that population?

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Did they include the City of
16 Riverside as well?

17 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, no, that's
18 already in the congressional district.

19 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** It's already in, yeah.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** This is RVNV
22 Congressional District, which presently consists of a
23 little tiny bit of Corona, Norco, Eastvale, all of Harupa
24 Valley, all of Riverside, all of Moreno Valley, if you
25 recall, and then when we had -- there it is. What we --

1 when we got the public input testimony from San
2 Bernardino, they consistently said that Paris, Good Hope,
3 Mead Valley, March Air Force Base would like to be with
4 Moreno Valley. So, we have to find a population switch.

5 Now, the recommendation that Commissioner Dai and
6 I would like to see in a visualization is to change the
7 RVMVN District to add Paris, Mead Valley, Good Hope,
8 Romoland, Nuevo and maybe we can see how much there is in
9 Homeland. And I guess Lakeview. We don't want to make
10 it by itself there. It's so close. Nobody mentioned it,
11 but we can do that. Okay. So, we'd like to see a
12 visualization of this district.

13 Now, when you add those, the pink areas, you have
14 to --

15 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Take out.

16 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** -- pull back. And
17 what the testimony we received in San Bernardino, much to
18 the hesitation of some people, even though I didn't mean
19 to put them on the spot, which is that we would pull down
20 Norco and Eastvale. And then if you have to pull
21 additional population it would be acceptable to go into
22 the Pedley, Mira Loma Area, because even if we still go
23 with option two in the section two ONT Pomona one, you'll
24 probably be okay because you're taking -- I think -- how
25 many -- there was about 65,000, I think, that they were

1 taking from Rubidoux in that second option. So, we'd
2 like to see that visualization.

3 In doing so, we're hoping that we could salvage
4 Temecula. We did see some news articles, even though
5 that we -- and I think that they're going to be passing a
6 resolution this week. So, we're keeping that in mind,
7 even though we haven't seen much in the way of public
8 testimony from them. So, we're hopeful, but if we go
9 with that option two up in Rubidoux and Glen Avon we
10 might be able to do the section two up there and keep
11 Temecula whole. So, that is the visualization we would
12 like to take a look at next time.

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Is that clear?

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes. Ms. Henderson, could
15 you show us that, how it looks without Eastvale and Norco
16 and with Mead and Paris?

17 **MS. HENDERSON:** I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can you show us what that
19 would look like without Eastvale and Norco, that switch,
20 just to see what the new configured district would look
21 like with those recommendations?

22 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, do you want
23 to do it now? That's what I (inaudible).

24 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah, that's the suggestion
25 that they can go do it later.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** They can go do it
2 and bring it back.

3 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, okay.

5 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I mean, those are
6 just the instructions.

7 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We're just trying to give them
8 enough instructions so that they can come back --

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. All right. Fine.

10 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- and show us the
11 visualizations.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Good. Okay.

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** One other note is that there
14 was a complaint from the San Jacinto Valley about being
15 put over with Coachella, but they are whole and they are
16 with Callmesa, Beaumont and Banning, which they didn't
17 object to in the assembly.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

19 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, that's just two different
20 COIs.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. Yes,
22 Commissioner DiGuilio.

23 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I just want to go back to
24 one of your early -- what you started it all off with.
25 This is all based on putting Inyo and Mono with the

1 foothills?

2 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Well, I think Mono would have
3 to go for sure, and if Inyo is necessary, I mean, this is
4 what Q2 can work out.

5 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay.

6 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** We want to give them the
7 flexibility to take both Mono and Inyo and put it in the
8 foothills.

9 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** And I ask that only
10 because I'm looking at what happens in the area that I'm
11 -- That Commissioner Aguirre and I are looking out in the
12 Central Valley, because that will require a population
13 push. And because of the section five that's being
14 congressional, there is not as many options of where to
15 push that population, so --

16 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right. There is 14,000 in
17 Mono, and we figured it had a better community of
18 interest with Yosemite.

19 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yes. And I think that's
20 possible. Maybe if I could build on that it would just
21 be simply to if we do foothill I think the population
22 would be, this is that part where Fresno has five
23 congressional.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can I just --

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** So, we could just push it

1 south, because I think it goes back into LA (inaudible).

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah. This is what we don't
3 want to start doing now. I think we want to do these
4 broad instructions by -- I know it's tempting. It's hard
5 to do it, but that's what we agreed to do. Are these
6 comments about what we just saw, or is it comments about
7 the process, the two hands that I have up.

8 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** What we just saw on the Pomona
9 Ontario.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. And then Commissioner
11 Ancheta?

12 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Mine is process.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** The process.

14 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** We did look at an
15 alternative proposal for VRA related districts. Do you
16 want to just discuss that or post them?

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I think we should if it's
18 that region, but let's hear from --

19 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Okay.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- Commissioner Yao, because
21 it's about the Pomona Area, and then you can give us the
22 section two thinking on that, which would be very useful.

23 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Let's put that Pomona region
24 back up.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Our assumption, and the reason

1 we didn't take Pomona out, you know, we kept the Pomona
2 Valley whole.

3 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Two comments. The first one
4 is, recall the testimony on the San Gabriel Mountain
5 saying it doesn't stop at the county line, the Los
6 Angeles, San Bernardino. So, that top line should go all
7 the way across. It doesn't impact population, but it
8 basically would totally include the San Gabriel
9 Mountains.

10 Secondly is that Los Angeles and San Bernardino
11 County line is really a wall to a great extent. Pomona
12 happens to be -- wants to be included with the Montclair,
13 Ontario and so on. And you saw the resistance of Upland
14 crossing over to the Los Angeles County. Now, if you
15 take Los Angeles County and put it into the San
16 Bernardino County, you're going to encounter about 10
17 times the resistance. So, while the population number
18 works out, that probably is going to be very difficult to
19 implement.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Can I get the comment
21 from the section two analysis up here.

