

BEFORE THE  
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the Matter of  
Full Commission Business Meeting

University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law  
Classroom C  
3200 Fifth Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95817

Friday, July 1, 2011

9:00 A.M.

Reported by:  
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Commissioners Present

Cynthia Dai, Chairperson

Jodi Filkins Webber, Vice Chairperson

Gabino T. Aguirre

Angelo Ancheta

Vincent Barabba

Maria Blanco

Michelle Di Giulio

Stanley Forbes

Connie Galambos Malloy

Lilbert "Gil" Ontai

M. Andre Parvenu

Jeanne Raya

Peter Yao

Commissioners Absent

Michael Ward

Staff Present

Dan Claypool, Executive Director

Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel

Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant

Consultants Present

George Brown, VRA Attorney, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher

Ana Henderson, Q2 Data & Research

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

Nicole Boyle, Q2 Data & Research

Holly Chow, Q2 Data & Research

Kyle Kubas, Q2 Data & Research

Public Comment

Efren Carillo, Supervisor, County of Sonoma

Dan Gjerde, Councilmember, City of Fort Bragg

Eric Schockman, CA League of Conservation Voters

Zeke Grader, Jr., Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's  
Association

Dave Bitts, Commercial Salmon and Crab Fisherman, Eureka,  
President of the Pacific Coast Federation of  
Fishermen's Association

I N D E X

	PAGE
1. Introduction	
Cynthia Dai, Chairperson	5
Roll Call	7
2. Public Comment	7
3. Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing	22
Lunch	151
4. Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing	
Adjourn	221
Certificate of Reporter	222

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JULY 1, 2011

9:09 A.M.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Good morning and welcome to  
4 another meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting  
5 Commission. My name is Cynthia Dai, I will be chairing  
6 this next sequence of meetings through the weekend and  
7 our Vice Chair for the meeting is Commissioner Filkins  
8 Webber, who just stepped out for just a second here.

9 Before I take roll, I'm going to go ahead and run  
10 through our agenda very quickly so the public has an idea  
11 of what we're going to go over today.

12 We're going to start, as usual, with public  
13 comment and give people an opportunity to speak. We're  
14 going to ask any members of the public who would like to  
15 comment to limit their comments to two minutes as we have  
16 some serious line drawing to do, based on the second  
17 round of input hearings that we just had, reaction to our  
18 first Draft Maps as we try to incorporate that input into  
19 our second Draft Maps. And then we're going to go  
20 straight into line drawing direction with our technical  
21 consultants, Q2. Our focus today will be on Southern  
22 California.

23 At approximately 11:00, we're going to be joined  
24 by Mr. George Brown from Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, our  
25 Voting Rights Act Attorneys and, together with Mr. Brown,

1 we will be reviewing districts in Los Angeles County,  
2 which is a challenging area for us to map, so we  
3 definitely want Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher's opinions as  
4 we go through possibilities and options for districts in  
5 Los Angeles County.

6 We'll take a break at lunch. Immediately after  
7 lunch, we are going to go into closed session. Because  
8 this is the redistricting process, and probably also  
9 because it's California, we do expect litigation, and one  
10 of the exceptions under Bagley-Keene that allows us to go  
11 into closed session is preparation for litigation, so  
12 we'll be taking advantage of Mr. Brown's presence to go  
13 ahead and prepare for litigation.

14 After that, approximately 2:00, we will resume  
15 with Q2, continuing on with our districts for Southern  
16 California. And our goal today is to finish the  
17 Congressional Districts and make a lot of headway in the  
18 Assembly Districts, at least.

19 Approximately 6:00, we will finish a number of  
20 business items that we did not complete at our last  
21 meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup>, and we will go until we are done with  
22 this agenda. I currently have that ending approximately  
23 7:45, but the Commission is advised that the more  
24 efficient we can be, the sooner we can have dinner. So  
25 that's a little preview of today's agenda.

1           We will be continuing direction to Q2 on Saturday  
2 and Sunday and, again, our goal is to provide all line  
3 drawing direction in this next session so that they can  
4 go off and hopefully resolve many of the issues that have  
5 been brought to our attention by the public in the second  
6 round of input hearings, so we hope to have a very good  
7 map that we can -- set of maps that we can present to the  
8 public on July 14<sup>th</sup>. So that's the plan for today.

9           With that, Ms. Sargis, can we go ahead and take  
10 roll?

11           MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Aguirre - Here;  
12 Commissioner Ancheta - Here; Commissioner Barabba - Here;  
13 Commissioner Blanco - Here; Commissioner Dai - Here;  
14 Commissioner Di Guilio - Here; Commissioner Filkins  
15 Webber - Here; Commissioner Forbes - Here; Commissioner  
16 Galambos Malloy - Here; Commissioner Ontai - Here;  
17 Commissioner Parvenu - Here; Commissioner Raya - Here;  
18 Commissioner Ward - [Absent]; Commissioner Yao - Here.

19           You have a quorum.

20           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you, Ms. Sargis. So with  
21 that, I'd like to open it up for public comment. Do we  
22 have any members of the public who would like to make a  
23 comment?

24           MR. CARILLO: Good morning, Commissioners. My  
25 name is Efren Carillo. I am the Chairman of the Sonoma

1 County Board of Supervisors and I reside in Santa Rosa.  
2 We did welcome you at a hearing in Santa Rosa, it is nice  
3 to see you all again. I appreciate the opportunity to be  
4 here this morning and thank you for your service to the  
5 people of the State of California.

6 I am, nonetheless, very concerned about the  
7 directions you provided your technical staff on  
8 Wednesday. We recognize that you tried to pay attention  
9 to the concerns of the residents of Sonoma in making  
10 changes to your Draft Maps. However, in addressing those  
11 concerns, we think you did tremendous and unnecessary  
12 harm to our neighbors in the north, some of them which I  
13 think are also in the audience this morning. In the  
14 Assembly plan, I know you were concerned that putting the  
15 county seat in Santa Rosa in a different district from  
16 the rest of the county would hurt the residents of  
17 Sonoma, and as a County Supervisor, I can tell you that  
18 we have been well served by the current district  
19 boundaries which put Santa Rosa with Napa, just like your  
20 first Draft Maps have already demonstrated.

21 We fully understand the need to be split, in  
22 fact, we believe it served us well in the past. I can  
23 also tell you that we much prefer your first Draft Maps  
24 to the lines that would go over the Golden Gate Bridge,  
25 or that would force the north state into a natural

1 pairing with very different communities on the other side  
2 of the coastal mountain range. In other words, we think  
3 that you mostly got it right.

4           On the Congressional plan, however, we feel that  
5 you did make an error. Marin and Sonoma should be paired  
6 in one Congressional District, and we thank you for  
7 recognizing that, as well, on Wednesday. Take Sonoma,  
8 take Marin, and put them in one district and you can  
9 essentially take everything else and put it in another.  
10 We thank you for paying attention to the North Bay, but  
11 please do not allow Sonoma County to be an excuse to  
12 punish the North Coast.

13           The main point in my testimony today is that you  
14 don't have to and you should break up the coast to make  
15 Sonoma County happy; however, I will remind you from my  
16 testimony I provided in Santa Rosa that we understand the  
17 need to be split, keeping Northern and Western Sonoma  
18 County, or, going east to west, the north does not  
19 reflect the community's best interest; north-south, we  
20 believe, reflects the community's best interest. Again,  
21 we thank you and recognize the challenge that is before  
22 you and, once again, thank you for your commitment to the  
23 people of California and I'm happy to take any questions  
24 if you've got them.

25           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Any questions? Commissioner

1 Forbes.

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I have one question. When  
3 you say the "North Coast," we had this debate, what is --  
4 how do you define the North Coast? How far south do you  
5 come and still consider it the North Coast?

6 MR. CARILLO: Well, the North Coast in our, I  
7 mean -- and this is what I described in my testimony in  
8 Santa Rosa -- we have communities of interest along  
9 tourism, the 101 Corridor, Fisheries, Watersheds. Now,  
10 the question specifically regarding the Assembly  
11 Districts that I recognize, or the Congressional? I just  
12 want to make sure, in general? Generally speaking, we  
13 think the alignment that we have right now recognizes the  
14 North Coast as the North Coast. I mean, we align  
15 ourselves with the Counties of Mendocino, Lake, Del  
16 Norte, and Humboldt when it comes to fisheries and  
17 watersheds. When we're addressing issues around commerce  
18 and tourism and agriculture, the same issues on the  
19 Congressional side, we think the Sonoma and Marin County  
20 have fared well in that essence, we just don't believe  
21 it's fair to split up the coastal counties and move them  
22 east to west, in essence looking at trying to incorporate  
23 Santa Rosa within the county as the county seat.

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Thank you.

25 MR. CARILLO: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Do we have any other questions?

2 Okay, thank you. Next speaker, please.

3 MR. GJERDE: Thank you, Supervisor. My name is  
4 Dan Gjerde. I'm a City Councilmember from Fort Bragg on  
5 the Mendocino Coast. And I have a letter from our Mayor  
6 in Fort Bragg. "Dear Commissioners: I am writing you  
7 this letter, and Councilmember Dan Gjerde is presenting  
8 it, because I heard, last Wednesday, this committee gave  
9 instruction to draw the North Coast in with the Central  
10 Valley Congressional District where we have almost no  
11 ties. My city and the County of Mendocino have well  
12 established economic transportation and cultural ties to  
13 Humboldt and Del Norte to our north, and to Lake, Napa  
14 and Sonoma to our south. I urge you to keep us intact in  
15 one Congressional District so we can have a unified  
16 strong voice in Congress as we have now. Thank you." Do  
17 you have any questions?

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Any questions? Thank you.  
19 Commissioner Barabba.

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: We received an awful lot  
21 of comments opposite of what we just heard from people  
22 who said "we don't have a relationship from Sonoma and  
23 Marin all the way up to Del Norte." What do you think  
24 causes the difference in opinion?

25 MR. GJERDE: I think they may be talking about

1 Marin County being a bit different from the North Coast,  
2 but Mendocino County has strong ties to the wine  
3 industry, and strong ties to Lake and Napa and parts of  
4 Sonoma County, which is more or less as we're represented  
5 right now.

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So the people who are up  
7 north who said "we have nothing -- we don't go that far  
8 south," were they referencing Marin, do you think, only?  
9 Or --

10 MR. GJERDE: I think primarily Marin. I lived in  
11 Woodland at one point and you always drive South, you  
12 rarely drive north.

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay, thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you.

15 MR. SCHOCKMAN: Good morning, Commissioners.  
16 Eric Schockman, I've addressed you many times before,  
17 from the California League of Conservation Voters. I  
18 woke up at 4:30 this morning and flew up from Los Angeles  
19 for my two minute spiel to you, and it also reflects the  
20 letter that I'm handing out, and it also reflects the  
21 coastal counties that you've drawn in the north and,  
22 really, the question about the natural barriers and  
23 transportation routes and policy needs of those  
24 communities.

25 We think, first of all, you've done a yeoman job

1 in the first mapping and small adjustments are really,  
2 that's sort of the critical point of this region, rather  
3 than a wholesale abandonment of environmental impacts  
4 that we see would go on if you start tampering with these  
5 districts. The decision, I think, was really based on  
6 sort of a false dichotomy between the North Coast and the  
7 North Bay, that somehow they're incompatible. So, we  
8 really urge the Commission to continue the North Coast  
9 with similar populations in Napa and Sonoma.

10 Secondly, I want to talk about the Congressional  
11 District that you've also drawn, and just make note that  
12 in the Congressional District you need to pick up about  
13 215,000. Rather than going inland up in the north  
14 inland, we would encourage you to look at Yuba, Sutter  
15 and Delta areas as the incorporation of the extra  
16 population, more in common environmentally, there's much  
17 more of an affinity for bringing those communities into  
18 the Congressional mapping for that purpose.

19 So let me conclude by just, again, thanking you  
20 for what will eventually be your thankless efforts of all  
21 the work you put in, you're working this weekend, God  
22 bless you for doing that. The citizens of California  
23 really are dependent on you. Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you, sir.

25 MR. GRADER: Thank you, Commissioners. My name

1 is Zeke Grader and I represent the Pacific Coast  
2 Federation of Fishermen's Association and over the past  
3 35 years I've had quite a bit of experience working along  
4 California's coast and, to a certain extent, working  
5 inland in the Central Valley with farm groups where we've  
6 had concerns with Salmon populations.

7 But what I want to speak to here today primarily  
8 has to do with the Congressional Districts along the  
9 coast. I do want to thank you in your first cut for  
10 trying to keep many of these coastal districts pretty  
11 much intact. I do, however, have a concern with  
12 particularly the area from San Francisco north. What it  
13 looked like was trying to reconstitute the old first  
14 Congressional District and the way it was when I was a  
15 kid and traveled with my father up and down that district  
16 when he was a Field Representative for a Congressman, and  
17 I can tell you pretty plainly that they're really two  
18 different districts there, the Marin - Southern Sonoma  
19 are more really in tune with the Bay Area, and with San  
20 Francisco, whereas you get Northern Sonoma, the eastern  
21 part over in Napa, it's always had much more of an  
22 affinity with the North Coast. And I would urge that we  
23 try and look and create the communities that way. I was  
24 pleased that you were not trying to go, at least in that  
25 first cut, trying to go eastward because there is very

1 little commonality, I think, in all my 35 years of  
2 traveling up and down there, between the coast and some  
3 of those more eastward county areas. But I certainly  
4 think that we probably should be looking at a North Coast  
5 District and a North Bay District for the area north of  
6 San Francisco. I think that's going to be the most  
7 important. I think, as far as the inland counties go,  
8 obviously Napa, Lake, and Trinity, I think, are the three  
9 counties that have more affinity with the coast than with  
10 the more inland areas, and we'll look at those as the  
11 ones to perhaps attach to the counties to get your proper  
12 population grouping. But I think that's going to be  
13 important. And, likewise, south of San Francisco, again,  
14 I would urge the districts try to be more coastal as  
15 opposed to trying to go eastward because, again, there's  
16 more commonality among the coastal members going north to  
17 south than there is trying to go east to west.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you, sir. One question.  
19 Commissioner Blanco?

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Over here.

21 MR. GRADER: Sure.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can you say a little bit  
23 more about why Trinity, in particular, maybe Lake and  
24 Trinity, have more affinity with the coast than some of  
25 the other non-coastal? That would be very helpful to

1 hear.

2 MR. GRADER: Well, Lake, I think in particular,  
3 just being north of Napa, the wine country area there,  
4 and I think just for a long time that Lake has always  
5 been very closely, I think, tied with -- maybe because of  
6 the coast range -- with Mendocino County, I think, than,  
7 say, with going eastward. Trinity, I think, in the  
8 standpoint of just sort of the recreational aspects, the  
9 mountain areas, and that, where I think it's probably  
10 much more in tune with, say, Humboldt than it would be  
11 going east and when you get down into the valley in  
12 places like Redding. Now, it probably could go either  
13 way, but I always felt that it was sort of the odd man  
14 out the way the districts were put together before, so I  
15 put that out there for you to consider because I think  
16 those are the three coastal counties that I know of, and  
17 this is almost 60 years of experience, ever since a kid  
18 traveling through all those areas of seeing what seems to  
19 be common, and also in more recent years working on  
20 watershed areas, particularly in the upper part of the  
21 Sacramento Valley on Salmon issues, and seeing where  
22 there tends to be kind of a split. And I've always seen  
23 it -- I've always felt, anyway, that Trinity was probably  
24 more in tune with Humboldt than it was with the valley.  
25 But I think you'd have to ask the people in Trinity

1 County that.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you. We have one more  
3 speaker.

4 MR. BITTS: Thank you for the chance to speak  
5 here today and I'd like to say that, regardless of what  
6 you decide on this issue of the North Coast, I'm really  
7 pleased to see the work that you're doing and probably  
8 the worst result you come up with will be better than  
9 what would have happened had you not done it, so thank  
10 you.

11 My name is Dave Bitts, I'm a commercial Salmon  
12 and Crab Fisherman based in Eureka. I'm also the  
13 President of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's  
14 Association, I'm one of the Fishermen that Zeke works for  
15 and he nominally works for me, although it doesn't always  
16 seem that way. And I just want to mention that I  
17 delivered fish into Fort Bragg yesterday, rode the fish  
18 truck down with my fish to San Francisco to pick up my  
19 vehicle, which I then drove over here, this is a little  
20 excursion for me, I'm hoping to be home in McKinleyville,  
21 Humboldt County, tonight. So that's just an example of  
22 the coastwise connection that exists in the fishing  
23 industry, it's been alluded to by others in the tourism  
24 and other industries that are coastal dependent. However  
25 you slice it, the North Coast is going to be the tail of

1 its Congressional District just because of population. I  
2 think, speaking for the tail of the dog, I'd rather be  
3 wagged by a breed that I at least recognize, which is  
4 currently the case, the way the district is now. And I  
5 hope that you'll consider that in your final line  
6 drawing. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Di Giulio.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Mr. Forbes doesn't want  
9 to let me have my cord.

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Oh, I'm sorry.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: That's okay. I'm glad  
12 you have been here. I think if you've been paying  
13 attention, we've kind of gone back and forth with this,  
14 trying to balance, recognizing that obviously some of the  
15 northern counties in general are very sparsely populated,  
16 and trying not to let them be dominated by the more  
17 populace areas that tend to be in the southern part, so  
18 we've been trying to balance, kind of equally  
19 distributing smaller counties' population in a district,  
20 whatever district that may be, vs. trying to follow  
21 something like the coastal area. I think, particularly  
22 in Congressional, when you're dealing with Federal  
23 issues, there's maybe more of an argument for coastal.  
24 So, you're saying that, being one of those small  
25 populated, the tail, really, physically and literally in

1 terms of the location and the size, that you're more  
2 comfortable on a coastal. And how far down do you feel  
3 like you have your affinity with the rest of the dog?

4 MR. BITTS: That depends a lot on who you ask.  
5 Personally, I feel that affinity on down to Monterey. A  
6 lot of my friends might only feel it as far south as  
7 Mendocino. I remember going to a CSF Conference in  
8 Eureka when I was a kid in Stockton and people there  
9 looked at me like, "Why are you at this Northern  
10 California conference?" So there is that feeling.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And one last question  
12 with that, I'm assuming most of that is a tie with the  
13 coast. I can see going down through Mendocino and maybe  
14 even Lake; when you get into Sonoma and the Napa, when  
15 you start moving east, you do change. So, do you see  
16 yourself linked with all of Sonoma and into Napa? Or  
17 more of staying with -- again, we've been looking at  
18 population centers to pick up, so you can't stay that  
19 sparsely populated on the coast, you're going to have to  
20 move inland. Do you see that there's a dividing line at  
21 all? Or do you see -- in a sense, you could go down to  
22 Sonoma and probably pick up most of Sonoma County, or do  
23 you continue to skirt Sonoma and go into Mendocino to  
24 pick up population? I'm not sure if that's making sense.

25 MR. BITTS: Well, I think right now the district

1 goes far enough into Sonoma County to make up -- and most  
2 of the population base is there. And I think that's  
3 probably as good as we're going to do. Is that  
4 responsive?

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, there's kind of a  
6 question how far into Sonoma and into Santa Rosa and pick  
7 up Santa Rosa, let's just say, in a Congressional where  
8 that's a lot of population; if you leave out Santa Rosa,  
9 you go down further into Marin along the coastal. So,  
10 it's kind of a tradeoff, do you take all of Sonoma  
11 including inland parts that may not be associated with  
12 the coast vs. skirting Santa Rosa and going down into  
13 Marin. So, just kind of trying to get your opinion on  
14 that.

15 MR. BITTS: Okay, I'm not sure that I have a well  
16 formed opinion on that.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: That's okay, it's early  
18 in the morning and we've got a long day.

19 MR. BITTS: As long as we do the coastal  
20 affinity, I'd probably be reasonably happy with either  
21 result.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, thank you very  
23 much.

24 MR. BITTS: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you, sir. Commissioner

1 Parvenu.

2 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Sir, one quick question.

3 MR. BITTS: Sure.

4 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Can you speak briefly on  
5 Siskiyou County? There was some testimony about keeping  
6 Siskiyou County whole as opposed to dividing it at some  
7 point to the far north. Do you have any travel relations  
8 in that area in terms of recreation and population  
9 distribution?

10 MR. BITTS: There is - the main link with  
11 Siskiyou County and the coast is the Klamath River and we  
12 have a lot of coastal issues relating to water and fish,  
13 and we usually find ourselves on the opposite side of  
14 those issues with Siskiyou County. It's a long remote  
15 drive to get from us to them. And I suspect that neither  
16 people on either end of that drive would not be happy to  
17 thrown together in the same district.

18 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thanks.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Anymore questions from the  
20 Commission?

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Actually, let me follow-up  
22 on that. Is the issue of water, is it because the  
23 quality of water that is between Siskiyou County and  
24 yours, what is the issue?

25 MR. BITTS: It has to do with the dams on the

1 Klamath River and the use of Klamath River water for  
2 irrigation in the Klamath Project and elsewhere, and we  
3 actually have sort of an agreement reached on those  
4 issues to move forward and take action that will be  
5 beneficial for the fish -- how much do you want me to get  
6 into this?

7 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, you did it. Thank  
8 you.