22 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Nicole, I think you have
23 the MALDEF layer in. So, it's MALDEF 44 and 43. MALDEF
24 44, which would be sort of the Pomona, Chino, Rancho
25 Cucamonga, they suggest a 50 percent majority Latino

1 district that would include Fontana. So, that's one
2 thing to think about. Their second district, I think,
3 and if we could get some color highlighting or something
4 on their 43rd Congressional, that one is very different
5 from what we have envisioned, and it raises some
6 significant compactness issues once you get it figured
7 out. It's better if you can highlight it. It's --

8 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Is it the one -- is it the San
9 Bernardino district?

10 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah, it's the one that
11 starts in San Bernardino and goes all the way down to
12 Paris.

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah.

14 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Again, the one on the
15 left, I think, is one to think about. It's not fully
16 consistent with all the COI testimony, but it is a
17 majority Latino district. And then it keeps going
18 further south, so --

19 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, that was visualization one
20 for Pomona Valley. And the reason we like visualization
21 two better is that we did a better job of keeping the
22 Ebony Triangle together as well as the other cities.

23 **MS. HENDERSON:** So, actually this -- excuse me.
24 This is MALDEF's district?

25 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** This is MALDEF's maps.

1 Yes.

2 **MS. HENDERSON:** This is not something that we
3 produced.

4 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Yeah.

5 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Right.

6 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** No, so I want to, again,
7 on the left side, that's another way to go, and I think
8 Commissioner Dai is identifying why the Fontana --
9 Fontana might want to go eastward rather than westward.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** What does that do to the
11 numbers that switch from Fontana from one side to the
12 other in terms of CVAP for the Pomona?

13 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** It reduces the Pomona one, but
14 it increases the San Bernardino one to very close to 50
15 percent.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

17 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, it just means you switched
18 the location of the section two.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

20 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** And it's also, like I said, so
21 you still have a section two district. It's a better fit
22 with our COI testimony, and it's a lot more compact, and
23 it also may solve our Temecula problem.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, okay.

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** So, we figured it hit a lot of

1 birds with one stone.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So --

3 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** And, again, just to
4 finish, I --

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, go ahead.

6 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- think, I don't know
7 that the Commission would want to try to replicate or
8 adopt the other MALDEF district is looking like. So,
9 again, that is drawn as a majority Latino district.
10 There is a potential claim there. We can decide whether
11 we want to do that or not. I think it's not in keeping
12 with our testimony, and there may be serious compactness
13 issues as well.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** What do the CVAP numbers
15 look like when we put Paris and Good Hope and Moreno
16 Valley together in that district that we just -- that you
17 guys worked on? That's why I wanted to see it, because I
18 wanted to see if that's, you know, a different way of
19 getting at the same issue. Which is the way I see this
20 is that we have very strong community of interest in that
21 area, in Paris and Riverside and Moreno Valley, and I
22 know that is a big growth area over the last 10 years
23 that wasn't captured at all in the previous -- I mean, I
24 think this is actually adds a congressional district in
25 this region.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** It does, but are
2 you suggesting that we would looking at that as potential
3 section two again or --

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Well, I don't know what the
5 -- I would like to see what the numbers -- that's why I
6 wanted to see it with Norco and Corona.

7 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah, the problem
8 is is that the section two or option two for Pomona
9 Ontario is going to come down and take from Rubidoux and
10 Pedley. So, if that's what this visualization is
11 consistent upon.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

13 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** And it's right
14 there. That's where you're going to get -- Well, anyway,
15 we can see it when they --

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I just wanted --

17 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yeah.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Because it's a possibility.
19 I do know that this is where there is tremendous growth,
20 both in terms of populations, I mean, and this is, I
21 think, one of the new congressional districts in the
22 sense for the region, not overall because California
23 stayed the same. But some of the ones that were lost in
24 the LA Area basically moved over --

25 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Yeah.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** -- to this area. And that
2 growth in the population there is, as has been pointed
3 out to us on numerous occasion, in this region most of
4 the growth is Latino population growth in this area. So,
5 it would -- That's why I curious to see. And it's really
6 centered in this area that we're looking at right now.
7 This is sort of the heart of the growth, which is why I
8 was curious to see what that Paris, Riverside, Moreno
9 Valley. But we don't have to do that right now.

10 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** No. So, one other small
11 suggestion, I want to make sure Kyle captures it, if we
12 want to work to boost the LCVAP for the San Bernardino
13 district, which is very close, it's, you know, 48.43
14 percent, and we want to boost it, it looks like, like I
15 said, we could take the curly cues that are on the other
16 side of the 215, and it looked like Mira Loma actually
17 had some population there.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I don't want to do
19 this right now. We already sort of gave them the broad
20 strokes. Okay. Now, does anybody else have something
21 like this that they want to present and give instructions
22 on that they've kind of moved the ball on? Yeah? Okay.
23 Commissioner Galambos-Malloy. Good.

24 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, Commissioner
25 Raya and I were charged with the San Gabriel Valley. I

1 would say that our interpretation of what that meant also
2 goes up into the San Gabriel Mountains. So, what would
3 actually be useful, I think, for us to see would be the
4 visualizations that had come up from our earlier
5 conversations about section two, because some of the
6 really key takeaways from the COI that we have gotten
7 since the first draft maps, as I mentioned earlier, has
8 been there is some validity to the idea of a foothills
9 district but you guys really took it too far. You
10 chopped up a bunch of cities, you know, communities of
11 interest left and right.

12 And so we really -- One of our first charges we
13 saw was to revisit that concept and see if there was a
14 way to balance this COI of a foothills district or
15 districts along with the stated communities of interest.
16 So, are we able to pull up those visualizations from --
17 that -- Ms. Henderson, do we have the visualizations that
18 we were looking at earlier when we were first talking
19 about Central LA?

20 **MS. HENDERSON:** Yeah, just a minute.

21 **COMMISSIONER GALMBOS-MALLOY:** Okay. No problem.
22 So, our basic concept was to break up the foothills
23 district, that long east west corridor, into a few
24 sections, and that these sections would be shorter on the
25 east west arterial and longer on the north south

1 arterial, and that would allow us to go farther down
2 towards to the 210 and the 10, which we got really strong
3 testimony for doing and persevering these clusters of
4 cities.

5 One thing that we were grappling with is that we
6 have had significant COI testimony about Glendale,
7 Burbank and Pasadena being kept together, but we have
8 also had significant COI about Pasadena being the hub for
9 a number of other smaller cities, Duarte, Monrovia,
10 Sierra Madre, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. I could go
11 on and on. And so one possibility we were considering is
12 to group Glendale and Burbank and some surrounding
13 communities of interest, and actually have Pasadena
14 grouped with its other partner communities of interest.
15 So, Commissioner Raya, do you want to weigh in on some of
16 these things we discussed?

17 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** You're doing a great job.
18 Yeah, I think the concern was that we had made some --
19 some cuts where there are ties, as Connie is suggesting,
20 where cities really share some significant resources.
21 And in some ways that might be more important on the
22 assembly or senate level, but because we were looking
23 into the whole foothills and going into the mountains and
24 protecting the federal lands, I mean, that was part of --
25 that was part of how this originally started out. So, it

1 was really just trying to find that balance, you know,
2 the communities that are affected sort of downstream, if
3 you will, but across a broader -- a wider range.

4 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Another thing that
5 we had discussed was how to -- and, again, this gets into
6 the border of where does our role begin and someone else
7 -- end and someone else's begin, because we were looking
8 immediately adjacent to Glendale and Burbank. And given
9 that there are the foothills moving into the mountains
10 with this concept of a district, that we would have the
11 potential to bring in the entire Griffith Park Area,
12 which we had significant COI testimony regarding keeping
13 it together, and it's also an area that shares a lot of,
14 you know, mountain open space concerns that you might see
15 in the foothill areas as well.

16 So, we roughly -- you know, to summarize, I think
17 we would give Q2 some direction to, again, break up this
18 long foothills district that we have east to west.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can we look at that while
20 she's talking.

21 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Well, that's what
22 it is right now, right?

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Oh, at the top. Okay.

24 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** You might want to
25 just --

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Just zoom out. Yeah.

2 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** You may zoom out a
3 little bit. Where we did start to have challenges, I
4 mean, you can see as we get closer to the eastern border
5 with San Bernardino County trying to figure out the
6 interplay with the counties, I think we can do some --
7 maybe some tweaking around the edges at the southern ends
8 of our San Gabriel districts to see, you know, where does
9 Claremont go. I'd be interested to see what
10 Commissioners Dai and Filkins-Webber think about this
11 idea.

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** It's very consistent with what
13 we came up with.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, just is what we're
15 looking at, these are your ideas, these four areas that
16 go down instead of across sort of the bay, the brown,
17 purple, greenish, those are yours?

18 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Yeah. I mean, I
19 think there is a lot of tweaking that could be done, but
20 these are based on trying to preserve some semblance of
21 the foothills districts, but trying to keep cities whole,
22 to keep like communities of interest, city groupings
23 together. So, those were the premises that we were
24 operating under and that we really needed to go farther
25 south in the urbanized foothills district.

1 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** The one that -- Did
2 you work off of those section two options and then go
3 west? It looks like you did. I mean, because the yellow
4 one is option one, right? Or, I mean, it's part --

5 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Well, I asked them
6 to pull --

7 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** It's the Pomona Montclair
8 Area next to the potential option two, section two,
9 right?

10 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Well, let me say,
11 Jeanne and I did not create, you know, direct Q2 to
12 provide any visualizations for the concepts that we were
13 dealing with, so it's very interesting to me that on this
14 separate track with the work that Commissioners Barabba
15 and Ancheta were doing on Central LA and kind of looking
16 north at the ripple effects that we were coming --
17 Commissioner Raya and I were coming to a similar
18 conclusion --

19 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Yeah.

20 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** -- separately that
21 we know we need to break up the hills districts, but how
22 can we do that in a way that is -- that we're not bumping
23 up against issues as we get down into more Central LA.
24 And I think what we're seeing from the synergy between
25 what they presented and what we're considering that we

1 can do it.

2 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm going to -- we're
3 going to stop at 4:30. Before I get to Commissioner
4 Filkins-Webber, I would like to make a recommendation and
5 see if folks think -- feel about this, that we take --
6 that Q2 look at what Commissioners Dai and Filkins-Webber
7 did, look at what Commissioner Raya and Galambos-Malloy
8 did, and the very initial -- you know, this last
9 iteration we did of the core of LA where we -- even
10 though we had some stragglers out there we had sort of,
11 you know, done the coast and we had done the southeast
12 cities. And perhaps put all that together in a
13 visualization for us, call it something. Call it 6/24,
14 you know, whatever, and see what that looks like put
15 together, because it might be the broad strokes of
16 something, even though we know we have to go in and do
17 some stuff on the inside. How do people feel about that?
18 Yes? No?

19 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** No.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I mean, this is not final.
21 This is just to give us a bigger view that now has a lot
22 of different ideas in it that we've discussed today so
23 that we have a thing that encompasses, because that's how
24 we get a sense of how things come together.

25 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** No, I think we introduced so

1 many other serious issues that, for example, the, as I
2 pointed out earlier, that between the Los Angeles County
3 and San Bernardino County, and just crossing county
4 without any consideration. For example, the city I live
5 in, they feel that the community interest is really with
6 Laverne and San Dimas, and simply because we created a
7 foothill district in that item together, I haven't heard
8 from them in term of the support for it, but lacking that
9 kind of testimony we kind of throw them in and throw them
10 into the San Bernardino County.

11 These are the type of things that if we move
12 forward with it it's going to encounter so much
13 resistance that it's not going to fly. It's --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Other Commissioners?

15 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Yes.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Commissioner Filkins-Webber.

17 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Unfortunately,
18 Commissioner Yao, you're going to be in the same
19 situation as what we see with section five. The reason
20 this is occurring is because SBRIA is one option, and
21 that is a section two district for Latinos. And when
22 that happens you can't go much anywhere else in that
23 configuration, with the exception of maybe one other
24 possibility. One other option that we saw, but this is a
25 section two, and we've already seen that section two

1 areas do impact all the surrounding areas.