9 MR. BITTS: Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you. Any other questions  
11 from the Commission. Thank you so much, I know some of  
12 you traveled quite far to come here, we really appreciate  
13 your input and we'll definitely try to integrate this  
14 into our line drawing direction in the next couple of  
15 days. Thank you.

16 Okay, so we are on to Line Drawing. We have our  
17 display ready, we're actually right on time. To my left  
18 is Vice Chair Filkins Webber, who will be today's  
19 enforcer. We are going to try to keep this running  
20 smoothly and, again, we're going to follow the same  
21 format that we did before, which is we are going to take  
22 a regional approach, and the Commissioner pair that was  
23 assigned to review the public comment for the area will  
24 start with their summary of some of the key points. I  
25 also believe we got a Regional Summary document from Q2.

1 Do we have hard copies of that?

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We should. Check with  
3 Janeece.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Ms. Sargis, do we have hard  
5 copies of the Regional Summary document? So we'll get  
6 that distributed. So, in fact, much of the thunder of  
7 the Commissioner pairs may have been stolen, but we'll  
8 let them comment first, then we'll go ahead and open it  
9 up to the rest of the Commission and make sure that our  
10 line drawing instruction gives our technical team the  
11 latitude they need to try to address as many of the  
12 issues identified by the public as possible.

13 So, with that, I'm going to turn this over to Ms.  
14 Ana Henderson from Q2, who will let us know what we're  
15 starting with first.

16 MS. HENDERSON: Thank you, Commissioner Dai.  
17 Before we get started, I just want to introduce Holly  
18 Chow. Holly is a member of the Q2 team, she has been  
19 working under Alex's direction while Alex is away, and  
20 she is here with us today to help show you all the  
21 Visualizations that we've been working on.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Welcome, Ms. Chow.

23 MS. HENDERSON: Okay. So, we're going to be  
24 starting with the Congressional Districts in the Orange  
25 County area and that's what we're showing on the screen

1 here. I also want to add that we sent over  
2 Visualizations and PDFs of the Visualizations have been  
3 provided to staff for posting.

4 We'll start with the Santa Ana-Anaheim area, and  
5 you'll also notice that the deviations are off on a lot  
6 of these districts, we're going to be looking for further  
7 guidance about where to shift populations, so just so  
8 you're aware that these are not down to the one percent  
9 deviation.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And just for clarification for  
11 the public, are we looking at revisions, or are we  
12 looking at what was done the first draft?

13 MS. HENDERSON: These are revisions. These are  
14 Visualizations based on comment from Commissioners.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Chair, who is the pair for  
17 this area?

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Are we going to hear  
19 from the Commissioners?

20 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It was Mike and me, but we  
21 had one set of maps, but then we had this conversation  
22 about what to do with Central Los Angeles and the Voting  
23 Rights Act District, so at that point Mike picked it up  
24 and, in fact, I just sent an email to Cynthia saying,  
25 "Where's Mike?"

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah --

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: He is at the  
3 airport and he just advised me that he's 45 minutes  
4 delayed, so he wasn't going to be here until probably  
5 after lunch.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, do you feel comfortable?

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, he and I have not  
8 discussed the second round, and the first round didn't  
9 mean anything after we did the VRA stuff.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can he call in on the  
11 phone?

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, I'm wondering if it would  
13 be terribly disruptive if we started with San Diego  
14 instead?

15 MS. HENDERSON: Sure, yeah, actually we're going  
16 to start with the Riverside area if that's all right with  
17 you guys?

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And again,  
19 that's at the CD level, the Congressional --

20 MS. HENDERSON: The Congressional level, yes,  
21 correct.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And this is  
23 based on the instructions that we had provided --

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: To Ms. Woods.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: -- in Stockton,

1 if I'm correct.

2 MS. HENDERSON: In Stockton and directly from  
3 Commissioners Dai and Commissioner Filkins Webber.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So a reminder here that this  
5 region was affected by a Section 2 District.

6 MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment, please. So we'd  
7 like to show you, so we received some direction from  
8 Commissioners Dai and Filkins Webber about the Coachella  
9 Valley and Imperial Valley, and if we could start with  
10 that, the direction was to combine the Imperial County  
11 down to the border area of Coachella Valley, so we just  
12 wanted to show you what this Visualization looks like.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And to clarify, this was in  
14 response to the San Jacinto Valley not wanting to be with  
15 Coachella, so this is what the result is. And this is  
16 something we could choose to do or not to do.  
17 Commissioner Ancheta.

18 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So could we zoom in on  
19 what is the Imperial County cluster of cities near the  
20 border, where the line is there. That looks like there's  
21 a division there along the 8. Is that correct?

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's a challenge because all  
23 the population is basically in one place.

24 MS. HENDERSON: Yes, so this was using the 8 as a  
25 dividing line.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Barabba.

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: As I recall, the elected  
3 official from Calexico, which I believe is south of that  
4 line, that indicated that he didn't understand why they  
5 would be connected to San Diego.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, there's  
7 quite a bit of testimony and there is a difference and it  
8 goes back to whether we're talking about an Assembly  
9 District, a Senate District, or a Congressional District.  
10 Some members of the public were specific, and the written  
11 public input that we have gotten online has been specific  
12 primarily about an Assembly District. There hasn't been  
13 as much in the way of Congressional District comments  
14 that support this combination. I mean, we've seen a  
15 little bit of it, but, in fact, I even went through  
16 NALEO's recent submission on June 28<sup>th</sup> and information  
17 regarding a recommendation on Congressional did not  
18 combine Riverside County with Imperial County. The  
19 implication in most of the comments were as to the  
20 Assembly level, which I've got a lot of information to  
21 provide to this Commission regarding the significant  
22 dispute between - I haven't seen it in any other area in  
23 our public comments where there is one recommendation on  
24 the one hand, you know, to put Riverside County with  
25 Imperial, and then another recommendation that Riverside

1 County does not wish to be in Imperial, there is a big  
2 dispute. I don't know that it -- I don't see it at the  
3 level of Congressional. But what I'm concerned about  
4 here is because this area, the population concentration  
5 for the most part in Imperial County is at the south, and  
6 I'm a little troubled that when we're looking at  
7 population this does split. It's my understanding there  
8 is a community of interest right in that area and  
9 obviously we see what happens with the Latino  
10 concentration there.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Could you actually pan up so we  
12 can show why that happened. Again, what we just wanted  
13 to do was provide options for the Commission to consider.  
14 This is a response to a public comment from a gentleman  
15 from San Jacinto Valley who was very happy with our ADs  
16 and SDs, but objected to being combined with Coachella in  
17 the Congressional -- that's 122,000 people, so if we were  
18 to --

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Let's take a  
20 look at the Banning Beaumont Pass area, wherever it says  
21 "COACH" if you could remove that table and let's see what  
22 dividing line we have on the west side of this.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can we ask to see  
24 cities?

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Just a little

1 bit more to the west, thank you.

2 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, Banning and Beaumont are  
3 included inside this district.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, so all this one shows is  
5 removing San Jacinto and Hemet, but you can see it's a  
6 very big population, so if we respond to that request,  
7 the result is you have to go south. But then that splits  
8 the community right at the border. So that's an option  
9 that was presented by the public.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I would have a lot of  
11 concerns about this option. That Imperial Valley as it  
12 is is a very sparsely populated area, and where the  
13 population is concentrated is down at the bottom and we  
14 had a lot of testimony about Brawley and Calexico, you  
15 know, Heber, you know, that whole area. Apart from it  
16 being a border region that, in itself, that community is  
17 extremely tight, so I think this would be extremely  
18 problematic.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Have too high of a cost.

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Have way too high of a  
21 cost.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, and I would point out  
23 that the San Jacinto Valley was kept whole in the  
24 previous incarnation and they were with Beaumont and  
25 Banning which they were within the Assembly and Senate,

1 so they didn't have any objection to that before. So  
2 this is absolutely something we could choose not to do.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Then -- oh, I'm  
4 sorry -- one other thing to look at, if you bring it  
5 down, there's not enough population to go north into San  
6 Bernardino County with 29 Palms and Yucca or, excuse me,  
7 Yucaipa, so there really -- and I suspect Ms. Henderson  
8 can confirm this, as well, that there wasn't a lot there  
9 and, as well, and you can see the numbers there in  
10 comparison to San Jacinto and Hemet. You would really  
11 have to go into a mountain range and that's not going to  
12 be consistent with the desert community.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: A question for the team. Is  
15 the priority to keep the voter in a single Congressional  
16 District? Is that why --

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, actually this is showing  
18 the ripple effects of responding to the proposal to take  
19 the San Jacinto Valley out of --

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I understand, but  
21 splitting the Imperial County with such a small  
22 population, how does that get weighed into the overall  
23 thinking at this point?

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: These are the choices we're  
25 making, you know, again, the point of going through this

1 exercise was to see what the ripple effects of  
2 accommodating certain communities of interest are on  
3 other communities. Commissioner Di Guilio and then -

4 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I appreciate this, I  
5 think this is a very helpful exercise for us to say we're  
6 responsive to what we've heard, we would like to see what  
7 happens if we're accommodating to those requests. And  
8 from this, I think the Commissioners, and we can actually  
9 visually see, there are some problems to it. So we can  
10 discuss it, it's on the record, we considered it, and if  
11 we choose not to, then we can move forward and say this  
12 is not acceptable, let's look at another Visualization,  
13 or let's continue with our options.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That's right. Commissioner  
15 Galambos Malloy.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Ms. Henderson,  
17 could I ask you to go back down to the border area? My  
18 general perspective on this is I think of it similarly to  
19 the discussion we had yesterday regarding Richmond and,  
20 you know, looking at a sparsely populated county and some  
21 small cities within, whatever we can do to preserve their  
22 integrity, I think, I would like to prioritize, so I do  
23 feel pretty uncomfortable with this Visualization. I  
24 think this is geographically a very isolated part of the  
25 state and we really do not want to compound that problem

1 with our maps. Can you zoom in a little closer? I just  
2 want to see the population numbers of El Centro and some  
3 of the surrounding places. It's about 40,000?

4 MS. HENDERSON: Forty-two thousand.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And 30,000 in  
6 Calexico.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Aguirre.

9 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, I would argue  
10 against, you know, accepting this Visualization. Given  
11 that not only are we splitting those cities, but actually  
12 if you're talking about border culture, you know, border  
13 culture is not only along the border, but itself being as  
14 isolated as that particular little area is, then I would  
15 argue that all of that is affected by the border and all  
16 of it should belong together. And at the Congressional  
17 level, certainly, to divide them up is really to minimize  
18 their voice. So I would argue against this.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so it sounds like there's  
20 pretty good consensus that this is not a direction we  
21 want to go. We explored it, we looked at it, and so for  
22 now we're going to leave the San Jacinto Valley in the  
23 original Visualization which is to keep them with  
24 Coachella.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Or, to state it

1 differently, we're going to keep our Congressional  
2 District on the border, the way we kept it.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, because there is  
4 definitely a tradeoff here and, you know, the reason  
5 we're doing this is to, you know, help the Commission see  
6 and help the public see the kinds of tradeoffs that we're  
7 having to make when we have conflicting communities of  
8 interest testimony.

9 Okay, so that was one ripple effect. Do you want  
10 to go further north, Ms. Henderson?

11 MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: Before we leave the  
13 Visualization for this area, can we go back to the  
14 Visualization that we prefer for the Imperial Valley?

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can you show the first draft  
16 version?

17 MS. HENDERSON: The first draft? Just a moment.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And again, we asked the Q2 team  
19 to explore a number of different options and show us the  
20 ripple effects.

21 MS. HENDERSON: Okay, this is the Draft One Map,  
22 so the area for this one is COACH and, then also below it  
23 is the IMSAN.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's really hard to see the  
25 District boundaries on this.

1 MS. HENDERSON: It's the green lines.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: They look black. But basically  
3 Imperial -- there we go -- Imperial County goes along the  
4 border, so this is what we originally drew, and the COACH  
5 District basically extended all the way west, including  
6 San Jacinto Valley.

7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Can you zoom into that  
8 area around San Diego so we can see specifically what  
9 communities are impacted?

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And in this  
11 Visualization, is the Salton Sea split?

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: At the  
15 Congressional. Actually, I think presently in our draft  
16 map, it's split at all levels.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right.

18 MS. HENDERSON: To answer the question about San  
19 Diego, we didn't do anything with San Diego in the other  
20 Visualization, so it's exactly the same.

21 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We haven't  
23 given any direction at the CD level in San Diego yet.

24 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: So the Logan, the Barrio  
25 Logan, has been included in the southern?

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't think we've gotten  
2 to that point.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We haven't given direction yet  
4 on San Diego, so let's kind of stay in Region 2 if we  
5 can.

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So, question, we're just  
7 responding to a comment made by the public -

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We're responding to proposals  
9 from the public for our second round of input hearings.

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And this is the first one.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, in  
12 Stockton, we asked Q2, this was the first area that we  
13 looked at, and asked for them to give us Visualizations,  
14 and this was based on Commissioner Dai and myself going  
15 through the public comment and coming to a consensus that  
16 we discussed with the Commission, and the Commission  
17 agreed for these Visualizations. So, that's where we're  
18 at. I'd like to see, if I may just move us along, we've  
19 got a few more minutes, we haven't gotten to San Diego  
20 yet, so if we can go to the Moreno Valley district, the  
21 Perris, Moreno Valley, I think that's the one that --

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So we're moving on?

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We're still in  
24 Riverside County.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And we're at the Region 2

1 level. So the next one that we heard a lot about was  
2 putting Perris, the Perris area back into the Riverside  
3 Moreno District.

4 MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so this is the  
5 Visualization here, the RVMVN.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I do have one  
7 question while you have that up. That's the  
8 Visualization that you've asked us to do putting the Mead  
9 Valley and Perris in, correct?

10 MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And then the  
12 district that is below, the PRS District, is that the  
13 result of the changes that are made? I just want to look  
14 at these two together.

15 MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, may I see  
17 the bottom? I just want to see what happened with -  
18 yeah, Temecula is still, okay. So we can talk about the  
19 first one, the Riverside Moreno Valley, first. I just  
20 wanted to see what happened down there.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So this was a suggestion of the  
22 public which was to take Norco and Corona out, and  
23 instead replace it with the Perris area.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Was that kind of an even  
25 switch? Or was there any type of ripple effects to that,

1 what you had done?

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: In the original Visualization,  
3 Corona was actually split. Are there any city splits in  
4 this Visualization?

5 MS. HENDERSON: No, but we haven't adjusted for  
6 population either. So the deviation is still off.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Oh, yeah, you can see it, it's  
8 actually off by 64,000 people. So there would have to be  
9 some --

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, that it's  
11 over 64,000?

12 MS. HENDERSON: That's correct.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So if this was a  
14 Visualization we like, what would be the recommendation  
15 to --

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, we had  
17 discussed before, and it's a little problematic, but I  
18 want to bring up the only other option if we stayed  
19 within the county lines was to pull out a little bit more  
20 of Murrieta and Temecula and put them into San Diego,  
21 which is troubling. But the other question I had for  
22 Commissioner Dai, but it might have some effect, the  
23 potential Section 2, we discussed that there's a  
24 potential Section 2 that is in Pomona Valley or possibly  
25 the San Bernardino, we had two options that we had taken

1 a look at back in Stockton, and I think that Mr. Brown  
2 may have had an opportunity to comment.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And we'll ask him when he  
4 arrives.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The one option  
6 that we understand that might be in San Bernardino, and I  
7 don't have it in front of me here, would come into  
8 Riverside County at the top portion near Glenn, Avon --

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And Rubidoux.

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: -- Rubidoux.  
11 And so you see what the concentration is here. If the  
12 SBRA ends up turning into -- a portion of it, anyway --  
13 turns into a Section 2, you could pick up some of the  
14 population down into Rubidoux, which is 34,000 people.  
15 And in doing so, this district would be diminished of  
16 population, but I don't know if that still helps  
17 Temecula.

18 MS. HENDERSON: Commissioners, do you want to  
19 move to that district now? Or do you want to continue  
20 discussing this one?

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Could I just say that, in  
22 looking at a lot of the comments, I did a fair amount of  
23 review of the latest comments, and we should look at them  
24 a little bit more closely, but there were quite a few  
25 comments about Temecula that said, "If you could keep us

1 whole, it would be okay to go into San Diego." So, I  
2 mean, I was surprised because it's one of those things  
3 where we've heard things both ways.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I know that some part of  
5 Riverside has to go somewhere.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But I did look through the  
7 comments last night and there was something to that  
8 effect, I don't know if we want to go that way, but just  
9 to --

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: What is the population  
11 in Temecula, do you know?

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's about 100,000.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, so it's going the  
14 other way.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah. And we actually have  
16 most of it in San Diego, I think we're 20,000 -- or in  
17 Riverside.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Actually, it  
19 was a fascinating piece. I think it was from the Mayor  
20 of Temecula and he obviously did the math because he  
21 looked at Riverside County and what his argument was, was  
22 if we had a 10 percent population deviation at the  
23 Congressional level, so I think there was a little bit of  
24 confusion as to where the population deviation would be  
25 allowable. And so he said, if we had 10 percent

1 population deviation, then Temecula and Pechanga could  
2 get into this Congressional District with Perris. And  
3 then, if they are watching, that's troubling because we  
4 don't have a 10 percent population deviation for  
5 Congressional and that's not possible. But it does make  
6 an interesting point and I'm a little concerned with, is  
7 the Pechanga Band of Indians there in that Temecula  
8 region -- we haven't really looked at -- we've looked at  
9 some Native American areas, and I'm wondering if even in  
10 this configuration that we're looking at, if we might be  
11 splitting. There is a significant community of interest  
12 with Temecula and Pechanga, and I don't know where this  
13 split is at, but we might need to consider it. The other  
14 question that I have is, what issue does the population  
15 deviation have on a Congressional level if the Indians,  
16 Native American Indians, might have, you know, the  
17 balance -- what you guys talked about this week, or a few  
18 days ago, about equal population vs. Voting Rights Act,  
19 and I started to think about that based on his comment.  
20 Are the Indians protected under Voting Rights -- Native  
21 Americans -- and then, how would that play in this  
22 Congressional District because we certainly don't want to  
23 split them.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, Commissioner Blanco.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, for the Congressional

1 Districts, we did pass a motion that was approved that,  
2 for purposes of Congressional Districts, we could have a  
3 deviation if it was for Voting Rights Act purposes. We  
4 did not -- that was defeated, that Voting Rights Act  
5 exception was defeated for State Legislative -- but it  
6 did pass for Congressional. So, I think that there are a  
7 couple of things that could affect this region given that  
8 motion which was approved, which is that, 1) if we had a  
9 potential Section 2 in this Moreno Valley or this area up  
10 here, the Fontana Rialto, Moreno Valley, if there was  
11 Section 2 there could be issues, population movement  
12 because of that vote.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So instead of just looking  
15 at the other area, it also allows us to do stuff in this  
16 area because we did that. That, in turn, could perhaps  
17 affect the areas below it that you're looking at. And  
18 I think we should think about the issue with the Tribes.  
19 But it might be that just having that permission in this  
20 area up here that we voted on for the Voting Rights Act  
21 might allow some things to open up below it, so I think  
22 that would be worth looking at.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I think we do  
24 have that. The question just becomes whether or not the  
25 Latino CVAP for Option 2 is high enough. But I think

1 they have them to show us today.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, so Commissioner Filkins  
3 Webber, do you have a suggestion if we end up not using  
4 Visualization 2, and that is a hard line at the top,  
5 would you take the EASTVALE to get that population? What  
6 kind of direction would you give? Because we had  
7 testimony that was not completely consistent, usually  
8 Mead Valley, Goodhope was in there with Perris, although  
9 Perris seemed to be the main city that people were  
10 worried about, sometimes Romulan which is very small,  
11 some of these smaller unincorporated areas, so there are  
12 certainly ways to pare down the -

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Lakehope was definitely in  
14 there, though.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah. So, you know, we have  
16 Mead Valley, Perris, Romulan, and I think it was called  
17 Goodhope?

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's Goodhope.

19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Goodhope and March Air  
20 Force Base, obviously.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: March was in  
22 there --

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: March was already in there,  
24 yeah. So we would have to, you know, lose 65,000 people  
25 basically. So, any thoughts about where we would pare

1 that down, assuming we want to go this direction?

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Can you put the  
3 population back up in Eastvale?

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Eastvale is -

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Fifty-three  
6 thousand, I believe it fell off there. So you don't have  
7 very many options here. It's either you pull down  
8 Murrieta into San Diego --

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can we look at the top part  
10 of this? It's very hard back here to see anything,  
11 cities. The focus - ah, that helps a little bit.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I thought I was going blind.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We probably are.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So Eastvale is 53,000, you know,  
15 I think Romoland is, what?

16 MS. HENDERSON: About 1,600.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: About 1,600, that didn't help  
18 us that much. So, there would have to be a split, but  
19 again it would be in what is now known as Hoopa Valley.  
20 I would note that that was not a city in the Census  
21 Database, which is what we are charged with using, so  
22 it's a less egregious split than --

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Commissioner Dai, Eastvale  
24 and Goodhope, California would actually be about what you  
25 need, that's 63,000 between the two of them.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I thought Goodhope was a  
2 big part of that testimony.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'm just telling you, it  
4 just gets you close to 64.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Without splitting anybody.

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Except there was a lot of  
8 testimony that it would split a community of interest, we  
9 heard overwhelming testimony about.

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right, but it wouldn't  
11 split a city, that's all.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, and again, this is a  
14 technicality because the Jarupa Valley was not a city at  
15 the time the Census was done, so technically it's not a  
16 city.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And this is where our  
18 ability to interpret some of the COI data, we know what  
19 the cities are and we know what the counties are, but  
20 this is where our job is, to balance it, it's not simply  
21 a numbers game, it's trying to -- to do numbers, but be  
22 realistic to all of those, the COI, cities and counties.

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so that's this option. I  
24 wonder if you can show the Visualization to the San  
25 Bernardino District north, so people can see the overlap.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, that would be really  
2 helpful.

3 MS. HENDERSON: Sure.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Do you have  
5 that option that takes it into Rubidoux and all that?

6 MS. HENDERSON: Yes. So we tried to look at what  
7 would happen with the Latino CVAP in that area.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We asked them to see if they  
9 could increase it to 50 --

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: In the one right above?

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, because there's some  
12 heavily Latino areas in the Jarupa Valley area. Oooh,  
13 49.11.

14 MS. HENDERSON: Yes, the LCVAP here is 49.11 and  
15 that was the highest we could get it in a reasonably  
16 compact shape.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, it is incredibly a  
18 compact -- not just you making it compact, it's clearly a  
19 compact area. I mean, you can't look at that cluster.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So this was our preferred  
21 Visualization and the question is, you know, this is the  
22 question for Mr. Brown when he comes, you know, is 49.11  
23 good enough? Because the nice thing about it is it  
24 solves some of our population problems because it takes  
25 out that top part of the Jarupa Valley.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, but I do  
2 need to get into some details here because you are  
3 splitting some communities of interest. For instance,  
4 where it says "Miraloma," how far down do you go on the  
5 15?

6           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't think -- are we  
7 going to really do this now, this kind of detail?

8           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, no, I  
9 just want to see, are you splitting into Norco or  
10 Eastvale? Or how far down?

11          MS. CHOW [presumed]: I'm not splitting any  
12 cities.

13          CHAIRPERSON DAI: No splits.

14          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, the other  
15 thing is, if you look over back at the 60 and the 215 or  
16 91 Interchange, is that the City of Riverside where you  
17 see the higher concentration up -- right there.

18          MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

19          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Is that the  
20 City of Riverside?

21          MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

22          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, do you  
23 have any other splits into the City of Riverside in the  
24 present configuration? Or is the City of Riverside  
25 completely excluded?

1 MS. HENDERSON: It's excluded.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: To the extent  
3 which you considered bringing in that area of Riverside  
4 at the 60 and the 215 and 91 Interchange, is there a  
5 possibility you could get to 50 percent LCVAP?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And along with that, do we  
7 have -- I don't recall, but maybe the folks that were  
8 assigned to this region -- did we get testimony about  
9 sort of Riverside, if it were to be split, where, and all  
10 that --

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, we did in  
12 San Bernardino. We got a representative from the Mayor's  
13 Office and they were fine, they were speaking primarily  
14 at the Assembly level because we split them there, and  
15 the other configurations, we did not split them at the  
16 Congressional level, they were satisfied with where the  
17 splits were at, at the River, and taking a look at this  
18 population, and obviously my familiarity with the area,  
19 that would not be unusual to put Rubidoux, if I'm not  
20 mistaken, that present line there is down the riverbed  
21 again and, so, based on their comments previously, they  
22 were not upset with the split that was made in Riverside,  
23 which split it in half, essentially, at the Assembly  
24 level.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, actually they were

1 extremely happy with our ADs in Riverside.

2           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, one thing to  
3 consider, given that we've had these conversations about  
4 consistency, like when we had the conversation about  
5 whether "share the pain" was actually a good concept, or  
6 a potentially inconsistent concept, you know, going back  
7 and forth between Congressional and ADs. Given that  
8 whole conversation, it might be consistent with our ADs  
9 to do this split, tracking the AD split, if that would  
10 help both bring up the CVAP and also help with the  
11 population below.

12           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And by doing  
13 that, I think you're also preserving communities of  
14 interest. The Miraloma area that you have right there is  
15 very equestrian, it's unincorporated, they have very  
16 large lots, and they also share the riverbed there with  
17 Norco. And so that's why I'm a little concerned with  
18 that split between Norco and Miraloma in comparison to  
19 the similarity where we do clearly see the 16, the 15,  
20 and portions of Riverside; there is not much difference  
21 in the communities between Rubidoux -- other than the  
22 river, but there is nothing there, you just drive over it  
23 on the freeway -- and the communities that show a higher  
24 potential for LCVAP. So I think we can prove the number  
25 and maintain a COI at the same time.

1           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And follow the Constitution  
2 because the Voting Rights Act is our second criteria  
3 above cities and splits, and so if doing that - I think  
4 we might actually be required under the Voting Rights  
5 Act, under our mandate since Voting Rights Act is number  
6 2 and cities are number 4.

7           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

8           COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Just as a process  
9 question, are we waiting for Mr. Brown to actually ask  
10 the question?

11          CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think we want him to look at  
12 it because we were kind of describing it to him  
13 theoretically and it sounded like he hadn't actually seen  
14 it when we talked on Wednesday.

15          COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Right, and there is a  
16 proposed map which is the MALDEF, and the revised map, I  
17 think, is the same as their original proposal which could  
18 create two Section 2 Districts in this region. I think  
19 we've been loath to go to one configuration because of  
20 compactness issues, but now that I'm seeing some of our  
21 own districts or Visualizations, it's not necessarily  
22 that non-compact.

23          CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay.

24          COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I think we might want to  
25 take a look at it.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That sounds worthwhile. Yes  
2 Commissioner Ontai?

3 COMMISSIOENR ONTAI: Let me ask just a technical  
4 question here. What is this thing? Why is that drawn  
5 like that? Is that a little -

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: That's the City  
7 of Alviso.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's a place.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: It's a place.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Eastvale.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's FedEx,  
12 actually!

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, Ms. Henderson, you said  
14 that this was the highest LCVAP you were able to  
15 accomplish within the constraints of not going into  
16 Riverside?

17 MS. HENDERSON: Yes. And also, I should let you  
18 know that we do have the "unity" maps if you would like  
19 to see them. We can put them up.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: The unity map was not for  
21 Congress, though.

22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: If you want, you could  
23 pull up the MALDEF, the Congressional, if you want to  
24 look at that. Now, again, we sort of -- we're not  
25 particularly fond of their Congressional 43, which you

1 might recall runs all the way from Rialto-San Bernardino  
2 down into Perris and goes into Rubidoux.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well is that  
4 the Congressional right there? That's their  
5 Congressional?

6 MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And that's what  
8 somebody said is compact?

9 COMMISSIOENR ANCHETA: No, I'm saying our  
10 assumption has been that it's really not that compact,  
11 but --

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah. This is  
13 the one I spoke of before being an octopus.

14 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Right, and I think we've  
15 been saying that we probably shouldn't try to do that,  
16 but some of our districts have a few tentacles of our  
17 own, so I wanted to just point it out there. The  
18 Commission said don't do it, I just want to confirm --

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, they  
20 split Moreno Valley in half --

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Which was a strong community of  
22 interest.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And they split  
24 Riverside, they split -- I can't even count how many city  
25 splits there are in this configuration.

1           COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: But the issue is  
2 compactness because you can split those things all you  
3 want if it's a Section 2 District.

4           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, I  
5 understand, but I'm also balancing that with some of the  
6 COI testimony. I mean, is this the way that a district  
7 is supposed to look when we just showed the possibility  
8 of a compact Section 2 District?

9           COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, if we could do one  
10 that is more compact, we should do it, but I think what  
11 they end up doing, and this is another option that we  
12 will, I think, be looking at which is they extend the  
13 Pomona Valley District over to Fontana to create a  
14 majority Latino District in that cluster which, again, is  
15 one of our options. But, to create the second Section 2  
16 District, they run this not so compact looking one that  
17 goes all the ways to Perris. Now, we can choose -- and I  
18 think, again, there may be someone that had some  
19 compactness problems if we try to go above 50 on the San  
20 Bernardino core one, that was a COI problem then and --

21           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We do have only  
22 a few more minutes, we need to get to San Bernardino.

23           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I would like for us to  
24 consider Visualization, we can talk to Mr. Brown, but I  
25 think the criteria are pretty clear that, if you have a

1 compact Section 2 District, you can split a city and, you  
2 know, I think that map that we were looking at previously  
3 really falls into that category.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So let me ask the Mappers this  
5 question. In our previous version here, this was our  
6 Visualization 2, if we took, let's say, just that leg  
7 into Riverside there, that very dense Latino area, would  
8 that increase it to 50, I guess, is my question?

9 MS. HENDERSON: It's possible.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's around that interchange.

11 MS. HENDERSON: Yes, do you have a set of  
12 directions about where to remove population?

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Probably where  
14 it says Moreno Valley, down at the 15, right --

15 MS. HENDERSON: Do you want us to do this right  
16 now?

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, we need  
18 to get to San Bernardino, we only have a few more minutes  
19 for this region.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So let's go ahead and give them  
21 direction to try -- so, again, the idea is to take that  
22 very dense Latino area from Riverside, but again we would  
23 have to remove population to make it up because this one  
24 is balanced pretty closely here.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think when you look at

1 this, you just clearly see a community there.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Parts of Miraloma, maybe?

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, parts of  
4 Miraloma would be fine. And closer to the farthest south  
5 portion, pull that up as well as you can -

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Moreno?

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, Miraloma.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Miraloma.

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Right there,  
10 that's where you're going to pull back from as much as  
11 you can.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Could we give general, like  
13 south, not into the streets, and then for the few minutes  
14 that we have left, what happens to the district now  
15 beside it in San Bernardino?

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay. Is that clear?

17 MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so let's move to the  
19 other. So anyway, you can see how that district comes  
20 down so it would solve some of our population problems in  
21 the district below.

22 MS. HENDERSON: On Friday, we didn't have a  
23 chance to show the option 1 that has the majority Latino  
24 CVAP District and on the Pomona Valley. Would you like  
25 us to show that?

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Uh huh.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And just to summarize, when  
3 we do this, let's make sure we summarize again option 1,  
4 what happens with the two adjoining districts, and option  
5 2, what happens with the two adjoining districts.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: The summary of this is we  
7 believe we can draw at least one Section 2 district here.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And there is currently now  
9 in --

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: One.

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- in the current  
12 conditional districts of 2001, there is already a Section  
13 2 District there, so it's not like a new one. There is  
14 one there. The question is, is there a second given the  
15 population shift in this area.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So what's happening here is the  
17 City of Fontana is what makes the difference, so in  
18 Visualization 2, Fontana is basically east and in  
19 Visualization 1, it is basically sucked into the Pomona  
20 Valley District, and gives that one a clear over 50  
21 percent CVAP.

22 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, in case you can't see it in  
23 the back, the LCVAP in this Ontario-Pomona District is  
24 51.93 percent.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And then the adjoining with

1 the old Visualization?

2 MS. HENDERSON: The adjoining district, the LCVAP  
3 becomes 34 percent in this Visualization because it is  
4 now including Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, Claremont, San  
5 Antonio Heights.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Got it. So then, in the  
7 second, if we do what we were just doing, what happens  
8 adjoining?

9 MS. HENDERSON: So you mean what happens with the  
10 Ontario-Pomona District --

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, it goes to 39 percent.

12 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, the LCVAP falls.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It basically swaps, but -

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, so it swaps, it doesn't  
15 spread out.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's basically Fontana.

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We have two  
18 minutes.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So this is one of those things  
20 where, as you can see in this adjoining district, you  
21 know, a lot of people really objected to this, that  
22 Claremont and San Bernardino don't have a lot to do with  
23 each other, so these are really a combination of two kind  
24 of separate communities of interest that don't have a lot  
25 of relation, which is the reason that we preferred

1 Visualization 2, because it allows us to keep the San  
2 Bernardino Valley together. But it's not 50 percent.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So it seems like  
4 Visualization 2, the pluses are it's a little more  
5 accurate to COI --

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: -- it still does a  
8 Section 2, but close --

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So the trade --

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: -- it's pretty darn  
11 close and we might be able to hit 50. The tradeoff is  
12 maybe, you know, I guess is how much are we willing to  
13 risk it not being enough to Section 2, or will the  
14 communities there feel like this is by now probably the  
15 population it is, right, I mean this is Census data.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, the Census data is a year  
17 ago, they're probably at 50 percent already.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: If you keep  
19 going on your list, we might be able to pull Temecula  
20 back into Riverside County, then we get to make Rancho  
21 Cucamonga whole, and in that Pomona Valley, and it won't  
22 be with San Bernardino, those are all the ramifications  
23 of the region if we went with that first Visualization  
24 that is at 48. But I think we might have a chance to be  
25 able to get our 49.11, that was higher than what I saw

1 previously. So if we could go just a little bit more  
2 into Riverside, we might be at 50 percent and then we can  
3 save the rest of the region.

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: To me, that seems like a  
5 good tradeoff, but maybe there are others that feel  
6 differently. To me, it seems like it accomplishes mostly  
7 what we need for Section 2 and has a lot of other  
8 benefits to the areas around.

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Tell me a little bit more  
10 about what gets taken out of the existing Section 2  
11 District because it is an existing Section 2 District and  
12 we have to remember that.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's the  
14 migration of the population between Fontana into San  
15 Bernardino, as I recall, because the original Section 2,  
16 if I'm not mistaken, was in the Fontana, Pomona, Ontario.  
17 And you see where the population shift has gone closer  
18 into San Bernardino, so the Section 2 is moving from what  
19 presently exists, as I recall, in the Pomona-Ontario  
20 Valley area into San Bernardino just primarily because of  
21 the migration of the population.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But, I mean, in terms of  
23 how it was configured --

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We assumed that  
25 the Pomona-Ontario one would be the Section 2, but part

1 of the draft maps --

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Currently, it's a Section  
3 2. What populations have they -- and when we do this  
4 Visualization, it isn't. So, is it because we've taken  
5 out that whole -

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's Fontana. Fontana is  
7 flipping between these two districts and it makes all the  
8 -- that's what boosts the numbers, and so you see that,  
9 you know, you see that in this version, you can see that  
10 the Pomona Valley is down to 39 percent and that's  
11 because they lost Fontana. But, you know, it basically  
12 boosts the San Bernardino one up. And this was -

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And there's no way to move  
14 the line over and just -- if Fontana is where the  
15 population is?

16 MS. HENDERSON: That reduces the Latino  
17 population of the San Bernardino District. The only way  
18 to increase that is to do something similar probably to  
19 what MALDEF did in that San Bernardino area.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, in the  
22 interest of time, I'm hearing that we feel more  
23 comfortable with the other Visualization that we would  
24 like to dip into Riverside to see if we can get our LCVAP  
25 above 50 percent. In the event we are - from the

1 population densities, I would feel like I'd be personally  
2 surprised if weren't able to get above 50 LCVAP, but if  
3 we were not, I would like to leave open the opportunity  
4 for us to revisit this a bit because I do think that,  
5 given that VRA is our second criteria, even though I know  
6 there's a lot of positive benefits for the region amongst  
7 the other criteria with the other option, again, a top  
8 priority to me is getting above 50 percent LCVAP if we  
9 can. So, that's where I would land.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, and I'm looking at  
11 this and I'm seeing not just -- it's sort of what Mr.  
12 Brown said the other day when we were talking about Santa  
13 Ana and Anaheim, you can either go really micro or you  
14 can pull back and you can see a region, and you can look  
15 at this large population regionally. And you're only  
16 able to do that if you sort of think about the Voting  
17 Rights Act as your second criteria and sort of step away  
18 a little bit from some of the other assumptions. So, I  
19 agree with Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, Commissioner Yao and then  
21 we're going to need to move on.

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just clarification on the  
23 title that we're giving to this map. This is the  
24 original option 1, right?

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: This is the original

1 Visualization 2.

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: What do we look at?

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Two.

4 COMMISSIONER YAO: Two. And what we just  
5 finished looking at before we shifted over to here, what  
6 title are we giving to that one?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: That one was Visualization 1.

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay. From the Foothill  
9 community perspective, I think Visual 1 is probably  
10 preferred as compared to this particular Visualization.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Really? Rancho Cucamonga wants  
12 to be with San Bernardino? We got a lot of negative  
13 comment about that.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: If you take a look at this  
15 particular Visualization, you see the concentration. I  
16 mean, there's a vast difference between those that are  
17 closest to the Foothill vs. those that are below, let's  
18 say, the Highway 10, it's like a forced situation,  
19 whereas, in this particular Visualization, for example,  
20 you can clearly see the Foothill community, even though  
21 it's in two different counties and everything. That  
22 would establish a much better community of interest, so  
23 to speak, as compared to the previous version where we  
24 looked at it, so I just wanted to establish as far as  
25 choosing between the two, we can establish a Section 2 in

1 this particular Visualization, I think that's preferred.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so Commissioner Yao  
3 prefers Visualization 1. That would make it easier  
4 because then that one is clearly over 50 percent.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: How are we going to  
6 process -- I mean, there's obviously some disagreement  
7 about this, do we make a decision now, or do we -- I  
8 mean, it seems like we have to make some kind of -- we  
9 don't have to eliminate one, but we have to kind of move  
10 forward with one.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Do others agree with  
12 Commissioner Yao, I guess, is the question.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, I would agree with  
14 him, but I'm not sure we have to choose one over the  
15 other today, personally.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We do.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We do because we have to be  
18 finished with our line drawing.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Don't we need  
20 Mr. Brown to --

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, we'll ask Mr. Brown, as  
22 well, just for those Commissioners who prefer  
23 Visualization 2. Commissioner Di Giulio, and I really do  
24 think we need to move on. So I will note that in both  
25 versions, Redlands is kept whole, which was one of the

1 things we were trying to address.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: If we move on, I think we  
3 have a lot of disagreements, so were we going to move  
4 forward with both?

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, we're going to have to  
6 choose one.

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But if you want to just run  
8 down the clock, I think we haven't explored it. If there  
9 are things like people believe the Foothills should be  
10 together, and then this brings down the CVAP, we haven't  
11 looked at some of the things we were willing to consider  
12 for the second Visualization about Riverside and where to  
13 pick up population, we haven't looked at that if this was  
14 a preferred option because of the Foothills. So I don't  
15 think we're finished, I really don't. I think what  
16 you're looking at there is a huge concentration that is  
17 new with LVAP, Latino VAP. And we haven't really thought  
18 about this in terms of some of these other  
19 considerations, so -

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Should we hold on this until  
21 Mr. Brown kind of gives us his thoughts, whether 49  
22 percent is good enough, or if we can hit 50.00 percent by  
23 including that part of Riverside, and then if we need to  
24 see --

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Where is Riverside in this

1 Visualization? Is it whole or split?

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Whole.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's whole.

4 MS. HENDERSON: In this Visualization, we haven't  
5 addressed Riverside at all, so we're really -- this is  
6 just to show the options in the Pomona Valley and San  
7 Bernardino.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right, but in the other  
9 one, we went all the way down -- Visualization 2 went  
10 right to the border of Riverside.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Correct.

12 MS. HENDERSON: That's correct.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right, and I'm just trying  
14 to -- I can't see from here, frankly, I can't see where  
15 Riverside is.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's south.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Is there any way  
19 to increase the contrast? I notice with the screens in  
20 the back, there is much more vivid contrast with the  
21 population density and the -

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And so that's my point is,  
23 if in the other one we go out and we're really looking at  
24 Riverside as being very connected to that area above it,  
25 you know, that was in the Visualization 2, here, it's

1 completely excluded from both. And so that's why I think  
2 this requires really a little bit thinking more about  
3 where Riverside goes, even in this first Visualization.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's not  
5 connected by COI.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's not -- yeah, the COI is  
7 connected between Moreno Valley and Riverside, that's  
8 what the other RVMV District was. It's Riverside plus  
9 Moreno Valley.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right, but I'm talking  
11 about if we split it.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It was split before along the  
13 river.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Not in a CD.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, that's my point --

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Oh, I'm sorry.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- is that we have not  
18 explored that option in Visualization 1 of splitting  
19 Riverside.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so we've already given  
21 direction to ask them to look at that.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: By Visualization 2, not in  
23 Visualization 1, is my point.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Oh, I see what you're saying.

25 Well, in Visualization 1, we have - it's over-populated

1 already.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I know, but it could mean  
3 -- it means a different configuration is my point.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can you give Q2 the specific  
5 suggestion you are --

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's very hard to see from  
7 here, I can't even --

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Is this  
9 supposed to be, you know, this is where it gets  
10 complicated -- is this Visualization 1 or --

11 MS. HENDERSON: This is Visualization 1 that  
12 we're looking at.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, this is  
14 Visualization 1.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And so we have a Section 2  
16 and then we have one by it, beside it, that is in  
17 Visualization 2 as a Section 2. And part of the reason  
18 is because of, now, it goes down a certain way, picks up  
19 more population going south, and now it even - we've  
20 thought about including Riverside. So I don't know how  
21 this works with the Foothill concept, but I'm saying in  
22 this Visualization, the adjoining district, why not go  
23 down and pick up some of that area?

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: How much higher  
25 do you want it than 51.3?

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, the one next to it.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: What's the LCVAP of the San  
3 Bernardino District next to it?