2 Now, you're going to see, if I recall correctly,
3 either I don't recall if actually in the option one if
4 Claremont was in -- I think Claremont might have been in
5 the section two district for option one for Pomona
6 Ontario. So, there is your choice. Right now we're
7 looking at the possibility of two options for a section
8 two, and it's just a matter of these surrounding
9 communities having to recognize that as a possibility.
10 And Claremont very well could be with Laverne in another
11 layer, either in a senate level or an assembly level.
12 But, again, this is what we're going to see in those
13 section two issues.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I'm not going to --
15 this is not a vote on this map. Okay? This is trying to
16 move the ball saying put these pieces together so that we
17 can look at them, and then we can do this kind of
18 discussion. But I would like for us to be able to have
19 something that we could work off of that will -- you
20 know, without us going into just, you know --
21 Commissioner Parvenu could say the same about this, and
22 so but this gives us the surrounding areas, the core with
23 a lot of problems still, but with a lot of the things
24 that include our section two analysis we asked folks to
25 do for us, our subteam. It includes the corrections

1 based on everybody reading the public testimony. And so
2 there is a lot in here that reflects both the law and the
3 testimony and the corrections the public gave us. So, I
4 think it would be a shame not to keep this as a concept,
5 and then work off of it. Work team, I'm going to end --

6 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** And all I would
7 say is I think this is a good strategy in terms of moving
8 forward that this gives us something to work from,
9 because -- And I think it then will allow it another
10 point, some of the discussions that Commissioner Yao is
11 mentioning. But we really do have to kind of get
12 something on the board, and I think there is probably
13 some general agreements that maybe we needed to address
14 some of these issues like foothill or the section two, so
15 that if they put those premises down for us it eliminates
16 a lot of the discussion, the long drawn out discussion.
17 It takes us straight to the point of saying is this a
18 possibility and why or why not? Let's move the lines
19 from here. So, I like that this has been set up along
20 this (inaudible).

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, I'm going to
22 summarize the assumptions for this. If I miss one,
23 please add it, and we'll ask them to save this. So, the
24 assumptions in this Greater LA map are, we made
25 corrections to the draft maps that included some of the

1 districts in LA that -- these are all congressional, that
2 took in areas that were very disparate communities, such
3 as the Pico Union and the West LA Areas. It took in
4 testimony about the southeast cities and tried to correct
5 a division that we had in our maps. It takes into
6 account a section two district in the Pomona Area, and a
7 potential section two district next to it.

8 It corrects a lot of city splits along the
9 foothills of LA, and even in San Bernardino where we got
10 a lot of testimony that there really was not one single
11 foothill, but that those foothills were integrated into
12 surrounding neighborhoods, and this attempts to correct
13 it. It also -- What else am I missing here?

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** I just wanted to clarify that
15 the Pomona in the congressional is not a section two in
16 this iteration. It's the one next to it.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Thank you. It also
18 takes into account a lot of testimony, Compton Carson
19 testimony, with Northern Long Beach. It takes into
20 account the testimony we heard in Culver City about a
21 community of interest that linked Inglewood with
22 Westchester and the Airport and the areas to the south of
23 -- with -- and that Torrance and Gardena were
24 longstanding communities, and it keeps Gardena whole and
25 keeps Torrance in the same district with El Segundo,

1 Lawndale, and the airport. And we had testimony about
2 aerospace industry.

3 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** We do need to note
4 that we split Torrance along PCH to preserve the coastal
5 nature of the district.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Am I missing another
7 assumption in this greater sort of rough map?

8 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Can I just -- an
9 amendment?

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Sure.

11 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** I think at this point
12 there are no section two districts. There are potential
13 section two districts --

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Correct.

15 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** -- pending our further
16 analysis.

17 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

18 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Maybe just note that we
19 haven't addressed it yet, but there is the one Long Beach
20 part that is short 400,000 people we'll address at a
21 later date.

22 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you. All right. It's
23 a wrap. Let's save that with those assumptions. All
24 right. Let me give you 15 minutes to stretch your legs,
25 and we have one -- we have a couple of business items,

1 and we're going to have to go through dinner because
2 they're important items. They're about the deviation,
3 and we have to have that decision so that we can really
4 move forward, and we have a financial conversation -- a
5 finance committee report that we need to hear that I
6 think is important.

7 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** Are we allowed to eat in
8 this room?

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I'm not sure. It's all
10 right? Okay. Great.

11 **(Off the record)**

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** We had really hoped to get
13 through today. I'm going to just insist that we get
14 through one before we break, and that's -- I want to get
15 through two. I want to have a discussion and a decision
16 and a vote on the deviation, and then I want to have a
17 report back from the finance committee, because there are
18 some major concerns about the fact that our law firm, our
19 VRA law firm has pretty much almost reached its max in
20 terms of hours, and I know that the finance committee
21 wants to report on next steps in relationship to that,
22 and that's really crucial given what we're about to go
23 into now with the map drawing.

24 So, let me just pose the deviation question, if I
25 can remember it. There was -- And Mr. Miller is here.

1 And so Mr. Miller, I'm going to ask you to take your
2 senate testimony seat here in front of the senate
3 subcommittee on deviation and give us your testimony.
4 And we have to go through this quickly, and we want a
5 recommendation.

6 **MR. MILLER:** I will not stroll.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes, no strolling. No
8 footnotes.

9 **MR. MILLER:** (Inaudible) say that. Okay.
10 Commissioner Ancheta has prepared a helpful memo to try
11 to frame the issue or issues, and let me borrow from
12 that, if I can, to set this up. And those issues are,
13 does the California Constitution or other California case
14 law set out a specific number for population deviation
15 the Commission must follow? Question one. Question two,
16 if not, what are the legal requirements the Commission
17 should consider in setting deviation policy?

18 Now, let me just comment on the approach I took
19 in taking a look at this, and that is coming at this as a
20 corporate and corporate regulatory lawyer as opposed to
21 someone who purports to be an expert in these narrow
22 issues. And I think there is, perhaps, some value in
23 that in that a reviewing judge is likely to have been a
24 corporate lawyer and litigator to someone as opposed to
25 someone with -- who has thought a lot about these through

1 his or her career.