4 MS. HENDERSON: It's 34.68.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It would take a lot.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And that district runs  
7 up and over, back to the west, correct?

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That's the problem we have, we  
9 only have one Section 2 District. It's your choice,  
10 either the San Bernardino one, or the Pomona one.

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It's not my choice, it's the  
12 Commission's choice.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That's what I'm saying.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Our choice.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Our choice. So, do we prefer  
16 the option that puts the district further east? Or do we  
17 prefer the option that puts it in Pomona Valley, which is  
18 where I believe the original Section 2 was?

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I think at  
20 this point, it's clear that we are not going to come to  
21 resolution on this in the next couple of minutes. I do  
22 think, when Mr. Brown comes, he may have some guidance  
23 that would influence which of these Visualizations made  
24 sense. I think we've had a number of Commissioners put  
25 their stake in the ground of which one they initially

1 feel more comfortable with, so perhaps we could revisit  
2 this in a few hours.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I'm saying I'm not even  
4 with either one, I'm saying I'd like to see more in here.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: But, just to summarize,  
6 it sounds like, and I'm going to ask Q2, based on what we  
7 have Visualization 1 and 2, and the population around it,  
8 the LVAP around this area, are you saying the most we can  
9 do is get one?

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The difference, I  
11 would say, is that, for example, with the MALDEF  
12 submissions, we clearly see there is a way to do two,  
13 whether we feel comfortable with the way to do that, you  
14 know, our analysis of that second district on the MALDEF  
15 version was that it really was not compact, the bottom  
16 portion of it had multiple fingers and reached down into  
17 various different communities, so the tradeoff was  
18 significant. And so, for those reasons, on the  
19 Commission's behalf, I would view that we can come out  
20 with a solid one of Section 2 districts.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: That's what I wanted to  
22 know, so our option of one depends on how we want to do  
23 it.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And there is  
25 already one now and the current Congressional District is

1 already there, we're not creating a new one, it's already  
2 there. The question is the ability --

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Where we want to place  
4 it.

5 COMMISSIOENR BLANCO: -- no, but the question, I  
6 think, is whether there's an ability to create a second  
7 district, given the population shift in this part.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And the answer is yes.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Commissioner Galambos  
10 Malloy said the answer is yes, so whether or not we want  
11 to accept -

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well, there may be  
13 other ways of doing it. I think the initial assessment  
14 from the Commissioners who looked at the MALDEF  
15 submission did not feel comfortable on the grounds of  
16 compactness. If there are any Commissioners, you know,  
17 Commissioner Blanco, if you have an idea of perhaps  
18 another alternative of groupings for a second Section 2  
19 District that might be more compact than the MALDEF  
20 submission was, I would be really interested in seeing  
21 that.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I would like for us to work  
23 on that because my sense of this is that when you sort of  
24 scan out and you look at this as a region, and this is  
25 sort of what we've been talking about more lately, and

1 you see the high density of Latino population in this  
2 area in some regions, and there is already a Section 1  
3 district there, and you see this growth of the  
4 population, when you look at the statistics, it's really  
5 interesting, in our districts when we were in L.A. and  
6 all of that, they were all under-populated, when you go  
7 to these Congressional Districts now, and you're looking  
8 at the adjustment, they're all over-populated and it's  
9 about taking out population, it's a very different  
10 dynamic, so you're really talking about this is where the  
11 population has grown, and the predominant population  
12 growth here is Latino, and we already have a Section 1  
13 [sic] District. So, I understand completely the concerns  
14 about the map that was presented to us, but I would like  
15 for us to really consider, is there another way to look  
16 at this population growth given testimony we've received,  
17 given that there's already one Section 2 District there,  
18 and that there's potentially a second one. So, I would  
19 really -- I would be willing to work with somebody, or  
20 decide from the work team how we should proceed on this.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I'm sorry, I  
22 just have to put this on the record, we're duplicating  
23 efforts because it's already been done.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Exactly, that's the  
25 point.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: This is the  
2 high concentration that you're talking about. I mean, we  
3 can look at Riverside County, you know, because this is  
4 San Bernardino County, and obviously in the valley, and  
5 Coachella Valley is where the other population figure is,  
6 but this is what we've been doing with this area to try  
7 and find two districts, two Section 2 Districts, and we  
8 can't get there at 50 percent, both, unless we're going  
9 to draw a configuration that looks like MALDEF, that  
10 stretches from San Bernardino County all the way nearly  
11 to Temecula. And if that's what this Commission wants to  
12 do for Section 2, then maybe we can do that and capture  
13 all of these orange squares all the way down through the  
14 entire portion of Riverside County. If that's what we're  
15 supposed to do under the law, then I guess we'll hear  
16 that from Mr. Brown, otherwise, we cannot get two Section  
17 2 Districts out of this because that's what we've been  
18 trying to do in Pomona and San Bernardino, because the  
19 population -- I mean, the density looks fine, but the  
20 population isn't there to create two 50 percent districts  
21 here, and that's what's already been worked on.

22           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I understand, but I'm not  
23 sure that, at least in the presentation today, I haven't  
24 heard whether there was a --

25           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Could we let Ms. Henderson

1 comment on what they've tried?

2 MS. HENDERSON: So if the question is have we  
3 attempted to draw two majority Latino CVAP Districts in  
4 this area simultaneously, is that the question?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, uh huh.

6 MS. HENDERSON: No, we have not. We looked at  
7 where the population distributions were and the  
8 directions that we -- there are two options, just because  
9 we weren't sure that we could get a very compact district  
10 to have two districts, so we have not actually tried to  
11 draw it out all the way. And then we've been working off  
12 the direction of the different options that we presented.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I would like to see an  
14 attempt -- and that doesn't mean going with the MALDEF  
15 map -- I would like to see an attempt on the part of Q2  
16 to do two simultaneous Section 2 Districts in this area.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Other thoughts from other  
18 Commissioners? Commissioner Di Giulio.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I respect Commissioner  
20 Blanco and maybe we should see if that's a possibility.  
21 I'd like to see kind of a timeframe. I guess I  
22 understand the need to see if it's possible, but I'm  
23 assuming that, even if -- if it's going to be possible,  
24 and it's going to be acceptable, that MALDEF would have  
25 done it, that they would have done two that were

1 reasonable.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can we put up the MALDEF just  
3 so -

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Again, there is an issue  
5 and if want to just go ahead and put Q2's time towards  
6 this, we can, but I feel like if anyone is going to do it  
7 and do it successfully, it was going to be MALDEF, as  
8 well as I know some of our Commissioners tasked with this  
9 were looking at this, as well, too, trying to find a way  
10 to do it. And the question really is, maybe our Mappers  
11 can say, you know, based on what you've seen so far, is  
12 it really possible. And I would think if it would, that  
13 MALDEF would have come up with something that would have  
14 been probably more reasonable.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm not going to make that  
16 assumption, I don't know -- I mean, we've done a lot of  
17 things in these maps that are improvements over other  
18 people's maps, you know, because of a lot of the  
19 testimony we've received and our time. So I don't feel  
20 comfortable making that assumption.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, may I ask  
22 you to comment since you were on the team that worked on  
23 this?

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Sure, I mean, again, there  
25 may be other permutations that could get you to 50

1 percent; I doubt the compactness issue will go away. You  
2 could try to go to Corona, for example, if you wanted to  
3 go in that direction, that might be a different way to  
4 go. But, if you're not color blind, you can see what the  
5 colors are. If you want to pick up populations and get  
6 above 50 percent, you've got to go for the red and orange  
7 areas, and again, Corona looks like another place to go,  
8 but it still raises the compactness question, so anyway,  
9 there aren't too many -

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, I understand, I  
11 understand. The reason I'm pushing here, let me explain  
12 myself, is I think this is where we're at most risk in  
13 terms of not drawing a new district. That's why I bring  
14 it up. I really have a strong sense of that. When you  
15 look at the knowledge that this is where the population  
16 shift is, when you look at the fact that it's the number  
17 two criteria and the issues of compactness are way down  
18 on the criteria, you know, even below cities and  
19 communities of interest, when you look at that I think  
20 this is where we're vulnerable legally. And I don't  
21 think that we've approached this region with that frame  
22 of mind.

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The compactness is in --  
25 I'm sorry.

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

2           COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And I'll let Mr. Brown say

3 this, but I believe what he will likely say is that, in

4 order to create a Section 2 District, you must deal with

5 the geographic compactness under the Gingles case. And,

6 he will no doubt say there is a competing line of case

7 law which is a U.S. Constitutional line of case law,

8 which is the number one criteria, compliance with the

9 U.S. Constitution that puts limits on the degree of non-

10 compactness on districts, even when drawn for Section 2

11 purposes. Now, again, it's a little more tricky in terms

12 of being able to justify this under the Section 2

13 criteria, or Section 2 justifications, but the first

14 thing a court is going to look at if somebody were going

15 to sue under either a Section 2 claim or a Constitutional

16 claim is, well, is this sufficiently compact? Now,

17 that's a judgment call, you know, you can look at various

18 numerical indicators, again, it's different from our

19 lower ranking compactness criteria, this is a Gingles

20 compactness question. And, you know, the Shaw vs. Reno

21 case is the one that has do with the visual test, and

22 this is one of those that is suspect on that ground. So

23 if you're talking about the U.S. Constitutional

24 compliance, we might have a problem here in terms of

25 complying with the U.S. Constitution.

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you, Commissioner  
2 Ancheta. I have Commissioner Raya and Commissioner  
3 Ontai, and then I think we need to leave it for Mr.  
4 Brown. Go ahead.

5           COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, my comment is that I  
6 see the struggle to get to the 50 percent and the  
7 compactness and I keep thinking what we're really looking  
8 at, I think, conceptually, is fair and effective  
9 representation. And so, even if we don't -- and I'm just  
10 throwing this out for consideration because we've kind of  
11 alluded to the fact that, in reality, these districts are  
12 probably over 50 percent, and so I'm kind of thinking  
13 about whether there is that number just below that would  
14 still be defensible, there is still fair and effective  
15 representation possible in those districts. I'm just  
16 kind of throwing that out because that's something that  
17 keeps rolling around in my mind.

18           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, great. And then  
19 Commissioner Ontai.

20           COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, since we haven't asked  
21 Q2 to officially look at two Latino CVAP Districts, it  
22 might behoove us to at least ask them to explore those  
23 two. But the question that I would have, then, is that  
24 timing wise would we have to wait until next week? Or  
25 does this decision have to be made today?

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Well, I think with Mr. Brown  
2 here, he can weigh in on the legal issues. I think we  
3 need to decide on the direction, or else we're not going  
4 to be having anything to look at. So, yes, we need to  
5 decide today. Okay, so with that, let's leave that to  
6 Mr. Brown, it sounds like there are still some questions,  
7 so we can -- I think there is one more district.

8           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: But are we  
9 instructing Q2 to look at drawing two - or looking at  
10 Commissioner Blanco's suggestion? I think she's right, I  
11 thought we were under the impression that these were a  
12 balancing of numbers and, if I'm mistaken, I think  
13 Commissioner Blanco is correct, that we do need to see in  
14 this Pomona Valley, San Bernardino area whether Q2 can  
15 provide us a configuration that could give two Section 2  
16 Districts here. So I think we still have to see that as  
17 an option, whether that means we come back and look at  
18 that Visualization next week, or whenever they can get it  
19 to us.

20           CHAIRPERSON DAI: I guess the question for Ms.  
21 Henderson, is it possible to do that and have us look at  
22 it on Sunday?

23           MS. HENDERSON: Maybe. I can say just from  
24 eyeballing it, and we've eyeballed it a few times, it  
25 will probably look very similar to what MALDEF has.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so I guess the question  
2 for the Commission is --

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I'm sorry, you  
4 said what?

5 MS. HENDERSON: In order to draw two districts in  
6 this area, it will probably look very similar to what  
7 MALDEF has presented.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, Commissioner Forbes.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Just one quick comment. I  
10 do think that we should look for two districts just to  
11 protect ourselves, so someone can say, "Did you look?"  
12 And we can say, "Yes." But, for me, this does not work.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so can we leave this for  
14 Mr. Brown? Because I think he will help us by looking at  
15 the MALDEF ones, especially if it's going to end up  
16 looking the same.

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We're 20  
18 minutes behind and Commissioner Dai is going to fire me  
19 already for not --

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But that is not -- I don't  
21 think that's what protects us, I think that we -- we, the  
22 Commission -- have to give the instruction that we tried  
23 to do it, it does not --

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And we can do that. What I  
25 would like is for our VRA Attorney who will be here in 25

1 minutes, if everyone can hold their horses for 25  
2 minutes, and let him --

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But it's not enough to show  
4 --

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: -- answer some questions for  
6 the Commission, and then we can choose to give that  
7 instruction.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay, but it's not enough  
9 to say to him, "Oh, what do you think of the MALDEF  
10 district?" We have to look at the district.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Understood, Commissioner  
12 Blanco. Can we look at the final district in this area  
13 so that we can finish Region 2? There is one more  
14 district?

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Redlands area.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: The desert area.

17 MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment. Okay, so this was  
18 an option to add the rest of Redlands into the San  
19 Bernardino District and to take out some or all of  
20 Fontana.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So I think this is going to be  
22 trumped by the Section 2 issue, no, I meant the Desert  
23 district, High Desert. Mono and Inyo.

24 MS. HENDERSON: Oh.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We did get

1 Crestline in there, right?

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: In Congressionals. This is  
3 just a complete Region 2.

4 MS. HENDERSON: So we're going to need to show  
5 you that one on Sunday if it's possible.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay.

7 MS. HENDERSON: I think there needs to be a  
8 little more discussion with our Mappers to the north  
9 about what we would then do with the Mono and Inyo County  
10 so we can make sure that all works out.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, as everyone recalls, we  
12 gave direction in Stockton that, especially if we made  
13 some adjustments, to make Redlands whole, that we would  
14 have to take population out of the High Desert district.  
15 And so the suggestion was potentially to move Mono and  
16 Inyo over into the Foothills. So I guess we haven't seen  
17 that tradeoff yet.

18 All right, let's see if we can start on another  
19 region until Mr. Brown gets here.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: To make a comment on the  
21 Perris issue with that 60,000 population, if we don't  
22 give direction to Q2 as to what city to pull out.

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We already did. We already  
24 gave direction on that.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Could you repeat it? Because

1 I didn't understand that.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Miraloma, parts of Eastvale,  
3 and parts of Miraloma, correct?

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, it's  
5 dependent upon what we were calling Option 2, which was  
6 the Section 2 in San Bernardino that cuts into Rubidoux.  
7 That took out -- Rubidoux is about 34,000, I thought --  
8 that would cut into that population and when you do that  
9 -- I'm losing my train of thought here.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: If it's concurred and  
11 understood, that's fine, but I didn't get that message.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The point was  
13 that 64,000 over right now, when you cut in with that  
14 potential Section 2 in San Bernardino into Rubidoux,  
15 you're pulling out that population there. The only other  
16 option was to have to pull up Murrieta a little bit, or  
17 consider -- I wanted to know about Eastvale, but, I mean,  
18 Eastvale could cross over into that Chino, but I think  
19 the ripple effects are problematic. But I think we might  
20 be getting enough population to clear up that 60,000.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: All right.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Ms. Henderson, where are we  
23 going next?

24 MS. HENDERSON: Orange County.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Orange County -- can we do San

1 Diego?

2 MS. HENDERSON: We didn't get any guidance about  
3 San Diego for the Congressionals.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so the idea is we'll give  
5 you guidance now.

6 MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So if you could pull over, and  
8 San Diego was --

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Gil and Jeanne,  
10 and they have 30 minutes -- well, actually, you have 20  
11 minutes.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So we do have a summary here,  
13 so if you want to review it and add to it, or augment it?

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And, again, we're talking  
15 only about the Congressional Districts, right?

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Correct.

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Because there's a mixed bag  
18 here. On the Congressional District, what Jeanne and I  
19 had summarized is that there seems to be an agreement  
20 with the MMRHB District from a Congressional standpoint.  
21 We didn't see any public testimony that opposed that  
22 configuration, however, one district was a contention and  
23 that is the CHNC District. Pull that up a little bit?  
24 And in that map, we received quite a bit of COI testimony  
25 to expand El Cajon City into the CHNC from the northeast

1 boundary line, and to expand east to include Chula Vista,  
2 as well, as part of CHNC. Right now, it's in the IMSAND.  
3 Maybe we can pull it up a little bit more so we can see  
4 -- or, actually, reduce it so you can see the relative  
5 position of the other two districts.

6 MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment, we're getting the  
7 text box for the IMSAN District so we can see it more  
8 zoomed in.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So the idea here is that  
10 this --

11 MS. HENDERSON: So can I ask just for  
12 clarification --

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Sure.

14 MS. HENDERSON: So is this talking about  
15 expanding the portion of El Cajon that is in this  
16 district so that El Cajon is whole? Or is that excluding  
17 El Cajon?

18 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Not excluding El Cajon.

19 MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so taking it out of the  
20 CHNCS District?

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No, taking it from the  
22 NESAND [sic?] and putting it into the CHNC. In other  
23 words, you're going to expand the CHNC map to include El  
24 Cajon, all of El Cajon City.

25 MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so that's going to increase

1 the population significantly.

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, and I'm just giving  
3 you the COI testimony.

4 MS. HENDERSON: Sure.

5 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And it may or may not work.  
6 And the other COI testimony that we received is to also  
7 include Chula Vista as part of the CHNC map. That's  
8 going to cause some problems, but, again, this is the COI  
9 testimony that we received.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I have a question, Commissioner  
11 Ontai, because I remember pretty clearly from the hearing  
12 that the folks from El Cajon wanted to be with east  
13 county, not with urban San Diego, so exactly the  
14 opposite.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right. My notes say that  
16 they would be with Alpine, Santee, Julian, and go north  
17 towards Riverside, that they preferred going in that  
18 direction.

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, that's true, we've got  
20 a number of conflicting testimony.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So right now, El Cajon is split  
22 in this one? Is that correct?

23 MS. HENDERSON: That's correct.

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: El Cajon is split, yeah.  
25 The other, as Commissioner Blanco mentioned, a lot of

1 testimony that we received from the COI is that these  
2 northern border cities along 8, El Cajon, Pine Valley,  
3 Harveston Canyon, Lakeside, all of those, the COI  
4 testimony was requested to be placed into northeast San  
5 Diego District, so by lowering, I guess, this boundary  
6 line that we had so that we would include all of these  
7 cities in the northeast section of the district.

8 MS. HENDERSON: So, if we -- so here in the  
9 bottom area, we've highlighted Chula Vista and you'll see  
10 that if we remove that from the IMSAN District, it's  
11 going to leave a little island that's non-contiguous  
12 because Chula Vista goes all the way across to Coronado  
13 where we start another district.

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, I'm opening it up for  
15 ideas, but I think that's some of the testimony we  
16 received.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I'm going to let Commissioner  
18 Raya speak, too, if she has any comments and she was  
19 supposed to have worked on this district, as well.

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm trying to pull up my San  
21 Diego notes. But we did get testimony, you know, concern  
22 about how the divisions were made, where the splits are,  
23 particularly with respect to Chula Vista and, then, more  
24 about that northeast district having a different  
25 character than combining with the more urban parts of San

1 Diego. But I think the big issues that I think that  
2 we're dealing with are more down in the Chula Vista area  
3 and the split that occurred there. And I don't have a  
4 solution to give you, but that's where I think there was  
5 quite a bit more testimony.

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And I don't know the  
7 solution either, we're probably going to have to figure  
8 out the numbers.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Di Giulio.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I was just wondering in  
11 this kind of taking a step back in all this, kind of the  
12 larger picture with this and how some of this has been  
13 put together, I know we haven't really gone -- if you  
14 start all the way and end up into Orange County, kind of  
15 trying to drop some of those, but the area that has the  
16 Coronado all the way up to Poway and past Escondido seems  
17 to be a district that's also problematic, and I'm  
18 wondering if you kind of look at it kind of pulled back,  
19 if you're able to put Chula Vista, at least, if you're  
20 going to split Chula Vista, maybe you could put a  
21 significant portion of it into that eastern and northern  
22 part district, and kind of rotate some population, it  
23 seems like that kind of -- I know we have an issue there  
24 with what we finally decide to do with that border  
25 district, but it seems like we could kind of rotate some

1 population around because the whole El Cajon area, La  
2 Mesa, there's a link with that going more north and  
3 south, and I'm just wondering if there was a population  
4 shift that could pull Coronado into the beach area, it  
5 will take away the northern part in Orange County, you  
6 could put Chula Vista in where it would like to belong,  
7 and kind of have more of a center part of San Diego there  
8 that's not split from the whole Poway down to El Cajon.  
9 I don't know, Commissioner Raya and Commissioner Ontai,  
10 if that -- it's kind of a large scale rotation, but if  
11 I'm trying to balance both the COI testimony we've heard,  
12 as well as if you pull back and look at the large scale  
13 nature of the districts, there might be some population  
14 rotation.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Let me call on Vice Chair  
16 Filkins Webber.

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I just had a  
18 question in going through the public comments. I'm  
19 looking for some specificity as to where the concern was  
20 at, in other words, was it at the Congressional level?  
21 Because my notes seem to have a reference more to whether  
22 we might have split them at the Assembly level and I know  
23 we see this --

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's true.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: -- often times.

1 Or is there a concern both, Chula Vista's concern at the  
2 Congressional level *and* the Assembly level?

3 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes, but more, I'm sure, at  
4 the Assembly level. Much more so at the Assembly level.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, is there  
6 some way that we can balance, you know, if they are more  
7 concerned at the Assembly level, if we can't accommodate  
8 at the Congressional? Or is there some way to work it  
9 out?

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: My feeling is we may not -  
11 we can probably not accommodate not splitting Chula  
12 Vista, we're going to have to split it one way or another  
13 under the Congressional map, but how much I'm not sure.  
14 And this is a numbers process.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So my recollection was that  
16 there were many people who testified that Chula Vista  
17 should be split, so I don't think it was an issue of  
18 splitting it, I think the issue was exactly where the  
19 split went. And almost all of my notes refer to the  
20 Assembly and the Senate, so I'm just wondering what your  
21 concern is on the Congressional level because we're doing  
22 Congressional right now.

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would kind of leave it  
24 where it is, put Chula Vista - I think the numbers would  
25 not work if we split Chula Vista under the Congressional

1 map. But let me move up to the north.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Did we address the issues,  
3 the one on the border. We can go to the north, but I  
4 think we still haven't addressed all the concerns about  
5 how even the border district went too far north and  
6 picked up cities, there was a lot of testimony. Why  
7 don't we come back to that?

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: That's really more -- the  
10 issue about where those splits are Congressionally, we  
11 did have so much strong COI testimony that you could go  
12 from Chula Vista to National City, into Barrio Logan,  
13 that area up into City Heights, all of that area somehow,  
14 and it's hard to see it just on this level, but we may  
15 need to take a closer look at how we configure this in  
16 order to -- and whether that is important at the  
17 Congressional level, I'm still not sure, but I do think  
18 that Central area -- I don't know why I'm calling it the  
19 Central area, but, you know, this sort of --

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: East San Diego.

21 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, East San Diego, but  
22 then going into -- is that considered east of the 805,  
23 Maria?

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, but it's really sort  
25 of a region that goes all the way up to the border with

1 OC and it's really just this whole rural east county, San  
2 Diego area.

3 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, and just for  
4 background information, San Diego County is actually  
5 diagonally split -- to back to that map -- diagonally  
6 split by a mountain range that's doing this, so on this  
7 corner here is essentially desert country. And  
8 everything to the west of that mountain range is  
9 urbanized with less, of course, on the Foothills. So, to  
10 give you some geographic context, in terms of the  
11 Congressional Maps, this would make a lot of sense, but  
12 we're trying to define where that boundary line is going  
13 to be along here. But that would be a logical geographic  
14 Congressional District. We could take it further down.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's what I was referring  
16 to.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Have we made a decision  
18 about Imperial County, for sure? I mean, I just don't  
19 recall, for the city.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Imperial County or what city?

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, are we putting  
22 Imperial with San Diego?

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Well, we just made a decision  
24 not to go down from the Riverside County line, so there's  
25 no other place for it to go.

1           COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, that was the final  
2 decision, okay.

3           CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think there was pretty good  
4 consensus from the Commission on that. Commissioner  
5 Ancheta.

6           COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Before we leave there,  
7 then, there's been commentary about splitting Barrio  
8 Logan and the Unity Assembly Map, it's something very  
9 interesting, but there's an ambiguity in the law  
10 regarding this, but I think there's support for this;  
11 they actually put the, well, we kept the bridge connected  
12 to the Coronado in order to maintain contiguity, there is  
13 an argument that, because there is a regular ferry that  
14 runs back and forth over the mainland and Coronado, that  
15 that's contiguous by ferry, which has foundation in the  
16 law in other states, but we couldn't find anything in  
17 California. But if you do that, you can basically rely  
18 on a contiguity existing that way, via the water, which  
19 allows you to basically go a little bit higher to include  
20 some of those areas of Barrio Logan.

21           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right. We had split it because  
22 we thought we had to.

23           COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Now, let me point out to you  
24 that particular area that Commissioner Ancheta just  
25 mentioned. Right here is essentially Sherman Heights,

1 right about there, and just below it is Logan Heights,  
2 and all of that strip there is Barrio Logan, and the COI  
3 testimony that we received, it was desired to include all  
4 of this area as part of the Latino community, the central  
5 core area for the Latino community. So, we could move  
6 this line straight ahead and include all of this, in  
7 other words, move this line here there and that would  
8 include Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, and Barrio Logan.

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I would really -- that  
10 was very strong testimony -- this is very similar to the  
11 testimony in East San Jose. This is a really cohesive,  
12 traditional community, and we've split it right in two.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: This is splitting it right  
14 here.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, right there. So I  
16 think we can either do what -- and I think we have a  
17 couple options, we could even do what Commissioner Ontai  
18 mentioned, we could look at the ferry option, or what was  
19 done in the -- I can't remember if it was in the 2001 or  
20 in the 1991 Masters maps, what they actually did was  
21 Coronado is connected by -- you can also get to Coronado  
22 through Imperial Beach, and what several maps over the  
23 years have done with this area is they connect through  
24 Imperial Beach. And it's not the first time this has  
25 been done in this area, it's another way to do this and

1 deal with the contiguity issue. And it's been done many  
2 times in San Diego.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Is there a legal question that  
4 we need to direct our staff to research?

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I did inquire of Mr. Miller  
6 and he also inquired of Gibson, Dunn, and I did some  
7 research, it's not clear one way or the other. Again, in  
8 other states, they allow contiguity by ferry or their  
9 water travel. And you have to do that with islands,  
10 obviously, because there is no other way to get to them.  
11 Frankly, someone would have to sue us and say "you  
12 violated your contiguity argument," and the court would  
13 have to say, "Yeah, you did that. Fix it." Given where  
14 California law is right now, which is the lack thereof,  
15 is what I'm saying.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So it is silent on it,  
17 basically.

18 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Basically.

19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And the reality is that,  
20 since they built that - since Coronado became  
21 approachable through that part of San Diego, rather than  
22 Imperial Beach, it really is how people get now to  
23 Coronado, either through the Ferry or over the bridge,  
24 that part on the bottom. So I think there is an argument  
25 that that ferry is a working ferry that people really use

1 to get to Coronado.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Right, and we did check,  
3 it runs 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., it runs on the hour.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So do we give direction to Q2  
5 to keep Barrio Logan whole with Sherman Heights and Logan  
6 Heights?

7 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, Sherman Heights, Logan  
8 Heights, and Barrio Logan should all be together.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And any direction on where to  
10 adjust that?

11 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, actually I have a  
12 little drawing here I could share it with our Mappers,  
13 but it would follow I-5 as you have it drawn here, and  
14 then it essentially -- you essentially have it, but one  
15 can claim this portion here is part of the old Sherman  
16 Heights.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can we zoom in?

18 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, blow it up a little  
19 bit, we can't see it at this level, we want to make sure.  
20 All right, so here is 5, this here from 5 to 15, is the  
21 core of Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, and then you add  
22 that section here to all of this, Barrio Logan would form  
23 the core of the Latino community downtown. Once you go  
24 west of 5, you're entering downtown San Diego. So I see  
25 this as possibly where the line is drawn that would make

1 this entire section part of the Latino community, and  
2 this bridge would not split it because --

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, I think we just kind of  
4 jogged around the bridge before, so if we just don't do  
5 the job, will that resolve it?

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay. So the direction to Q2  
8 is to fix the split in Barrio Logan, and my question was,  
9 any suggestion on where to adjust for population?  
10 Remember, we have to get down to one person, so that  
11 means if we're adding population into this district, it's  
12 going to affect another district because we're going to  
13 have to re-take population out. If you don't have  
14 specific suggestions, then we will -

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I don't have any  
16 suggestions.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay. Mr. Brown is on his way  
18 in, so we will be able to start L.A. County and maybe get  
19 any questions answered about the San Bernardino  
20 Districts. The other thing, it sounds like -- I did not  
21 hear a clear direction from the Commission on what to do  
22 about Chula Vista and National City. Should we give  
23 direction to Q2 to research the public comment database  
24 to verify where the split should be and make an  
25 adjustment accordingly?

1           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And did we finalize where  
2 we're going to -- how high up or where the Congressional  
3 border district is, what cities it's going to include or  
4 not?

5           CHAIRPERSON DAI: We did not, so if you have  
6 specific direction, let's give it because we have Mr.  
7 Brown here.

8           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I need to look at it.

9           COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah.

10          CHAIRPERSON DAI: Could we switch back to the  
11 border district? And can we pan out so that we can see  
12 those cities?

13          COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And after Commissioner  
14 Blanco, could I just add a couple general directions to  
15 give and be done with it?

16          CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes. Actually, why don't you?

17          COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, I think just  
18 generally I see a couple issues that maybe we could have  
19 general directions. And as you recall, Commissioner  
20 Ontai mentioned San Diego is a place of valleys and  
21 hills. There are some problems here. Escondido and  
22 Poway -- or excuse me, El Cajon and Santee, first, are  
23 split and they're both communities in a valley that is  
24 surrounded by mountains, so I think there is a problem  
25 with the area where Santee and El Cajon are split. I

1 think the issue of, again, you go back up and in another  
2 valley is the Escondido Poway area is split, too. You're  
3 going in and slitting these areas that are next to each  
4 other and they're isolated because they're in literally  
5 light up valleys and around hills. I still, again, also  
6 think there's a problem with a district going from  
7 Coronado all the way up to Poway, actually northern and  
8 eastern on that, I think there has to be a shift there to  
9 incorporate that. So I think there are some areas of  
10 shifts in that central part [inaudible] the rest of that  
11 boundary of the south. I know that northeast San Diego  
12 is really low on population, so you have to find it  
13 somewhere, but we can explore some of those.

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: In doing that, especially  
15 looking at El Cajon, you have to also look at the I-8  
16 transportation corridor, it's not really -- those cities  
17 are not necessarily as isolated as you may think they are  
18 just because they have hills.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: It's true, I'm just  
20 trying to see the COI that's, well, the similarities of  
21 those areas next to each other and if there's a way maybe  
22 to swap them. Yeah, it may not be possible, but I  
23 thought maybe we could give general directions to explore  
24 that.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, one thing we heard

1 about El Cajon, and I think - I would be curious what  
2 Commissioner Ontai - that we got sort of different  
3 comments about El Cajon. El Cajon used to be much more  
4 rural and out there, and as Commissioner Raya points out,  
5 it's now been so connected by the 8. And we did have  
6 comments that said that there were parts of El Cajon that  
7 people really felt were part of San Diego and not as  
8 rural as it was in the old days, so just one thing to  
9 consider, if we're dealing with population issues, I  
10 think El Cajon is one area that has the possibility of  
11 perhaps different parts of it having different  
12 characteristics, we did hear that, and so I think that's  
13 a possibility if it were to help resolve some issues, so  
14 it was a little bit of a --

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And that's why we split it in  
16 the first place, so, you know, it's completely reasonable  
17 to say that, for all those reasons, because we did get  
18 conflicting COI, that we keep it split, but maybe we look  
19 at where that split happens.

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, you could also maybe  
21 look at the trolley goes out there from downtown, so that  
22 may be -- I can't recall exactly where it stops, but that  
23 may be also an indicating of kind of where it meets the  
24 urban.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And my point was just

1 simply that maybe pairing Santee and El Cajon, wherever  
2 that may go, it seems like there are communities that are  
3 similar, I just didn't like that they were split from  
4 each other, I should say, more than that. That was more  
5 the point.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So we should look at that  
7 border because that's going to affect a lot of other  
8 things.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so let's make some final  
11 comments. Mr. Brown is here. I understand you have a  
12 presentation? At 1:00, okay. So, let's just finish  
13 these comments on the border.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I just have one  
15 question. Have you taken a look at the potential options  
16 of respecting the Orange County - San Diego line in South  
17 OC? And obviously that's mutual on both sides of the  
18 county line.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, Gil and I did have a  
20 lot of conversation about the Temecula issue and the  
21 coastal, the San Clemente being drawn down into San  
22 Diego, and I think we, well, Commissioner Ontai indicated  
23 that a lot of people in Temecula commute into San Diego,  
24 that there is a real strong connection with parts of  
25 that, or that people have gone -- left San Diego and gone

1 to Temecula because of the cost of housing. So it's not  
2 necessarily really separate in terms of economy,  
3 transportation, housing issues.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I meant the  
5 Orange County one.

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Right, okay, yeah, I was  
7 throwing in Temecula at the north end, as well, but the  
8 other one, the Orange County, I think we agree that we  
9 need to do something about moving - I think there's just  
10 too much testimony, we have to respect that county line.

11 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, I think our  
12 recommendation is to make a clean cut along the county  
13 line. But, for the Temecula area, there is such a strong  
14 percentage, we believe, of residents that live and work  
15 in San Diego, there are a lot of military families that  
16 have bought homes up here because it's cheap, and they  
17 commute, and I-15 is one of the heaviest corridors in San  
18 Diego County because of that bedroom community that  
19 provides housing for San Diego.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, great. So, I think there  
21 was earlier direction, commentary about an attempt to  
22 keep Temecula whole, I don't know if that's going to work  
23 out, this is Congressional, so I think that's the  
24 question, is if we have the bulge coming from the  
25 population surge down there, assuming we keep that

1 Riverside line, you know, there's only so much we can do.  
2 Any other comments for Ms. Henderson so we can finish up  
3 this region because we'll need to give you -- do you have  
4 a sense of, again, what's been tried? If we're  
5 suggesting things that are not viable, we would like you  
6 to tell us.

7 MS. HENDERSON: Well, I think we need a clear  
8 sense of what's being suggested. It would be really  
9 helpful for us to try to do it on a district by district  
10 basis, which I know is hard because you see something  
11 that might work somewhere else, but it's really hard for  
12 Kyle to keep up with the notes because we're skipping  
13 from district to district. So maybe we need to not try  
14 to squeeze us into 10 minutes.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, why don't we switch  
16 because we have Mr. Brown here, welcome.

17 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Let's switch to L.A. County.

19 MS. HENDERSON: Chair? I'm sorry, if there are  
20 questions that need to be posed to Mr. Brown about this  
21 area that we've gone over earlier today, it would be  
22 helpful to do that first since we need to switch machines  
23 to get L.A. County.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That sounds great. So you get  
25 to look at San Bernardino first. So, hopefully you had a

1 chance to look at these two Visualizations? Yes, the  
2 Congressional.

3 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Hello? Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: This is the Congressional.

5 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes, I've had a chance to  
6 look at those.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Excellent. So we had asked --  
8 this is Visualization 2 and we had asked Q2 to see what  
9 they could do to increase the Latino CVAP as much as they  
10 could and we are at 49.11 percent. This is the  
11 Visualization that is still preferred by many  
12 Commissioners because it's a little more consistent with  
13 the communities of interest around it, as well as in it.  
14 But it's not quite 50 percent.

15 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: My view remains that, if a  
16 plus 50 percent can be drawn in a geographically compact  
17 area and there is racially polarized voting present, and  
18 we meet the totality of the circumstances test, then to  
19 comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, a  
20 majority-minority district that provides for effective  
21 representation of Latinos in this instance should be  
22 drawn. So, drawing a district that has 49.11 percent, in  
23 the absence of other evidence, doesn't seem like it's  
24 going to make that standard. And given that it's  
25 adjacent to the other Visualization, I don't understand

1 why you can't push west a little bit into Ontario and  
2 pick up -- I mean, I don't know the data, but has that  
3 been considered?

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Another  
5 possibility that we just gave Q2 some direction to  
6 explore was looking at that 215 - 91 interchange. In  
7 Riverside, you'll see there is some Latino population  
8 density there, and whether that would be an option.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, would you move the label  
10 so we can see? There we go. See that leg into  
11 Riverside.

12 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Pushing it down south a  
13 little bit. Yeah, if it's adjacent and it's a small  
14 change to that, it seems that that would be appropriate.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And then Visualization 1, as  
16 you recall, if you could just overlay that?

17 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: And hopefully they're not  
18 just going to pick up that little outline foot and  
19 instead do something -

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Based on Mr.  
21 Brown's suggestion, you could actually look further to  
22 the west in Fontana because you did go all the way to the  
23 15, so what Mr. Brown is concerned about is making it  
24 look kind of strange, you could probably balance it out  
25 because there's from Fontana over to the 15, that's all

1 similar area, and then coming into that one corner, and  
2 you might be successful if, Mr. Brown, you are concerned  
3 about it going right into capturing just that orange part  
4 of Riverside.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so this was Visualization  
6 1 and -

7 MS. HENDERSON: Sorry, I just put 2 up so we  
8 could finish that discussion.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, no problem.

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The area right  
11 at the 15 and the 10, you can move that over in Fontana  
12 and then pick up the corner, probably just the corner of  
13 the 60 and the 91 on the north where we talked about  
14 before.

15 MS. HENDERSON: That area in Riverside? Yes.  
16 And to address Mr. Brown's question, we probably wouldn't  
17 be able to go much further into Riverside because of the  
18 population distribution.

19 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could somebody just make  
21 a run right now without taking too much time, if you just  
22 highlighted that area?

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: How long would it take?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Just unclick an area on  
25 a corner just so we could see?

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so while they're doing  
2 that because that is going to take a little time, in  
3 Visualization 1, we had a clear 51.93 percent LCVAP  
4 District in the Pomona Valley. And then, a second  
5 question came up which is, you know, the question whether  
6 we could draw two, which MALDEF has done, which raises  
7 some compactness issues, and what your view is on that?

8           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: I'd like to -- do we have  
9 their versions?

10          CHAIRPERSON DAI: We do, so why don't we just  
11 finish this first since they just selected it.

12          MS. HENDERSON: Commission, a suggestion, for  
13 removing population we could remove the portion of  
14 Highland that is still in this district.

15          CHAIRPERSON DAI: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

16          MS. HENDERSON: I'm not sure if there is enough  
17 population in there, but we'll see.

18          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Mr. Brown  
19 didn't want you to create that tail, he just wanted you  
20 to take a little bit.

21          CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's the only way to get to 50  
22 percent.

23          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No it's not,  
24 because what my suggestion was is taking the rest of  
25 Fontana where it's orange to the 15 freeway, picking up

1 as much into the corner of the 91 and the 215 Freeway  
2 because there is a lot of Latino population there. And I  
3 only say that because Mr. Brown was a little concerned  
4 about this configuration right here, about just picking  
5 up that portion of the population.

6 MS. HENDERSON: When you refer to the corner,  
7 what do you mean?

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The 60 Freeway,  
9 north of the 60 Freeway, west of the 91 Freeway, first.  
10 North of the 60 Freeway, west of the 91.

11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: This is an area  
12 where the 60 and the 215 are one and the same.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, so west  
14 of the 215 Freeway, north of the 60.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Could you point to it at the  
16 screen so we know you know where it is?

17 MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment please, thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Gil, give her your pointer.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, anyway, there we go.

20 MS. HENDERSON: Yes, it takes a while to move  
21 from the hand that moves the map to the little grabber  
22 that grabs the box, so it just takes us a moment. Thank  
23 you.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No problem. Okay, so that  
25 raised it to 49.53 percent.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So again,  
2 that's contrary to what Mr. Brown just said.

3           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, what I said was, if  
4 you're going to add that foot, is there a way to do it in  
5 a shape that doesn't look that way.

6           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: There is. This  
7 is what my suggestion was.

8           COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think it's helpful if you  
9 can use the pointer or something, it just makes it  
10 clearer for everyone.

11          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And, Mr. Brown,  
12 I'm just going off of your suggestion because I do know  
13 options and I live in this area, so correct me if I'm not  
14 following you correctly. But your concern was what they  
15 just captured right here which, if we could do it another  
16 way, it would look better, correct?

17          VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Right.

18          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay. So the  
19 initial suggestion by this Commissioner earlier was to  
20 capture this area here, so we need to pull this line  
21 down. The other option, if we don't pull this in, is to  
22 go right here. This is all Latino, all right up in here,  
23 this is a compact area, it's close to the Fontana area,  
24 and you pick it up, so that's what my suggestion was, is  
25 where you'll make up the population from here. Even if

1 you go down here -- well, anyway, that's what my  
2 suggestion was and I thought that we understood to see  
3 what the numbers would be.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And that would bring the  
5 Latino CVAP down in the adjoining district, correct, if  
6 we did it that way?

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We don't even  
8 have any numbers worked out in this district yet.

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, the adjoining. That  
10 would bring it down over there even further.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: But then the  
12 third option that you'd asked for is to ask Q2 to take a  
13 look at whether or not they can draw two Section 2  
14 Districts here. Anyway, the goal is to get to 50 percent  
15 here, so I don't know, we're still going to have a  
16 problem when you take Latinos from one district and put  
17 them into another.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Correct, I'm just pointing  
19 out that, then, that one, that adjoining district, is  
20 right now at 51 percent.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, it's at 39.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, currently, the way that  
23 Pomona Valley current Congressional District, I'm not  
24 talking about our Option 1. So, we will - when our  
25 reconfiguration totally --

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: It would move it over.