2 So, I tried to amass the California case law,
3 such as it is, on this issue, and take a fresh look. And
4 the idea here is to be direct, to try to suggest a method
5 to deal with these issues and not to read from any cases
6 or provide any footnotes, except with one exception,
7 which I can't -- please remind me I'm holding it to the
8 end, if I forget it.

9 So, in taking this look, I think it is important
10 to consider the two lines of cases that exist. We'll
11 focus on California, but you can't -- we shouldn't ignore
12 the federal law on this issue. And we know, I think this
13 is not in contention, but it's useful to set it up, that
14 the United States Supreme Court has required precise
15 mathematical equality in congressional districts. So,
16 that's a standard we know is clear. We'll set it over
17 here for now.

18 The same court and the other federal courts have
19 given State courts some additional leeway with respect to
20 legislative districts. I think it's useful to ask why
21 have they done that. And my reading of the case is --
22 comes up with two reasons. There may be more, but the
23 two that seem evident are, one, that the courts feel that
24 this issue is best developed over time in a stream of
25 cases, if you will, that address individual state

1 circumstances, and, secondly, that in many states the
2 size of state legislative districts are dramatically
3 smaller than congressional districts. And as a result of
4 that, in those states you could have larger percentage
5 variations and still have very small actual numerical
6 differences between districts because you're dealing with
7 a much smaller base. So, those are two things to
8 consider.

9 I know that we've sometimes used the term, in the
10 federal line of cases, safe harbor for districts that
11 have no more than a 10 percent variation. I think that
12 that is taking the concept a little bit too far. For me,
13 a safe harbor is always safe, if you will. Once you're
14 in you're in, if you meet those facts. In this area of
15 the law, though, it's -- districts that are not
16 numerically precise have a rebuttable presumption of
17 being satisfactory below 10 percent under the federal
18 cases. A rebuttable presumption is sometimes in law
19 school referred to as the bursting bubble presumption.
20 It can be overcome. It goes away, and you don't have any
21 protection, if you will.

22 So, you start out safe, arguably, but there is no
23 guarantee, after looking at all the facts, that you're in
24 a safe harbor. And when they talk about a deviation
25 these cases, the language typically looks something like

1 this. It's allowed in order to further legitimate state
2 interests such as making districts compact and
3 contiguous. Okay. So, that's the federal side of the
4 coin.

5 Now let's look at our California side of the
6 coin. I don't think it's fair to say that there is an
7 absolute bright line test. I hate to give away my
8 conclusion at the beginning, but I think it's easier to
9 take away the suspense and talk about the analysis. But
10 let's look at what the courts have said and what that
11 means for our own decision making.

12 Now, there are two principle California Supreme
13 Court cases that speak to this. They were both decided
14 prior to Prop 11 and Prop 20. I want to note that, but
15 come back to at the end how significant their earlier
16 time period is or isn't. They have similar facts. One
17 was decided in 1972, the other in 1992. In both
18 instances the redistricting plan the legislature had
19 adopted, it was vetoed, it was challenged by the courts,
20 and the California Supreme Court, in turn, appointed
21 three other judges to develop maps and bring those maps
22 back to the Supreme Court for approval.

23 In 1992, those judges who had that
24 responsibility, on behalf of the Supreme Court, set as
25 their own target population variations for senate and

1 assembly districts that were within, and I think you've
2 heard this language before, but it's important to
3 understand where it comes from, within one percent of the
4 ideal, except in unusual circumstances, and in no event
5 should a deviation be greater than two percent. So, this
6 was not, and this is why I wanted to be clear about what
7 it was and what it wasn't, it wasn't a law, and the
8 Supreme Court itself didn't announce it. But what they
9 did do was essentially ratify the target that the judges
10 it appointed chose as being appropriate for the job, if
11 you will. So, that's how it comes forward to the Supreme
12 Court, and those maps were approved by the Supreme Court.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Did they ratify the target
14 because it was the issue in the case or by approving the
15 maps you're implicitly saying they ratified the
16 deviation?

17 **MR. MILLER:** The latter.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. But it wasn't the
19 issue in the case, the deviation? That they speak to the
20 issue of the deviation in the case?

21 **MR. MILLER:** Not that I recall. They were
22 ratifying a target that the special -- that the other
23 judges had approved. The same situation, essentially,
24 occurs 20 years later in *Wilson v. Yu*. In this case,
25 again, California had not independently acted as a

1 legislature, if you will, or through proposition to
2 specify a numerical number, but the number that came back
3 from this set, if you will -- Well, they again said each
4 legislative district will vary less than one percent from
5 ideal equality, and the districts they actually proposed
6 to the Supreme Court were one-half of one percent within
7 the ideal number. And, again, the Supreme Court approved
8 the maps, making note of the standard that was used by
9 those judges, and approving those maps.

10 Now, it's interesting, it's not binding but it's
11 interesting, there was a very vigorous dissent by a
12 distinguished justice, Justice Macks, who thought that
13 was way too much. He said that with the technology that
14 exists in 1992 the goal should be numerical equality on
15 the same basis as is the case with congressional
16 districts.

17 So, where does that leave us? Yes?

18 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Mr. Miller, and this is a
19 footnote, I believe that case, the Wilson v. Yu case from
20 '92, the Court also ratified a congressional deviation of
21 .25 percent.

22 **MR. MILLER:** That's correct.

23 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** That's correct. So, it's
24 actually higher than what we have currently been using.

25 **MR. MILLER:** They did ratify .25 percent in that

1 case. Well, I know that there has been discussion in our
2 prior meetings about the relevance of those cases,
3 because we have somewhat different language today than
4 was used then. I think I've tried to compare, and this
5 language does change over time, but what hasn't changed
6 is the essential elements of the language.

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can I ask a quick question?