2           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- it would move it over  
3 and if we take that area that goes down from 34 probably  
4 to even lower than that, correct? Because that is where  
5 that population is? I would assume that that's true,  
6 correct? I mean, I just want to make a comment, Mr.  
7 Brown, on this concern you have about that area there  
8 down that we've picked up. My sense, looking at the map  
9 and looking at the concentration, is that that's not, you  
10 know, we have maps that have much more than a little leg  
11 like that and what we're picking up is a concentrated  
12 neighborhood of Latinos in that area, and so I'm worried  
13 about sort of a notion that that's not compact when you,  
14 in fact, do have a compact population in that area. And  
15 I just don't want us to be overly concerned with  
16 something like that where we have things that aren't  
17 square all over our maps, and if this is a population  
18 that we've found there that lives there, that's compact,  
19 why not draw it like that? I feel a little --

20           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes, and let me apologize  
21 for always using lawyer speak because I didn't say you  
22 couldn't do it, and I didn't say not to do it, all I did  
23 is I asked the question about whether there was a way to  
24 do it without the foot. It would be interesting to know  
25 why that configuration exists, for example, is that a

1 city? Is it a neighborhood? I mean, why do people live  
2 in there in the concentrated area? Is it an  
3 unincorporated area? What is it?

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's the City  
5 of Riverside.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Riverside.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And, no, we  
8 have not received any testimony regarding that area.  
9 It's actually the downtown area of Riverside.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And we had it split in all  
11 of our Visualizations and --

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, we didn't,  
13 I'm sorry, we split it at the river. We split the city,  
14 but not in this area.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right, it's been split at  
16 the river and we had, I believe, some testimony about the  
17 differences in the City of Riverside, so that's a city in  
18 there.

19 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Right, so my comment was  
20 meant to be just a question about whether this could be  
21 done in a better shape, but it wasn't to say that you  
22 couldn't do it this way. I think you all have to  
23 deliberate among yourselves and, like with many of these  
24 decisions, you have to decide what you want to do.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, Mr.

1 Brown, this is what I think we -- we had this discussion  
2 earlier, which is essentially some of the Commission  
3 members had made comments that it doesn't really matter  
4 how funny it seems to look if we need to do it for  
5 Section 2.

6 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yeah, so because there is a  
7 required Section 2 District, you need to draw an  
8 effective district, and when drawing that district, you  
9 should try to do it consistent with other redistricting  
10 principles, but you must do it. So, what you have to do  
11 is deliberate about what is the best way to do it and you  
12 can consider the implications of the two things we've  
13 been talking about, one is pushing west up above and the  
14 other is grabbing that foot. And I haven't said that  
15 either one would be improper to do, I think you could  
16 defend both.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Forbes.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I mean, we haven't  
19 gotten to 50 percent even adding that, so I would suggest  
20 that we try Commissioner Filkins Webber's addition and  
21 see if that gets us to the 50 percent.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Filkins Webber,  
23 you are suggesting taking out the whole foot and then  
24 just adding the area to the east?

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, I would leave the foot

1 in at this point because we're going to need the foot to  
2 get to 50 percent.

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Is that foot the Municipal  
4 boundary of the City of Riverside?

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No.

6 MS. HENDERSON: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's Riverside.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's in the  
9 middle of Downtown Riverside.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, is that something we can  
11 do, then, is just grab that -- would you point it out  
12 again, please, Commissioner Filkins Webber?

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And then I would  
14 recommend we look at potentially shaving off population.  
15 I don't know the numbers, but in that area, or I think  
16 Loma Linda, the case could be made for Loma Linda to go  
17 into the Redlands area district if the population numbers  
18 worked out.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So your  
20 suggestion is to split a city where we might have an  
21 option of not splitting a city?

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm saying let's  
23 look at all the option, evidently it's preferable if we  
24 don't have to split a city, I don't see in front of me  
25 the actual population numbers of the city, so I don't

1 know if Loma Linda if that is an option to us to balance  
2 out population.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It actually looks like Redlands  
4 is split in this. Is that correct?

5 MS. HENDERSON: It is not split.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: All right, we are at 49.53, it  
7 actually went down a little bit.

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, in addressing the  
9 ratio, you can either work on the top side or the bottom  
10 side, the numerator or the denominator, so in terms of  
11 trying to get that number up to 50 percent, you've got to  
12 pick the area that's light in color.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That's what we're doing.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: And also, you have to drop the  
15 population, so it looks like the Loma Linda, again, I  
16 don't know what the exact number is, if you drop that,  
17 then it's likely to move you up toward the 50 percent  
18 point.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And my point with  
20 that, knowing the area very well, that Loma Linda shares  
21 commonalities with cities on both sides of it, really.  
22 So, if we were able to preserve -

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: To put it with Redlands, they'd  
24 be fine.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Exactly.

1           COMMISSIONER YAO: Loma Linda identified very  
2 much with Redland, and so to the ease of them.

3           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so you're going to have  
4 to take a piece of it because Loma Linda has a  
5 significant population, does it not? It's like 60,000 or  
6 something like that?

7           MS. HENDERSON: We're going to put those  
8 population numbers up for you.

9           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Thank you. And, again, the  
10 other suggestion that Commissioner Filkins Webber  
11 suggested was parts of Mira Loma, which are light  
12 colored, as well, which probably have lower population.

13          COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think Commissioner Yao  
14 is right, I think once you get rid of the 13,000 people  
15 that were over, your percentages will equalize. Right?  
16 Because right now, your percentage is based on too high  
17 of a number. If you take out those 13,000 over --

18          MS. HENDERSON: From a Mapping point of view,  
19 just a couple questions. Are we keeping this portion of  
20 Riverside, the City of Riverside, in this district?

21          CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes.

22          MS. HENDERSON: Okay. There are some areas that  
23 we could probably remove population from, I'm not sure if  
24 that's something you want to do right now, or if you want  
25 to just direct us to look at that and see if, by removing

1 some areas here, that the LCVAP would go over 50 percent.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, that's what we would like  
3 to direct you to do and I think, you know, it looks like  
4 it is going to take some time, so we don't have to do  
5 this live, but I think the suggestions are, again, the  
6 part there north of Mira Loma looks pretty beige, so I  
7 don't know how much population is in there, and it looks  
8 like there might be some smaller unincorporated areas at  
9 the top, too.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I don't know if we've  
11 decided this, but are we saying now that, rather than  
12 take pieces of the adjoining district where there were  
13 large Latino populations, that we're going to do this  
14 other process, the taking out? Right?

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Well, we have to take out,  
16 we're 13,000 people over.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, I understand, but  
18 before we were trying to get over the 50 by going east.  
19 Are we saying we're not going to do that now, we're going  
20 to do it by this other --

21 COMMISSIOENR RAYA: No, going west. We went  
22 west.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I mean west, that we're not  
24 going to do that?

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think we need to give

1 direction to Q2 to fiddle with both to see what they can  
2 do to get to 50 percent.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Is that enough latitude there?

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: With the preference for not  
6 taking so much in that western and that it's going to  
7 affect the other district.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Correct, that was my point.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, that's helpful.  
11 Commissioner Ancheta.

12 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: All right, I agree with  
13 that point wholeheartedly that we should not be  
14 diminishing the western district.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's right.

16 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And I'm happy to just move  
17 forward and let Q2 try to work this out. I did want to  
18 confirm, or have Mr. Brown confirm, or underscore our  
19 discomfort with the MALDEF alternative because MALDEF  
20 does have, again, two Section 2 Districts, which raises  
21 serious compactness issues. But just to get some  
22 confirmation because I don't think any of the  
23 Commissioners are particularly comfortable with going  
24 that direction.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'll summarize my

1 presentation and my question to you. My concern was that  
2 part of what we were doing here, there was a possibility  
3 of a Section 2 on one side on the west, and then this  
4 other one on the east, and they're exclusive, right?  
5 They can't both be over 50. And so my concern from a  
6 potential legal liability perspective is that we've got a  
7 map that actually -- there already is right now in the  
8 current Congressional Districts in this area, there is  
9 already one Section 2 District, so we're not creating a  
10 new one, we're just rearranging the deck chairs a little  
11 bit here. There's a map that's been presented to us that  
12 adds a Section 2 District, it's very non-compact, the  
13 map. My concern is that this, as opposed to other parts  
14 of the state where our Congressional Districts, when we  
15 were doing population those districts lost population in  
16 this area of the state, this is where all the districts  
17 are like huge now, right? This is where the population  
18 shift has been is into this region. And there's a large  
19 growth of the Latino population in this region, and so  
20 I'm just -- we had given the instruction to Q2 to see, is  
21 there any way to the additional one that is in another  
22 map that's been presented to us, but is very non-compact.  
23 Is there a way to do it? Because I'm concerned that,  
24 given that this is where the population growth is, that  
25 this is probably where our exposure is.

1           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, I certainly agree that  
2 we need to continue to look to see if we've missed any  
3 areas where another 50 percent district could be drawn,  
4 that is true with all the district types. And have they  
5 done that? Have they been able to do that yet? I assume  
6 not since we were just looking at two alternative --

7           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, we just asked them,  
8 but they did say that they've looked at stuff and that  
9 pretty much everything they come up with kind of looks  
10 similar to the MALDEF District that was presented to us.

11          VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: The blue one there?

12          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

13          MS. HENDERSON: Yes, so these districts, the  
14 green on your left-hand side, the LCVAP on that is 50.3  
15 and the blue district, the LCVAP is 50 percent.

16          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And so the question is, is  
17 that something we should pursue? I mean, I can see a  
18 couple of ways. It looks non-compact to me, and then I  
19 think about some of the coastal districts we have drawn  
20 that have that exact same shape and then go inland to  
21 pick up inland, and look very similar to this in terms of  
22 length and with things that stick out, like what we've  
23 done in Ventura and what we've done in Sonoma, Santa  
24 Rosa, they look very similar. So, I am concerned that  
25 somebody could say, "Why was that not compact?" And

1 there are very similar looking districts in other parts  
2 of our map. That's my concern.

3 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: I think what -- at first  
4 broad brush, it does look to be a bit unusual in shape.  
5 I think it would be worth evaluating further by asking  
6 and looking to see if MALDEF provided information that  
7 would suggest why this grouping makes sense, whether  
8 there are specific relationships among the communities in  
9 there, which communities are in there. But, yeah, my  
10 first reaction is that it does seem to be more on the  
11 non-compact side.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Barabba.

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes. Relating this to the  
14 other districts, the length of the other districts, they  
15 were caused by the lack of population in those counties  
16 which forced us into a lengthy district, whereas these  
17 are just linked by seeking out a particular population,  
18 alternatives, from a population point of view.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Raya.

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, that's my question  
21 exactly. Is there a difference in how we weigh doing  
22 that, choosing one just to get out and get people, any  
23 kind of people, vs. this type of construction where it  
24 may not even coincide with some of the COI testimony that  
25 we've had.

1           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, when you're in an area  
2 where you're not considering the Voting Rights Act or 14<sup>th</sup>  
3 Amendment issues at all, from my point of view, you start  
4 with the premise, "Well, I have to draw a district here  
5 somewhere." And you have to group them in ways that make  
6 sense and that comply with the various criteria, in the  
7 order. So, if you've grouped appropriate counties  
8 together and cities together, and communities that you  
9 think are related, and local communities of interest, and  
10 you end up then with a compactness issue -- again, I'm  
11 not talking about this area, but other areas -- that is  
12 the fifth criteria, it's something you need to pay  
13 attention to, but I could see how you could end up with a  
14 district in that area. Here, on the other hand, the  
15 danger when you are considering race and putting together  
16 a district is that, if you're wrong, if the courts  
17 disagree that you've got a geographically compact group  
18 that has a majority, then you've got a 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment  
19 violation because you've used race -- it's clear you've  
20 used race to draw the district. And the rule articulated  
21 by the Supreme Court is not that there's something wrong  
22 with having an unusual shape, there are lots of unusual  
23 shapes, it's that the unusual shape is evidence that race  
24 was the predominant factor in drawing the line, it's  
25 evidence, it's not the only evidence that's allowed, but

1 it's some evidence.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So,  
4 hypothetically, if MALDEF has not provided us any  
5 information that would support a contention that there is  
6 something that is common between the cities or the areas  
7 that are identified, the blue area, based on their  
8 materials or lack of information in that regard, and what  
9 appears to this Commission to be contrary to the  
10 information that we received in public testimony, is it  
11 reasonable to assume that the manner in which they have  
12 drawn the district appears to be for racial purposes  
13 only?

14 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, I wouldn't attribute  
15 motives to them, I assume they think it's a valid Section  
16 2 District, but just they could be wrong. And if you  
17 don't have information that supports it, then you  
18 shouldn't rely on Section 2 to draw the district.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: But the  
20 information to support it would be compact, minority --

21 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Related communities, a  
22 rational reason why you group these together, you might  
23 want to know something about the geographic distance.  
24 You all may know this already, but I can't tell --

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I do and I know

1 all those communities from Muscoy all the way to  
2 Romoland.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, Commissioner Galambos  
4 Malloy.

5 COMMISSIOENR GALAMBOS MALLOY: Similar to  
6 Commissioner Filkins Webber, I'm sitting here thinking,  
7 knowing the area really well of interpreting beyond the  
8 LCVAP numbers what is really the core -- other core  
9 aspects of what might hold these communities together. I  
10 mean, we know that in particular parts of the state,  
11 particularly Southern California, that the freeways tend  
12 to indicate community clusters, and so I think the  
13 portion of the district that aligns around the 215  
14 Freeway, I can see some similarities between those  
15 communities, even though there's a difference between  
16 some of the more Foothills oriented communities and the  
17 southern, there is an interesting mix of quasi-rural and  
18 urban areas. I think the part of the district that I'm  
19 having trouble with is understanding the connection as we  
20 get farther into the Rubidoux, like the southwestern  
21 portion of the district. And you know, kind of the  
22 connections between the three farthest prongs between  
23 Meadowbrook, between whatever that southwest portion is  
24 kind of right there down by Norco, and then up by Muscoy.  
25 And without having really a narrative to support that,

1 even with my knowledge of the area, I'm personally not  
2 able to make the case yet.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And that's my concern is  
4 sort of with that northern portion because we had a lot  
5 of testimony and we did do a Visualization, in fact, we  
6 have a Congressional Visualization that has Perris and  
7 Moreno Valley and, you know, what's in here in the  
8 southern portion, although ours includes March Air Force  
9 -- so this southern portion, we have a lot of testimony  
10 about it being together, including Riverside. But  
11 whether there's a linkage, and we've done that, whether  
12 there's a linkage going up is my question. I just want  
13 to make sure that we really explore all our options here  
14 so that -- and it's very helpful to have Mr. Brown here  
15 so that we can really have a record for this area in  
16 terms of Section 2.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Raya and then I'm  
18 going to have to ask us to make a decision here.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, well, my question is of  
20 a general nature, but it's related. Is that okay to go  
21 forward with that?

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Go ahead.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay. Mr. Brown, the thing  
24 that I was thinking about in our discussion this morning  
25 is that, if we had two districts, neither of which quite

1 reached 50 percent, you know, thinking about the concept  
2 of fair and effective representation being the ultimate  
3 purpose of what we're trying to do statewide, would we  
4 have a defensible position to have -- considering  
5 especially the reality that time has passed since the  
6 Census took place and probably, you know, the numbers  
7 we're looking at obviously shift on a daily basis -- but  
8 if we had two districts that were not quite 50, would  
9 that be a defensible position, rather than actually  
10 establishing two Section 2's or whatever?

11 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: I don't think that's a path  
12 that the Commission should go down. I think that the  
13 Voting Rights Act as interpreted by the courts creates  
14 some constraints and even though the suggestion you make  
15 might make perfect sense, it's not really supported in  
16 the legal framework.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so yes, we have 22  
18 minutes to look at L.A. now, so I want to just see what  
19 the Commission's pleasure is. Do we want to instruct Q2  
20 to explore trying to draw two Section 2 Districts which  
21 will probably end up looking like this based on what our  
22 Mappers have told us? Or are we not comfortable that a  
23 district like this is something we would want to defend?  
24 Commissioner Di Guilio.

25 COMMISSIOENR DI GUILIO: I'd like to propose what

1 Commissioner Galambos Malloy had mentioned very early on  
2 in this discussion, is that maybe we choose - if it's  
3 going to look like this, I think there's probably  
4 agreement we probably wouldn't do it, so I think for the  
5 purposes of moving forward, maybe we choose the other  
6 option. But I also think it's very important that we at  
7 least have it on the record that our Mappers tried. So,  
8 I think for the sake, if everyone agrees that this  
9 wouldn't be acceptable and are assuming this is what it  
10 would look like, let's move forward with the other one,  
11 but have it on the record that our Mappers tried.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so we are giving you  
13 instruction to show us an option that has two Section 2  
14 Districts.

15 MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay? Can we switch to L.A.?

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: Again, for the record, have we  
18 decided on which of the two options -- options, again is  
19 not the right word to use anymore -- division 1 vs. the  
20 option 2, I think, were the two names. Have we made a  
21 decision on that?

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think, if I can speak for the  
23 Commission, and let me know if I've captured it, is that  
24 we are trying to raise the Latino CVAP of Option 2 to 50  
25 percent, and we've given them some direction on what to

1 try. So, if it does reach 50 percent, I think that is  
2 the preferred option by many on the Commission; but, if  
3 it doesn't reach 50 percent, it sounds like, according to  
4 Mr. Brown's recommendation, we draw the other one. Is  
5 that close?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think it is a little  
7 circular because, if we did have already a Section 2 that  
8 some of the Commissioners liked, that doesn't quite -  
9 your way of framing the question doesn't address that.  
10 So there was a Section 2 that we drew, that some people  
11 on the Commission already liked.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Should we do a show of hands,  
13 then, to see how many people preferred -- because if we  
14 actually prefer Visualization 1, we should save Q2 the  
15 time to try to get the Visualization up to 50. Right?

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think based on Mr. Brown's  
17 comment, we only have one of the two versions that we  
18 looked at, we only have one that meets the requirement.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: In its current incarnation,  
20 yes.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right, so again, if we want to  
22 go back and reinvestigation, and we can do that,  
23 otherwise I don't think we have any choices.

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Again, the choice is whether we  
25 ask Q2 to spend the time to increase the LCVAP of

1 Visualization 2 to 50 percent in the same way we are  
2 trying to also have them investigate whether they can  
3 draw two Section 2 Districts.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: You had raised a concern,  
5 Commissioner, about that you preferred the Foothills  
6 configuration in the one that is already Section 2,  
7 that's, I mean, one of them is going to be Section 2,  
8 that's not the issue. The question is now the other  
9 issue that you raised, whether you prefer a configuration  
10 that has the Foothills as in the previous one.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right, either option is  
12 acceptable to me, so I'm not going to put my stake on one  
13 or the other, but the fact before us is that, if we want  
14 to proceed, the two versions that we looked at, one has a  
15 50 percent and the other one, if we really like it  
16 enough, then we're basically going to come up with  
17 another option that hasn't 50 percent, and then at that  
18 point in time, then we have to come back and choose  
19 between the two versions that has a Section 2. Is that  
20 the route that we want to go?

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, that's not what we said.  
22 Again, one more time, we are choosing whether to ask Q2  
23 to explore Visualization 2 and try to get it to 50  
24 percent; if they cannot, we default to Visualization 1.  
25 So there is no choice there, I mean, we're just asking

1 them to try it. Do we want to ask them to try that?

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay. Are you clear,

4 Commissioner Yao?

5 COMMISSIONER YAO: So the decision before us  
6 right now, or the conclusion that I hear is that, if we  
7 can get the Visualization 1 to meet 50 percent  
8 automatically, that will trump the other option that we  
9 looked at.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Visualization 1 is already at  
11 50 percent.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: If we can get Option 2 to have  
13 a 50 percent district, that trumps Vision 1. Is that the  
14 decision?

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, I think that is the  
16 decision. All right, do we have L.A.? Okay. So I  
17 believe what we're going to look at for L.A. is based on  
18 some options that Commissioners Ancheta and Galambos  
19 Malloy have worked on that include the ripple effects of  
20 the surrounding areas. Is that correct?

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think we have a technical  
22 issue.

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, let's take a five-minute  
24 break and we will hopefully have our screen up at that  
25 point. Thank you.

1 (Recess at 11:46 a.m.)

2 (Reconvene at 11:52 a.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We are back with the California  
4 Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are doing line  
5 drawing. We are now going to look at L.A. County and the  
6 results of some of our direction to our line drawers back  
7 last week. So, with that, Ms. Boyle, do you want to kind  
8 of take us through this?

9 MS. BOYLE: So based on some of the direction and  
10 the work that we did in Stockton, we now have these four  
11 districts here that are potential VRA Districts. This  
12 one is not above 50 percent, but the other three are and  
13 it splits the southeast cities, only breaks off Commerce,  
14 which I was told that is kind of a peripheral community  
15 on that COI, and it also breaks out Lynwood, which is,  
16 again, I think a peripheral community on that COI. It  
17 keeps Downey whole, it keeps Pico Rivera with Whittier.  
18 One potential issue with this one is that it has -

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, Nicole,  
20 can I interrupt? Is there a way you can change the  
21 resolution, the color of the cities and population  
22 numbers --

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: City names.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: -- is very  
25 difficult to see.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

2 MS. BOYLE: I'm sorry, I don't know why the map  
3 is coming through like this on your display, it looks  
4 better on the display on the back.

5 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, it is the projector, I  
6 believe.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We're getting a projector after  
8 lunch, so...

9 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, I apologize, I didn't know this  
10 would happen. And I don't know how to make this look  
11 better, I'm sorry.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think we can read it now, so  
13 just keep going through it. Please speak into the mic.