8 **MR. MILLER:** Sure.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Our mandate says districts
10 shall comply with the United States Constitution.
11 Congressional districts shall achieve population equality
12 as nearly as is practicable, and senatorial assembly and
13 State Board of Equalization districts shall have
14 reasonably equal population with other districts for the
15 same office, except where deviation is required to comply
16 with the Federal Voting Rights Act. Is that language
17 that's in Prop 11 for the -- different that what was in
18 the redistricting criteria before Prop 11 about
19 population equality?

20 **MR. MILLER:** It's virtually the same. In both
21 instances the terms reasonably equal population are used.
22 There are some differences in -- The other criteria that
23 we are using now were also present in the prior
24 iterations, both of them, with slight differences. One
25 is the language around integrity of cities and counties.

1 In 1992 that language was should be respected to the
2 extent possible. The new line -- the new language
3 substitutes respected to the extent possible for
4 minimize, which I think is a little bit stronger in this
5 current iteration by the use of the word minimize. The
6 other change is that the word local has been added to
7 community of interest. But what strikes me is that a
8 reviewing court looking at those reasonably subtle
9 differences I don't think would find a reason to say that
10 the approach it took to approving population deviation
11 twice should be changed as a result of that language.

12 There is a reliance on precedence, and while that
13 wasn't the expressed holding of those two cases, and I
14 don't want to guild the lily by saying it was --

15 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Right.

16 **MR. MILLER:** -- it was, nonetheless, an important
17 discussion in those cases. And I just -- I can't find a
18 substantive change in Proposition 11 and 20 that would
19 cause the court to move very far, if at all, from what it
20 said about that issue in the prior cases. Yes?

21 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay. So, again, I'm not
22 a lawyer, so forgive me. So, what Commissioner Blanco
23 saying was it wasn't what was at issue was a deviation,
24 but it was a part of this ruling. So, what's happened
25 is, there has been two cases you're referring to where

1 they've approved these maps and they happened to have
2 these low deviations. Has there ever been a case that's
3 come forward with a higher deviation that they've said,
4 no, we won't do it because it's too high? They've set a
5 standard for this is what they've liked, but they haven't
6 yet broached what they don't like?

7 **MR. MILLER:** I think that's fair to say.

8 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay. So, all right.
9 So, the point being, I guess, is that if we don't have a
10 clear indication from them that we can't do something,
11 all we're inferring is that this is based on their past
12 actions is this is met to their approval. There could be
13 two ways to read it is either, well, let's kind of stay
14 with what they've shown to like or we maybe take on a
15 little more risk and say, well, maybe we should push the
16 envelope a little bit and see if they're willing to
17 review something higher.

18 **MR. MILLER:** And that is the choice. I think
19 you've set that up very nicely for us to consider. When
20 I was interviewed, when we talked about solving difficult
21 problems, I suggested that clients be given a range from
22 white on one hand, which is virtually no risk, I think
23 it's fair to say you have a safe harbor at point .25
24 percent, and gray to dark gray on the other side. In
25 this case, where it is the first criteria to be met, and

1 you have courts that are very clear on the congressional
2 side that it's absolute numerical conformity, and in
3 California where you have senate districts that are
4 actually larger than congressional districts, so that
5 deviation is going to be driving higher actual numbers of
6 people in those districts, I would suggest that this is
7 one where when you move away from what the court had
8 talked about as being acceptable, you move quickly into
9 the grayer zone on the risk scale. And then the question
10 is, is that in the best interests of this process?

11 I think what you would have -- It makes it, in my
12 view, one of the easier criteria for a plaintiff to
13 challenge, because it's numerically based. There is an
14 answer, yes or no. And then the test comes, can that
15 plaintiff offer a map to a court that it asserts could
16 reasonably have accommodated the other criteria and
17 resulted in less population deviation? That's kind of
18 the spectrum of the risk you'd be assuming, and the
19 manner in which the case might come forward.

20 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Okay. So, one more
21 clarification. I'd like to know where Proposition 11 and
22 20 fit into this. I understand this has been the legal
23 side of it. Now that we have -- I think if we had --
24 didn't have the mandates that we're under to listen to
25 COI testimony and fit it all together, we could follow

1 those guidelines pretty clearly. But now I feel like, as
2 a non-lawyer, I'm trying to incorporate what Proposition
3 11 and 20 have said into these legal guidelines. So,
4 does Proposition 11 or 20 allow us a different type of
5 consideration, in looking at this issue of deviation,
6 than the issues that have faced those other rulings?
7 Does it give us more leeway? It's not been tested yet,
8 of course, but where does Proposition 11 and 20 fit in?

9 **MR. MILLER:** Well, the reason I don't feel the
10 court would be likely to reach a different result in
11 2012, let's say, than in 1992 is because community of
12 interest was also a factor then. It's not a new concept
13 to enter the fray. I think the difference is you have
14 paid more attention to it. You've certainly spent way
15 more time than anybody else ever has in getting that
16 input, amassing it, having more to work with. But to say
17 that it necessarily has taken on greater weight in the
18 totality of the criteria is probably not correct. It's
19 taken on greater weight in the time we've devoted to it
20 in making it a public process.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Just to move this along a
22 little bit, can you tell us, I want to know your
23 recommendation, but also how it applies -- how it
24 actually works. In other words, overall deviation for
25 the total maps, you know, by district, just to have that

1 clarification.

2 **MR. MILLER:** District by district is the short
3 answer on that score. I have come up with an example of
4 a way to test the waters for the Commission, if you will,
5 if you feel it's compelling to go beyond what the court
6 has previously approved. This would be a mechanism that
7 I'll suggest. And I'll just read my test, if you will.

8 That would be you would, one, you would need to
9 determine the totality of this circumstances, okay, what
10 does that mean, as determined by the facts supporting the
11 appropriate constitutional criteria. You know, you're
12 looking at number four, in particular, marshaling all the
13 facts that you come up with. That batch of facts creates
14 a strong bases for the need to deviate from population
15 equality. Two, that the criteria you're using for that
16 is consistently applied, and, three, the flip side of it,
17 that population equality cannot be achieved in another
18 iteration of the district without substantially
19 compromising other constitutional criteria.

20 I don't think it's enough to look at it one way
21 only and say, we've got the facts to deviate on
22 population. You have to ask the other side of the
23 question and demonstrate to yourselves that it can't be
24 done another way. That would be setting a high bar, and
25 I think you need a very high bar on this particular

1 criteria given that it's the first, given that it's
2 numerical, and given that the methodology that we're
3 using today is more like what was used in 1972 and 1992
4 than less like that methodology.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And one final question, and
6 then I'm going to open up, and I'm not really sure how
7 we're going to have time to discuss and vote on this.
8 But I have a final question, which is, did the previous
9 criteria have the same emphasis as Prop 11 and 20 on
10 minimizing city splits?

11 **MR. MILLER:** That's where I mentioned the
12 language is different.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, ours is a tighter
14 standard in our -- stricter.

15 **MR. MILLER:** I'll just give you the language
16 again. The prior language was that geographic regions be
17 respected to the extent possible. The new language is
18 divisions are to be minimized to the extent possible.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you. All right. We
20 have two ways to go. We could take this conversation,
21 this presentation by Mr. Miller, ruminare, chew on it.
22 We do have to give our staff time to set up, and we just
23 have to. And we can -- the only other way I see to do
24 this is to put it over until our next business meeting.
25 While I don't see another time, we don't have any other

1 time agendized to do this. Commissioner Yao, I know
2 you're shaking your head, but we just don't have any
3 other time to do it. And that still would give us time
4 to draw maps with the deviation, whatever decision we
5 come up with.

6 So, I don't see any way around that, but that's
7 the -- you know, we've got -- that's our timing. So, I
8 think what would be good is in the three minutes that we
9 have left I would say ask your tough questions now that
10 you want to have answered in order to go home and think
11 about this.

12 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** (Inaudible).

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. The vote on the
14 recommendation by counsel? Okay. Do I have a motion on
15 that?

16 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** I move that we use the one
17 percent deviation as enunciated by the Supreme Court in
18 the 1991 case.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Can you just say that again
20 slowly?

21 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** Sure. I move that we use
22 the one percent deviation number that had been approved
23 by the Supreme Court in 1991, or found acceptable by the
24 Supreme Court in 1991.

25 **MR. MILLER:** Commissioner --

1 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** Is that --

2 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** -- I think that --

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And my question here is
4 whether that was what the Court was discussing in its
5 opinion, whether it actually reached a decision.

6 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** But they did. They
7 clearly approved it, though.

8 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay.

9 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** I mean, they did discuss
10 that at length and they did approve it.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Is there a second to
12 the motion? Yeah, I mean, this is an important issue, I
13 think. That's what I was trying to get at. They
14 approved the maps that have that deviation. I really
15 need to know, did the Court face the issue of what was
16 the appropriate deviation and rule on that?

17 **MR. MILLER:** No. They approved the maps, the
18 special masters had set that as the goal, and that was
19 the goal that was approved by the Court. Or the maps --

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** The goal?

21 **MR. MILLER:** The maps consistent with the
22 standard that had been set --

23 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Does the opinion --

24 **MR. MILLER:** -- with the maps approved.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Does the opinion deal with

1 the deviation issue?

2 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** I'll quote from the
3 opinion.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

5 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** This is -- Let's see. As
6 the report observes, population equality must be --

7 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** what was that first -- I'm
8 sorry.

9 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** -- deemed -- As to the
10 report, which is the master's report, observes,
11 population equality must be deemed the primary
12 reapportionment criterion being mandated by the provisions of
13 the Federal Constitution. Under the master's plans, each
14 legislative district will vary by less than one percent
15 from ideal equality. We find these minor deviations as
16 amply justified by legitimate State objectives. Indeed,
17 the master's one percent variation limit for the
18 legislature is identical to the standard approved in
19 another case that the court relied on. That's what they
20 had to say about the one percent.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. Anyway --

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I'm not a lawyer here,
23 but I want to clarify this, because --

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah, it's important.

25 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** -- that's part of their

1 -- that's part of their discussion of the maps, but it's
2 not -- again, it's not what they were ruling on. It
3 didn't say this is what you have to do. It might have
4 said something they liked about it, but who is to say
5 what they would like about another set of maps that come
6 forward? I just don't -- I'm not a lawyer, specifically
7 at that level, but it doesn't say that that's what they
8 have to do.

9 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. We don't have a --
10 There is a motion, and we need a second, and then we
11 should have this conversation.

12 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** I will --

13 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** I'll second.

14 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** So, there is a second.

15 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** I didn't hear the
16 second. Who was it?

17 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Mike Ward.

18 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Thank you.

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, there is a
20 second. So, I think, Commissioner DiGuilio, you want to
21 finish your comment and then -- No?

22 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** No, I just want to make
23 sure. I wanted to get the legal aspect of that, that
24 that was just part of the commentary on the ruling, it
25 wasn't the ruling itself.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I would agree that we need
2 to, I mean, distinguish between -- there is perfectly
3 good grounds for the one percent or going with what the
4 court -- what the mappers did with -- what the special
5 master's did. I want to make clear, though, you know, we
6 need to understand, I think, as a Commission, that that
7 is different than saying we're going with a court
8 approved -- a Supreme Court deviation standard. I don't
9 believe that the Supreme Court has set a deviation
10 standard for redistricting in California.

11 Now, so I just want to make sure that we --

12 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** I tried to set that up and
13 make it clear how the issue came before the court.

14 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** In the interest of time, I
15 call for the question.

16 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. I need a second to
17 the call for the question.

18 **COMMISSIONER:** Second (inaudible).

19 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. No discussion. Yeah,
20 public comment on the -- the public comment right now is
21 on whether to call the question, not on the underlying
22 motion but on whether to call the question.

23 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** No comment.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. Let's take a
25 roll call vote on calling the question.

1 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Aguirre.

2 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** No.

3 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** I'm sorry. Was that
4 a no? This is call for the question.

5 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yeah.

6 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** (Inaudible) for the
7 question. Okay. Sorry.

8 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Yeah. Aguirre, no.
9 Ancheta.

10 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** No.

11 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Barabba.

12 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** No.