14 MS. BOYLE: Okay. One potential problem that I  
15 see with this configuration in terms of the community of  
16 interest testimony is that we have Bellflower and  
17 Montebello with Whittier, and we have testimony that  
18 Whittier would prefer not to be with Montebello and  
19 Bellflower. Over here in East L.A., we've joined Bell  
20 Gardens with Commerce, with East L.A. and we've removed  
21 Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Griffith Park, so we're able  
22 to maintain most of this Hollywood COI, however, it's not  
23 with Beverly Hills.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Is Boyle Heights united?

25 MS. BOYLE: Is Boyle Heights together now?

1 MS. BOYLE: Yes, Boyle Heights is together in  
2 this East L.A. District.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And East L.A. is  
4 altogether?

5 MS. BOYLE: Yes, and East L.A. is whole. In many  
6 of the group submissions, East L.A. is split.

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Could you elaborate a little  
8 bit, please, on the testimony you just referred to,  
9 Whittier vs. Bellflower --

10 MS. BOYLE: Right. We heard - this is specific  
11 to the Mayor of Whittier, said that he would like to be  
12 with Pico Rivera, he had preferred that we would include  
13 Hacienda and La Habra Heights, but we have not, and he  
14 also said that he would prefer not to be with Montebello  
15 and Bellflower because, administratively, they deal with  
16 city issues differently.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Was he the only one who  
18 made that comment?

19 MS. BOYLE: I believe so in terms of Bellflower  
20 and Montebello, yes. But having Whittier with Hacienda  
21 Heights and Pico Rivera, there were several different  
22 speakers.

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: In reading the comments,  
24 and I like this, but I did see a lot of comments that  
25 included La Habra in here. They sort of go both ways,

1 the comments about La Habra, but I'm fine.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And, again, maybe  
3 a framework, I think there's many cities, particularly on  
4 the periphery of each of these districts and of the  
5 overall configuration that we can talk about where  
6 they're best suited, but as opposed to the first time we  
7 went through this exercise where we essentially started  
8 on the edges like a jigsaw puzzle, and worked our way in,  
9 and then we found ourselves really hemmed in without  
10 options, we started in the central areas of Los Angeles,  
11 some of the most densely populated areas, and tried to  
12 look at what are the best configurations starting from  
13 the center, out. So, it's kind of a different  
14 methodology we used. And my personal opinion is that we  
15 actually got some better results or preliminary results  
16 for the Commission to consider.

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, I think this is much  
18 more respectful of the significant COI testimony that we  
19 got.

20 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I agree completely with  
21 working from the core, from the central area of the city,  
22 I think as our approach here, that I'm concerned about  
23 because we get boxed in and the central part of Los  
24 Angeles, as Commissioner Galambos Malloy said, you know,  
25 we have ourselves, for lack of a better term, a leftover

1 area, and that area certainly should not be considered  
2 that - I see some issues with the Crenshaw district being  
3 connected with Santa Monica and Malibu as we go further  
4 up along the coast in Pacific Palisades, so there is some  
5 fine tune adjustment here that truly needs to be made.  
6 And could you also highlight the text boxes with the  
7 tables? I can't read these numbers from here. Or is  
8 there a way you can show that in a clearer - yeah, that's  
9 better.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And if you could  
11 continue just going through the overall configuration, I  
12 think we'll get farther west, but, again, starting in  
13 this core and kind of walking us through the different  
14 districts?

15 MS. BOYLE: Yes. So the next district down here  
16 is the Compton Carson District. We didn't do much to  
17 this District. I think we pulled - hold on. So this  
18 district is the same as the one that we configured in  
19 Stockton. Actually, I may be looking at the same one.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, does Mr. Brown have any  
21 questions? So there are three potential Section 2  
22 Districts, one that is south of it that is a pretty high  
23 concentration, but not 50.

24 MS. BOYLE: And just as a summary, this Compton-  
25 Carson splits Carson, has part of North Long Beach, has

1 all of Paramount, all of Lynwood, Willowbrook, I'm not  
2 sure which community this is, I think it's West Rancho  
3 Dominguez, Watts, up to Florence Firestone, and has a  
4 piece of L.A. here.

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Chair, if I may. Just to  
6 confirm for the good -- I know when we were putting some  
7 of this together, I think Commissioner Galambos Malloy  
8 made this adjustment when we were with Q2, so, Nicole, I  
9 believe even if you included Wilmington, you wouldn't be  
10 able to get to 50 percent. Is that correct?

11 MS. BOYLE: We did have this district to 50  
12 percent before.

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Latino?

15 MS. BOYLE: Latino, yes.

16 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And that's if you did  
17 include Wilmington?

18 MS. BOYLE: That's if you do include Wilmington  
19 and I think you need to pull more out of here and pick up  
20 South Gate.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, it's a  
22 fairly elongated district if you do push it to over 50  
23 percent.

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I only raise it simply - I  
25 think we should just decide whether we want to do that or

1 not, but go ahead, maybe there was a way to get to 50  
2 percent, so --

3 MS. BOYLE: Yes, there is.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What is the percentage  
5 right now.

6 MS. BOYLE: It's 43.1 percent.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: But then isn't  
8 there a problem if you pull out South Gate, you're  
9 pulling out a significant Latino population from that  
10 district?

11 MS. BOYLE: Right. We would shift the district  
12 south by doing that. You'll still be able to maintain a  
13 50 percent district up here, but it will be more -- it  
14 will change the shape of it.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What's the district above  
16 it? What is the concentration?

17 MS. BOYLE: This is 60.63 percent.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown, have  
19 you had an opportunity to review these configurations?  
20 Would you have any feedback?

21 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes, I looked at them. A  
22 few comments. First, I think you're engaged in exactly  
23 the right exercise of trying to draw the districts based  
24 on the public input that you've received. What I would  
25 like to see the Commission do is to make sure that it's

1 developed that analysis and I would do it in a written  
2 narrative, not necessarily before you finalize this, but  
3 what you want to make sure of is that there has been a  
4 large volume of - as you know, the public testimony and  
5 written submissions - since the first Draft Maps. And  
6 you want to make sure that that information has been  
7 evaluated and considered, and that the evaluation process  
8 has been documented, and that the configuration you come  
9 up with, the Commissioners have drawn on that information  
10 and made decisions based on it. They don't have to agree  
11 with it, but they should be making choices based on what  
12 you're getting from that public information.

13           In addition, I think in L.A. there are a number  
14 of challenging legal questions, the answers to which  
15 aren't going to be entirely clear. And one of them that  
16 is going to be raised is the issue of what is the  
17 implications of the polarized voting patterns that we  
18 find, and we're in the middle of discussing these issues  
19 with Dr. Barretto. And it may be the case that, around  
20 the edges of the large concentration of the Latino  
21 community, if there is racial block voting, that may have  
22 some implications that would suggest creation of a  
23 majority-minority district. So, in this iteration, I  
24 think there is a question about the COMP district, which  
25 I assume is Compton, about whether there might need to be

1 a 50 percent district in that area.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And when you  
3 say a 50 percent district, do you mean for African  
4 Americans?

5 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, that's a good  
6 question, too, we'll talk about this afternoon.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I didn't know  
8 which one you were referring to yet because that was  
9 going to be my question, but you can finish your point on  
10 that one.

11 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Right. The question would  
12 be whether a 50 percent district needs to be drawn for  
13 any particular group. But what I had in mind was I was  
14 just describing kind of the issues with respect to the  
15 Latino District.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Blanco.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Does that racial, the  
18 analysis that Mr. Barretto is working with counsel on,  
19 look at block voting intra-racial, like whether African  
20 Americans vote for Latino candidates? Or is it just a  
21 White -

22 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Because of some work product  
23 issues, I don't want to get into great detail now.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay. Well, I would hope  
25 that it would look at all the different kinds of

1 polarized voting and not just White vs. other minority  
2 groups because I think that's part of an analysis that  
3 would be helpful for these areas that we're looking at  
4 right now.

5 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Especially that zone there  
6 that includes Downtown and University Park, I see some  
7 issues with that area and what that district does is you  
8 have the traditional West Vernon, for example, and  
9 Vermont Square, that's a traditional African American  
10 area, and that area has very little in common with  
11 Huntington Park and Cudahy, and Walnut Park, once you go  
12 past Alameda, or you go past Figueroa, or the 110  
13 Freeway, it's a whole different set of neighborhoods over  
14 there. And I see that being a problem. And University  
15 Park, Exposition Park, is taken out of an area and Adams,  
16 that area, I can't read it from here, that area with the  
17 University and with Exposition Park and the Museums has  
18 traditionally been aligned with the African American  
19 communities to the south. So that Visualization looks  
20 very odd to me.

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can we see, I don't know if  
22 you can do this as we're looking at it, it might be  
23 information overload, the density maps for this area?

24 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, then  
25 Commissioner Filkins Webber, and we need to do a time

1 check.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: For the Commission, as  
3 well as members of the public, because Mr. Brown did  
4 refer to the term "work product," and Commissioner Blanco  
5 raised the question about, you know, what racially  
6 polarized voting analysis is yielding, and maybe just for  
7 clarification so the Commissioners and the public can  
8 understand what that means, and then Mr. Brown, or Mr.  
9 Miller, or both are well qualified to explain that.

10 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes. So the exercise that  
11 counsel is engaged in, VRA counsel, is to advise the  
12 Commission on potential requirements of Section 2 in  
13 drawing maps, and that is a legal conclusion, and there  
14 are various inputs to that legal conclusion, and the way  
15 that the Commission has structured our ability to give  
16 our advice on our recommendation was that the Commission  
17 hired an expert to work with counsel so that counsel can  
18 then exercise its judgment. So the work we're doing with  
19 the expert is work of counsel as part of our legal  
20 analysis, and we believe that under California law that  
21 is work product.

22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Very brief, of course,  
23 explain what work product is in terms of -

24 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Sure. Well, the attorney's  
25 thoughts, impressions, and opinions belong to the

1 attorney and are not subject to disclosure, except within  
2 the judgment of the attorney in consideration with their  
3 client.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I don't want to  
6 throw a wrench into it, but we need to be prepared, and I  
7 think I want the Commission to be prepared, as well,  
8 given your analysis and the work that you're performing  
9 with Mr. Barretto, but is there a possibility that these  
10 configurations that we see right now may have to change  
11 if you need to make a recommendation that we have to  
12 create a Section 2 District for African Americans in this  
13 area?

14 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I mean, you  
16 wouldn't need to do that right now, right?

17 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Yeah, we're looking into  
18 that and more to say about that in our closed session,  
19 but we haven't reached that conclusion, but certainly  
20 that's one of the things that would be considered.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I guess the  
22 Commission might want to know when we might have to hear  
23 from you on that conclusion because I don't know if  
24 that's next week or -

25 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: Hopefully next week.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, because  
2 that will likely impact all of these configurations that  
3 we've been looking at, even before the first draft map  
4 because we really spread out that population here and it  
5 could just throw this entire area into a tailspin.

6           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Before we go, we're at 12:07,  
7 I'm going to take this until 12:15, and then we have to  
8 break because we have a conference with Mr. Brown. And  
9 we will be going into closed session immediately after  
10 lunch. Commissioner Parvenu.

11           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I just want to chime in  
12 here and say this, that creating a Section 2 District for  
13 African Americans really doesn't help the situation  
14 because African Americans have been able to vote for  
15 candidates of their choice in less than 50 percent  
16 districts, so, Mr. Brown, could you comment on that in  
17 terms of the racial success of having effective districts  
18 with less than 50 percent?

19           VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: We haven't formed any  
20 conclusions or recommendations about forming a majority  
21 African American district. The analysis that we're  
22 attempting is to evaluate evidence of racially polarized  
23 voting in Los Angeles County and trying to understand its  
24 implications. And after we understand it further, we can  
25 come back with recommendations. So, Commissioner Filkins

1 Webber asked a hypothetical question and I answered it  
2 that, yes, hypothetically there could be a  
3 recommendation, it really depends on the facts. And just  
4 as a reminder to everybody, the requirements before you  
5 conclude that a Section 2 District is required is the  
6 three Gingles preconditions and the Totality of the  
7 Circumstances, and they're not easy questions for all the  
8 reasons that Commissioner Parvenu has raised and many  
9 members of the public.

10 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, I just want the  
11 record to show that my recommendation would be to not  
12 have a 50 percent majority-minority African American  
13 District.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, thank you. So Q2 has put  
15 up the information for the Latino concentrations. Do you  
16 want us to pan out?

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: Chair Dai, is it the desire of  
18 the Chair to finish the L.A. District by 12:15?

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That is the desire, but my  
20 desires have nothing to do with the pace of this  
21 Commission, but we do have to break for lunch at 12:15 is  
22 what I'm saying.

23 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, so if we're going to  
24 come back to it, then their comments associated with the  
25 beach cities and going all the way down to Long Beach -

1           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can we finish the central area  
2 first? So this was the request?

3           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, the reason I wanted to  
4 see this is, you know, because we were talking about that  
5 Compton area and I know that I have been sort of trying  
6 to think about this notion of over-concentration in this  
7 area, and so I can't see Wilmington down there.

8           CHAIRPERSON DAI: And we did receive COI  
9 testimony about the transportation corridors down here,  
10 so I guess the question is we asked and received an  
11 answer from our Mappers, is it possible to create another  
12 50 percent district if we pull that down, I assume we'd  
13 lose Florence Firestone and it would shift the district  
14 south, and the question does that help the surrounding  
15 districts, I guess, would be the question.

16          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I wouldn't  
17 think that it would because, when you do that, you're  
18 going to isolate Long Beach. But when you pull that  
19 down, you're putting in Lynwood with South Gate and then  
20 that center district, which I guess is considered - I  
21 can't figure out which box goes with it, but it's already  
22 at 60 percent, I believe.

23          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yep.

24          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So then, when  
25 you do that, that's going back to 70 percent, probably,

1 and then you're back to the problem because I think that  
2 district was like that before.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It was.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So when you  
5 pull down, everything else flows, and then that gets  
6 over-concentrated again.

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I agree and that's why I  
8 just wanted us to keep that whole issue in mind, along  
9 with other issues. There's this, you know, tricky issue  
10 in this core area for concentration, that I think it's  
11 important to minimize as much as possible.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: That was one of  
13 the primary considerations, I think, when the Commission  
14 tasked Commissioners Ancheta, Barraba, and myself, to  
15 look at the Los Angeles Area, again, it appeared that  
16 there was over-concentrations of certain populations that  
17 might actually work across purposes with our overall goal  
18 to ensure effective representation for the Los Angeles  
19 Region, and so we looked at a couple of different  
20 configurations around Wilmington and, again, I think as  
21 you get out to these outer areas, you know, we had made  
22 an agreement as a Commission for right now that we felt  
23 that based on the COI testimony it was very clear that  
24 the airport should be connected with Inglewood. Once you  
25 make that decision, you can imagine the effects that has

1 on the whole southwestern side of Los Angeles and into  
2 Long Beach, it really limits what population you have to  
3 play with, particularly because we have clusters of very  
4 strong COIs here, we have kind of the Carson, Compton,  
5 Long Beach, we have the Gardena, Torrance area, we have  
6 San Pedro needs to be with the Port, so we're really  
7 getting boxed into a corner here. Now, one thing as I  
8 look at this that I am remembering is that we had  
9 directed Q2 to keep the Airport with Inglewood, in my  
10 recollection, though, the Airport is actually located in  
11 the City of Westchester, so there is some flexibility  
12 there with El Segundo and I think we do actually have COI  
13 testimony that links El Segundo with some of the other  
14 southern cities there because of connections with the  
15 aerospace industry, and so it's only about 20,000 people,  
16 but that's significant and we could work with that  
17 population.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can I ask a question? I  
19 think it was helpful that Commissioner Galambos Malloy  
20 pointed out one of the assumptions that we are operating  
21 on, which is what we were asked to do, was to link the  
22 Airport with Inglewood, and I think there are a lot of  
23 reasons we did that, and now looking out at how it plays,  
24 I'm wondering if -- I don't know if anyone has considered  
25 it or looked at it, what happens if we break that

1 assumption and what happens because I feel like, if this  
2 is what happens when we keep the assumption, then this is  
3 what happens, and I understand if we break that  
4 assumption, what happens, and I want to have a bigger  
5 picture to chose from.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, I mean, I think there's  
7 a tradeoff basically. We could either put Inglewood with  
8 the airport, or that affects your Westside district,  
9 basically. So it really is a very clear tradeoff. It  
10 also, as we can see, has an effect on an African American  
11 community that is close to downtown, so I think it's an  
12 either/or, I don't think we can have it all in this one,  
13 we're going to have to make some clear choices.  
14 Commissioner Ancheta, then Commissioner Yao.

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I just want to pose a  
16 question for Mr. Brown because all of this gets trumped  
17 if there is a Section 2 District we have to draw. The  
18 configuration right now doesn't include the Wilmington  
19 area and if we determine that that perhaps isn't going to  
20 be Gingles compliant, can we just not have to draw one  
21 that includes Wilmington is the question. In other  
22 words, in order to comply with the Section 2, do we have  
23 to draw one that is a 50 percent district that includes  
24 Wilmington?

25 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: If the question is, if you

1 need to draw a Compton area district that has 50 percent  
2 Latino in it, what needs to be added, I don't know the  
3 answer to that. But if you concluded that you need to  
4 draw a 50 percent district, it would be in that area, it  
5 wouldn't mean that it has to be in a particular  
6 configuration, you'd have to figure out what are the  
7 options.

8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, let me just try to  
9 sharpen that, then. And, again, the compactness  
10 assessment is always somewhat subjective, there are  
11 numerical indicators, but one of the reasons I think this  
12 came out the way it is currently is that, among other  
13 things, but I think there was a concern about the  
14 compactness of the district. If you just look at it from  
15 -- notwithstanding all the other testimony, which was not  
16 irrelevant, of course, but just in terms of a Section 2  
17 analysis, that there may be some compactness issues  
18 because of the distance of Wilmington from the other core  
19 Latino areas. That was the reasoning we went through  
20 and, again, other things aligned, certainly.

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So this was the thinking on  
22 this, right? And even though we did have strong strong  
23 testimony about the corridor down to the harbors and the  
24 fact that that was heavily traveled and the pollution  
25 issues and the desire to have a district that connected

1 the Harbor and the Freeway that went down and the  
2 corridor, your feeling was that that was a community of  
3 interest, but for Section 2, this was not compact.

4 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Those were the reasoning  
5 process that, again, we could split communities of  
6 interest, you could do a lot of things if you had to draw  
7 a Section 2 District.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And in Stockton,  
9 we discussed the Ports at length and the conclusion we  
10 came to was that we actually had conflicting COI, that  
11 there is a strong argument and there have been  
12 significant public comments saying link the corridors to  
13 the Ports. We've also seen link the immediately adjacent  
14 corridors to the Ports, and that there's some flexibility  
15 as to whether the Ports actually go in the same district,  
16 or whether the Ports are separated out. It goes back to  
17 the either/or, really looking at the numbers and the  
18 strong COIs we have in this area, I don't -- the moment  
19 you make a decision about whether to link the Port north-  
20 south, or whether to link the Airport on the east-west  
21 access, that cuts off how you can flow with your  
22 population and we absolutely have to leave one of those  
23 areas open in order to accommodate all of these  
24 surrounding districts, otherwise we are going to end up  
25 with isolated segments of population that we just can't

1 have.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, again, we have a hard  
3 stop here, so I guess just, Mr. Brown, do you have any  
4 comments on whether this current configuration is  
5 compliant with Section 2 or are you ready to comment on  
6 this?

7 VRA ATTORNEY BROWN: No, I'm not ready to comment  
8 on it. And the reason is because what we want to do is  
9 develop the overall record before we make a final  
10 conclusion on that, and that means developing the  
11 explanations for each of the districts, and I know we had  
12 a general discussion of it, but I think we really want to  
13 have thorough written narratives, at least for my  
14 purposes, that we - so that we understand what our record  
15 looks like. And the legal issues are complex, and so  
16 what I've said so far today is that, as a general  
17 proposition, I think these districts look fine, the  
18 Commission has engaged in the right exercise, you seem to  
19 be trying to track the public input, and that's all what  
20 you should do. There may still be issues with respect to  
21 what to do where the communities are -- where one  
22 minority community is adjacent to another.

23 COMMISSIONER YAO: Let me just take 60 seconds  
24 and come in on the impact of using this approach to the  
25 Bay city, as well as the Ports. I understand what we're

1 doing, we're basically starting from the central, whereas  
2 the last time around for the first draft, we started with  
3 the constraint of the coast, and then working in. In  
4 this particular scenario, we compromise greatly the Bay  
5 cities, in other words, a lot of the cities that are  
6 included in the Airport and so on, that the Bay Area  
7 considers to be their core community. On the Southside,  
8 a lot of things are happening, again, because of the  
9 constraint of the population, splitting San Pedro,  
10 dividing Long Beach into three Congressional Districts,  
11 having part of that going into Orange County, as well as  
12 the 710 corridor that we have lightly touched upon, these  
13 are all the impacts because of the fact that we started  
14 with the core Los Angeles Region, and then working  
15 outward, because of the fact that we're against the  
16 coast, it has to go both ways and it has to stop whenever  
17 we run out of people, so those are the impacts and if  
18 that's the desire, if we feel those compromises are  
19 acceptable, then that's all we can do because we really  
20 have no options at this point.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, you're way over your  
22 time, we are going to have to break for lunch. We just  
23 are trying to work around hard stops for both of our  
24 consultants and trying to get what we need to get done.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: A process point, when we

1 come back to this, can you just give us an idea of what  
2 we'll do?