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Wait, wait.

14 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** On calling the question
15 I'm a yes. Yes.

16 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** The motion is to call
17 the question. Aguirre.

18 **COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE:** Yes.

19 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ancheta.

20 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** No.

21 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Barabba.

22 **COMMISSIONER BARABBA:** No.

23 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Blanco.

24 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No.

25 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Dai.

1 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** No.

2 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** DiGuilio.

3 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** Yes.

4 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Filkins-Webber.

5 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No.

6 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Forbes.

7 **COMMISSIONER FORBES:** Yes.

8 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Galambos-Malloy.

9 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** No.

10 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ontai. Oh, sorry.

11 He's not here. Parvenu.

12 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** No.

13 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Raya.

14 **COMMISSIONER RAYA:** Yes.

15 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Ward.

16 **COMMISSIONER WARD:** Yes.

17 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Yao.

18 **COMMISSIONER YAO:** Yes.

19 **COMMISSION LIAISON SARGIS:** Only six votes. The
20 motion fails.

21 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Okay. So, now we have a
22 motion that's been made and seconded, and discussion on
23 the motion. Commissioner Filkins-Webber. And I have to
24 tell you guys that we can't have this conversation. We
25 tried to have a motion and a second and a vote, but it's

1 not -- we don't have the time, folks. Sorry.

2 **COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:** Chair, I suggest that we
3 table this motion until our next meeting.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right. Thank you. All
5 right. We need three minutes from finance, really
6 quickly.

7 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Okay. I just want to mention
8 that the financials are going to be sent out with a
9 report from our executive director, and then I'm going to
10 pass this over to Connie, who will be taking over as F&A
11 lead.

12 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you.

13 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** So, an issue has
14 come to my attention from a couple of different angles in
15 the work that Commissioners Barabba, Ancheta and I were
16 doing in Los Angeles this week. It came to our attention
17 that Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher had actually declined a
18 request to join us in that exercise because of some
19 concern that there may be approaching their billable
20 hours. At the same time, Commissioners have expressed a
21 concern that some of the input that we have been getting
22 from our firm may not actually be within the scope of
23 what we have retained them to do.

24 Based on the feedback that is coming from the
25 Commission, it has been put on our laps that Finance and

1 Administration should begin tracking this matter more
2 closely based on the contract issue to really ensure that
3 the billable hours, both past from Gibson, Dunn and
4 Crutcher, and also moving forward are really tightly
5 aligned with what work products we need to have from them
6 based on the work plan that Commissioners Ancheta and
7 DiGuilio are managing. Toward that end, the idea that I
8 wanted to put before you was that Commissioner Filkins-
9 Webber, as lead of legal committee, myself, as lead on
10 Finance and Administration, and that we would work with
11 Mr. Miller to do an immediate and thorough review of past
12 billable hours from Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, and work
13 with them moving forward to ensure that we're on track to
14 get what we need over the coming weeks. So, wanted to
15 put that out and wondered if Commissioner Filkins-Webber,
16 do you have anything you'd like to add?

17 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** No, sounds great.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** I don't we need a motion on
19 this. I think we can just task the two leads on these
20 committees to work with our chief counsel and have this
21 by the next business meeting.

22 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Yeah. So, then,
23 based on that, I would think we need to get a request in
24 to Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher immediately for the detail
25 on their past billable hours.

1 **MR. MILLER:** I'll be sure that the information
2 that is necessary for the Commissioners to have this
3 discussion is made available.

4 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** And if we could have it with
5 some time, because I really would like to review the
6 records closely.

7 **COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS-MALLOY:** Yeah. I think if
8 we could request having it on Monday of next week, that
9 would give us a day or two to look at it before
10 Wednesday.

11 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** All right.

12 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** Before we adjourn, Chair --

13 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes.

14 **COMMISSIONER DAI:** -- I just wanted to remind all
15 of the Commissioner pairs that they should send their,
16 you know, problem areas for their region with suggestions
17 and proposals that have come from the public, and maybe
18 how to resolve some of that to Q2 so they can start
19 working some stuff up.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** That would be great. You
21 saw how useful that was today, so I really urge you guys
22 to do that.

23 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** I'm sorry, but
24 point of clarification that as I understood it from a
25 recent e-mail we want these requests to go through our

1 team. So, these requests should not be going directly to
2 Ms. McDonald, as I understood it.

3 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Correct.

4 **COMMISSIONER FILKINS-WEBBER:** Okay. So just for
5 clarification.

6 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Correct. It goes through
7 the work team, not directly to Q2. Janeece, I'm --

8 **COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:** I thought it was staff.
9 It goes to staff.

10 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Yes, Commissioner Parvenu.

11 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Yes, 10 second correction
12 statement. In yesterday's discussion about deferrals, I
13 made the mistake of stating -- I inadvertently said 5,000
14 when I meant 5,000,000. In other words, there were
15 5,000,000 residents that were either deferred or
16 accelerated in the last recycling -- redistricting cycle.
17 I just wanted, for the record, that to be stated.

18 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** Thank you.

19 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** I can sleep tonight now.

20 **CHAIRPERSON BLANCO:** You know, it's just a small
21 deviation.

22 **COMMISSIONER PARVENU:** Three zeros. Got it in
23 there on the record.

24 (Thereupon, the Full Commission
25 Business Meeting was Adjourned)

**CERTIFICATE AND
DECLARATION OF TRANSCRIBER**

I, DEBRA AUBERT, a duly designated transcriber, Foothill Transcription Company, Inc., do hereby declare and certify under penalty of perjury that I have transcribed the audio recording which covers a total of pages numbered 1 - 226, and which recording was duly recorded at Sacramento, California, in the matter of the California Redistricting Committee on June 24, 2011, and that the foregoing pages constitute a true, complete, and accurate transcription of the aforementioned audio recording to the best of my ability.

I hereby certify that I am a disinterested party in the above-captioned matter and have no interest in the outcome of the hearing.

Dated July 17, 2011 at Sacramento County,
California.



Debra M. Aubert, Transcriber
July 17, 2011
Foothill Transcription Company, Inc.