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, we're going into closed  
4 session when we come back.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, will we come back  
6 to this afterwards, though?

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: After we're done with closed  
8 session. All right, we'll break for lunch.

9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Where will the closed  
10 session be?

11 MS. SARGIS: Closed Session is going to be in  
12 this room, so if you're not involved in the closed  
13 session, you'll have to stay outside until we give the  
14 high sign to come back in.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: All right, we are adjourned  
16 until 1:00, then.

17 (Recess at 12:23 p.m.)

18 (Reconvene at 2:33 p.m.)

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, welcome back to the line  
20 drawing session for Southern California of the California  
21 Citizens Redistricting Commission.

22 When we left you, we were looking at Central L.A.  
23 I want to remind the Commissioners that this has not  
24 changed since the last Visualization, so we don't want to  
25 re-discuss what was already discussed last week. What we

1 want to do at this point is to provide line drawing  
2 direction to our Mappers so that they can make changes  
3 that will go into our second Draft Maps.

4           So, we looked at these four core districts and  
5 I'm open at this point to any suggestions for modifying  
6 it. I also want to remind everyone of Commissioner  
7 Galambos Malloy's point that we're probably going to have  
8 to make a choice here because there is clearly a trade-  
9 off in this area, we're actually going to have to make a  
10 choice: do we keep the Airport with Inglewood District,  
11 which tends to have a negative ripple effect on the west  
12 side, or do we relax that constraint, which will allow us  
13 to do a better job on the beach cities, and maybe deal  
14 with some of the issues around the Port, and perhaps do a  
15 little more justice to the Crenshaw District which, as  
16 Commissioner Parvenu pointed out, is being kind of cut  
17 off. So, it's kind of an either/or thing, we are not  
18 going to be able to accomplish all of these things.

19           So, thoughts on that? Commissioner Filkins  
20 Webber, then Commissioner Galambos Malloy, Di Giulio,  
21 then Parvenu.

22           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Just on that point  
23 that you mentioned, because I do want to focus rather  
24 than moving all around, then we can be more effective.  
25 In looking at some of the recent public comments that we

1 received, I think, in the last week or so in Los Angeles,  
2 and maybe, Commissioner Blanco, if you're up to date on  
3 the public testimony, I recall there being some testimony  
4 from Palos Verdes Area about their having a lack of  
5 connection to Santa Monica, and because that distance,  
6 even though we're looking at it as a coastal district,  
7 but one thing that does break that up is the Airport. So  
8 if we gave the Airport back to Inglewood as we had  
9 discussed before, that does break that coastal and it  
10 might give some support to the testimony we received from  
11 Palos Verdes vs. Santa Monica, even though I know it puts  
12 tougher constraints on us in looking for population, but  
13 I just wanted to throw that in there from this morning.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, thank you. Commissioner  
15 Galambos Malloy.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, I believe  
17 when we made the decision in Stockton to move forward  
18 with this Visualization, it was definitely based on the  
19 acknowledgement that we had gotten feedback from the  
20 areas north of the airport such as Santa Monica and a  
21 couple of other cities that they actually did not  
22 identify with the southernmost portion of the district;  
23 whereas, again, we had conflicting testimony and more  
24 flexibility in the Port area. So, unless we have some  
25 massive wave of testimony that has come in to the

1 contrary, I would say this is what we decided last week,  
2 to the most extent we can keep moving forward. I think  
3 what Q2 really needs from us right now is, if we are  
4 generally okay with exploring these core districts, what  
5 we should do is look to the northwestern area here to be  
6 able to zoom in on essentially north of the airport. I  
7 would also say, too, from my perspective El Segundo is  
8 completely flexible to go south if we need to later on,  
9 but as we get up in here, there's some population issues  
10 and maybe I'll let Nicole or Ana kind of give an overview  
11 of some of the decisions we need to give guidance on.

12 MS. HENDRSON: Yeah, that's exactly right. So  
13 we're just putting up the text box for this district or  
14 this area right here, and you'll see that we have an  
15 extra 93,000 people in it, so that's over. We're going  
16 to need to figure out where to put these people.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And we purposely,  
18 again, the instruction that was given to the sub-grouping  
19 of Commissioner was just to work on the core, so there's  
20 a reason, it's not that it can't work, it's just we  
21 didn't spend the time trying to make it work.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Right, and I think there  
23 was some discussion about this with Jamie the other day.  
24 That northwestern part where it has Calabasas, Topanga,  
25 all that area split into three, Agora Hills, we had given

1 her direction not to have it split into three, that  
2 Malibu was not going to go up with Oxnard. So there's an  
3 exchange there that we have given some direction that  
4 might change that, too, trying to keep those -- because  
5 this is a Federal issue and it's the Federal lands --  
6 it's the Santa Monica Mountains and we thought,  
7 particularly for this, there was a way to try and keep  
8 that more intact, so that might affect some of your  
9 discussion down there, too, Nicole. And at some point,  
10 if we're going to focus here, that's fine, I had one  
11 other comment if we go down south at some point, back  
12 again.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, Nicole, can we confirm that  
14 what you have there is consistent with what --

15 MS. BOYLE: With what Jamie showed you? Correct,  
16 this boundary here is your new modified boundary for the  
17 district, based on the direction you recently gave her.  
18 So we're going to coordinate with that and it keeps the  
19 population exchanges within these three districts, so  
20 it's doable.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Excellent. Okay, are you  
22 finished, Commissioner Di Giulio?

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I just said, if we're  
24 going to focus here, I was going to add another comment  
25 from before in the queue when we were still in the south.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just to clarify here, so  
3 now we have in L.A. and West L.A. we have Agora,  
4 Calabasas --

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I can't see from up here so  
7 it's very hard to tell what this instruction that we  
8 gave, where did it end up.

9 MS. BOYLE: Sure. So what you told Jamie in the  
10 boundary I have here would have Moore Park - or, I'm  
11 sorry, would have Simi Valley and Santa Susana with Santa  
12 Clarita, and it would have Moore Park in this what looks  
13 like a split of Simi Valley with Eastern Ventura County.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, but there was also  
15 another area we talked about.

16 MS. BOYLE: Really? This is the boundary I  
17 received from her. Do you know which area --

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It was the southern part  
19 because, in that district, you have Malibu and Agora  
20 Hills going up with Oxnard, I believe.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, Malibu is no longer with  
22 there.

23 MS. BOYLE: I'm looking for the boundary to make  
24 it thicker, but Agora Hills would now be with Malibu,  
25 Calabasas, and Topanga, and the only L.A. County city

1 that would -- East Ventura, I believe, here is West Lake  
2 Village.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay, that was my question,  
4 whether we'd done that.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I thought somebody said  
7 no, but apparently yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes. So we've fixed Malibu  
9 because it was --

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It was hard to tell our  
11 District line vs. the County line.

12 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, I haven't made the adjustments  
13 because I didn't send this Visualization in, I just have  
14 an overlay of what she did on top. But I will align my  
15 lines and then that will change this 98,000 number for  
16 West L.A., but not --

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So just a process question here  
18 because I don't want to go all over this place because we  
19 had different Commissioner pairs focused on different  
20 parts of L.A. So, are we okay before we leave the core  
21 central L.A., are we okay with those districts, or do we  
22 want to make changes?

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, we didn't finish  
24 looking at that, we didn't look at downtown.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That's what I'm saying. Can we

1 try to finish one area and then we'll go back up this way  
2 because we have different Commissioners looking at that  
3 area.

4 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I want to make a comment.  
5 Chair?

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Parvenu.

7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, I'd like to make a  
8 comment here about maintaining the integrity and the  
9 logic of having the Airport with Inglewood, with that  
10 east-west connection because of the Century Boulevard  
11 Corridor, and there's a flight pattern, and --

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Parvenu, do you  
13 have a change, because that's already in here? Do you  
14 have a change? If you have direction that you would like  
15 to give?

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: The direction would be to  
17 keep Westchester and the Airport.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's already in there. Do you  
19 have direction to change the current Visualization?

20 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, I do, to reduce some  
21 of that 98,000, there's nothing in common with the  
22 Crenshaw Baldwin Hills area and Madera Heights with the  
23 area to the northwest, so I would remove some of that  
24 population since it's over 93,000, to capture that area  
25 along Laverne Park and the Crenshaw area added to the

1 south. There's far more in common with that area to the  
2 south. Baldwin Hills --

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Nicole, how many people do we  
4 have in the southern district?

5 MS. BOYLE: It's perfectly balanced right now  
6 with 600. We could potentially move Torrance out with  
7 the Beach cities and it's currently split by this  
8 Visualization at the Pacific Coast Highway and shift the  
9 district north. Is that what the Commissioner is  
10 suggesting?

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That would split the  
12 traditional Japanese COI that we had talked about in  
13 Torrance and Gardena.

14 MS. BOYLE: We could potentially just increase  
15 the split. I think the Japanese community is in the  
16 northern part of Torrance, I could be mistaken, though.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: We had discussed  
18 that as an option, that the Torrance split may change, as  
19 long as we do preserve the cultural Japanese community  
20 between Torrance and Gardena.

21 MS. BOYLE: I could also shift the district north  
22 with moving the 20,000 here in West Carson with  
23 Wilmington and possibly some parts of L.A. here also,  
24 moving it to the east, and that would allow me to shift  
25 the district north by maybe as much as 98,000 people.

1 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Because we heard testimony  
2 from West Carson about being connected.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We did. About West Carson  
4 and Carson, we did hear that.

5 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That would make sense.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: The City of Torrance at this  
7 point is split, right?

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's already split, yes.

9 MS. BOYLE: Correct, it's split up the Pacific  
10 Coast Highway. This is Torrance. Torrance goes to the  
11 ocean.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: We also received some public  
13 comment about between Torrance and Redondo Beach, we may  
14 need to look at that dividing line and see whether that's  
15 the most optimal place of splitting that. They're  
16 complaining that a lot of the Redondo Beach Zip Code is  
17 really part of Torrance, okay?

18 MS. BOYLE: So would you suggest that perhaps  
19 Torrance would go better with Redondo Beach and Pales  
20 Verdes Estates, and not with Gardena?

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: No, no, I don't think we're  
22 trying to change the population, just refine that line a  
23 little bit -- if I could give you that data afterward,  
24 I'll do so.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So it might be the same

1 thing if Nicole moves that line up, it might capture more  
2 of Redondo Beach and Torrance together, because right now  
3 it's split, so again you might be able to accomplish what  
4 Commissioner Yao is saying, by moving the line up, you  
5 pull in more of Redondo Beach in the same part of that  
6 western part of Torrance.

7           COMMISSIONER YAO: Right. The comment I received  
8 was that they would rather have the totality of Torrance,  
9 that region together, as compared to the way it is right  
10 now.

11           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Wait, what was that, the  
12 totality of Torrance --

13           COMMISSIONER YAO: In other words, the split  
14 between Torrance and Redondo Beach is splitting some  
15 neighborhoods that shouldn't be split. It's a  
16 neighborhood issue, not a population issue, or the  
17 wholeness of the city issue, it's just a neighborhood  
18 issue.

19           CHAIRPERSON DAI: So, just for clarification for  
20 Nicole, her suggestion that we actually move the line  
21 over, the line splitting, I guess, West Carson? Is that  
22 what you're suggesting, to move that over to make the  
23 population?

24           MS. BOYLE: Yes, to move West Carson to the  
25 District to the east, pulling the line in. That would

1 allow me to shift 21,000 north. But I believe what  
2 Commissioner Yao is suggesting is to adjust to increase  
3 the split, so that we have whatever area of Torrance  
4 belongs with Redondo Beach with Redondo Beach and  
5 whatever population that involves, I could then shift  
6 north.

7 COMMISSIONER YAO: That's a clean-up issue and  
8 not a split issue, yeah.

9 MS. BOYLE: But it would be useful for getting -  
10 we have a 98,000 person bubble and we need to move the  
11 lines towards the bubble.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That area where it is  
14 split now along the PCH, as you go east of PCH, it  
15 becomes a more hilly terrain, it's a higher elevation; as  
16 you go west of PCH, it's more flat, and it's more  
17 commercially oriented with the Piers and the restaurants,  
18 so there is a distinction between the east and west side  
19 of PCH, so I just wanted to bring that geography into  
20 play.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, it's current split along  
22 the PCH, but I think Commissioner Yao is suggesting  
23 something different.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I don't have the data  
25 with me right now, but I can give you that information

1 within 24 hours.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So are we under-  
4 populated in the Peninsula one? Where are we now with  
5 the southern part?

6 MS. BOYLE: In the current configuration, we have  
7 it balanced, but that obviously has to change because of  
8 the bubble to the 98,000 people to the north.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: How far, because I can't  
10 quite tell, does the Peninsula one go all the way down  
11 and around both Ports and part of Long Beach?

12 MS. BOYLE: Correct, but what this is going to  
13 allow us to do is to pull out of Long Beach by 98,000, so  
14 we may actually make it all the way past the Port and we  
15 may actually be able to separate the Port, I'm hoping.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The one thing, this was  
17 the area I was looking at and the one thing I'm a little  
18 concerned about was that you have this big long coastal  
19 region that has both the Ports in it, where we've heard a  
20 lot of testimony that the people that bear the brunt of  
21 the Ports goes north and south and, again, we might not  
22 be able to adjust that, I understand that, but this is an  
23 area of concern that I wanted to see if there's -- it  
24 seems like, to be honest, a lot of the affluent people in  
25 the Peninsula have control over the Ports, and they're

1 not bearing the brunt of the environmental --

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, without modifying the  
3 core, there is no way you can accommodate that, so -

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Commissioners,  
5 we did have this discussion in Stockton, we don't want to  
6 keep repeating this, just let me -- I've been told to be  
7 the enforcer, I've just calculated the time, and we're  
8 really going to have only 30 minutes for the next four  
9 districts and we have not been good, and we have spent a  
10 considerable amount of time on this right now, so if  
11 there is some other direction you want to give, I would  
12 say I can give you another four minutes in this area.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I would just ask, so, if  
14 we go with what we have so far, there is no way to adjust  
15 that? If that's the case, then I'll just withdraw it.

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think that's the case.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, we had this discussion  
18 back in Stockton. So, again, try not to repeat or rehash  
19 things because if we said we're okay with this core, tell  
20 us what you want to change and so we can give direction.

21 MS. HENDERSON: Chair?

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: A lot of public input on not  
23 splitting San Pedro, are we going to do anything about  
24 that at this point in time? Again, if we have that  
25 98,000 bubble, that could be a way to correct that

1 problem; if not, then we can't do anything about it.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: My understanding  
3 is, as we directed, there is no split in San Pedro.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can Ms. Henderson speak,  
5 please?

6 MS. HENDERSON: Chair, if the direction can be -  
7 we definitely have heard the issues about the Ports being  
8 in the same district and what Nicole was just saying is  
9 that it may be possible because of the 98,000 bubble that  
10 is up to the north, that we may be able to move this  
11 PVEBC district to the west and split the Ports. Is that  
12 something that we can explore?

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: That's the  
14 problem. We said that we're keeping the Airport with  
15 Inglewood and that's where the problem lies, correct?

16 MS. BOYLE: I'm looking at possibly drawing  
17 behind the Airport. We would have the majority of the  
18 Airport with Inglewood and I would basically just draw  
19 along the coast here to capture population north of  
20 Westchester and Santa Monica if I needed to. But if we  
21 shift this district far enough north, that might not be  
22 necessary.

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We have a lot of testimony  
24 about Marin Del Rey and Del Rey being kept together, so I  
25 wouldn't want to split them apart.

1 MS. BOYLE: Right, they didn't care which way  
2 they went, but they wanted to be together.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Together, right. And there was  
4 an environmental COI around there, too.

5 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Right, with the Bellona  
6 Wetlands.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, one other  
8 point that I would make for direction purposes is, if  
9 you're going to be pulling the population out of San  
10 Diego -- or, excuse me, out of Long Beach -- is that  
11 correct?

12 MS. BOYLE: Uh huh.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So we would  
14 have to make a decision as to what is going to happen on  
15 the Los Angeles and Orange County border right there  
16 because, if we take a look at it, we've left that little  
17 tiny area of Cerritos, Lakewood, parts of Long Beach, and  
18 we've left -- we did discuss this in Stockton a little  
19 bit because I thought we had given some direction to take  
20 Artesia out of there, out of that one district, but that  
21 didn't happen here. But we really have a concern about  
22 that Orange County line and, so, I think that we still  
23 need to give direction to respect that line. And if  
24 we're going to be working on that side of the map, have  
25 you looked at that?

1 MS. BOYLE: I have a little bit of an issue in  
2 this iteration because, up here, these reconfigurations  
3 left a remainder on the border here. This area used to  
4 be in a district with me, it's about 100,000 people, so  
5 it's a remainder of a district, so I have a remainder on  
6 this border, which means I'm going to have a remainder on  
7 this border, as well.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Unless we find  
9 something in between, that can be a give across county  
10 line.

11 MS. BOYLE: Correct, yeah. But to solve that and  
12 to map it back up to the border like it was in the first  
13 draft, we would have to put these, including Rancho  
14 Cucamonga and San Antonio Heights with L.A. Does that  
15 make sense? So this was in a district with L.A., now  
16 we've got whatever it is, 30 percent of a district here  
17 on the border. So what that means is I have the other  
18 part of the district that's going to be over here on this  
19 border because I'm not going to pass it up to Jamie  
20 through any of her borders because her configurations are  
21 set. So, basically, that population on the San  
22 Bernardino border is going to come all the way down  
23 through Riverside and back up to Orange County, unless we  
24 decide to incorporate it into one of these districts.  
25 And I have two other Visualizations for these districts

1 here that do some hopping over, but this here is a  
2 potential VRA District. So, it's difficult to deal with  
3 this. I could attempt it -- it's at 49.68 now, so I  
4 can't really shift it any further east. Does that make  
5 sense? Because that would pull me down more. So I  
6 certainly couldn't shift it far enough east to pick up  
7 all the remainder of the district I've created with these  
8 internal configurations here. Does that make sense,  
9 Commissioner?

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So you're saying the  
11 middle is set, so you can't go through there to push the  
12 population?

13 MS. BOYLE: Right, it's not so much that it's  
14 set, we can still rework these, but what we have here is  
15 a cluster of potential VRA Districts, and they have an  
16 outer boundary, if that makes sense, and we are trying --

17 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And so we have to rotate the  
18 population around.

19 MS. BOYLE: Right. And we're attempting to  
20 create a certain number of districts that we know can be  
21 created based on the public submissions we've received.  
22 And right now, the only direction I have other than the  
23 Artesia issue is to try to shift this district, or to  
24 remove these areas to a district to the west, but that's  
25 the only direction I've received about reconfiguring

1 these, and there are things to still be a question about  
2 exactly what we're going to do about these districts,  
3 particularly the south and the west L.A. But in this  
4 current configuration, the long San Gabriel Foothill  
5 Mountain district in a lot of ways solved problems  
6 because it allowed me to jump across here and pick up the  
7 leftovers from the VRA configurations to the south.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Well, that's still an option.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: If you ask your  
10 regional pair, I don't know that we would agree that it's  
11 still an option.

12 MS. BOYLE: You have incorporated this in  
13 Visualizations into San Bernardino County districts, and  
14 I believe you have a successful Visualization that is  
15 using this area now?

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, we do. It puts Claremont  
17 in.

18 MS. BOYLE: I believe it would be your Option 2  
19 for San Bernardino?

20 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, just to sharpen our  
22 discussion, if we don't touch anything up there in the  
23 Foothills and in those districts we looked at earlier  
24 today, and we went down to where we were, what are the  
25 options for that population?

1 MS. BOYLE: Right here?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, just crystallize it  
3 for us down there. If all we could work was in this  
4 area, what would it be?

5 MS. BOYLE: So we are going to shift these lines  
6 up here to get this 98,000 people, so that's going to  
7 pull this in by that 98,803 people. And I'm -- I'm not  
8 sure exactly what's left in Long Beach, I can check right  
9 now and I can give you a better idea of where that will  
10 get us.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So your plan  
12 would be to create another district either with Lakewood,  
13 Cerritos, probably Los Alamitos, and picking up the rest  
14 of Long Beach in order to adjust for that 93,000?

15 MS. BOYLE: Potentially. Once I figure out what  
16 this remainder is here, then it's open to configuring  
17 with whatever we need from Orange County.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, so why  
19 don't we just leave it at that for now and we'll have to  
20 take a look at it next week.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Or possibly Sunday, right?

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, okay.  
24 Anything further in this area?

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We haven't looked at

1 Downtown.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I know, we're  
3 going to get to L.A., we're moving around, but I want to  
4 get out of South L.A. here, we spent a lot of time here  
5 and we really want to get to downtown. Anything else?

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so we're looking at  
7 downtown.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And the next  
9 region, as far as the way we have it blocked off, we've  
10 already -- this was Commissioner Parvenu and Commissioner  
11 Yao's area, which is technically Westside, South Bay,  
12 Long Beach, so we could move more to the Westside, which  
13 would be flowing up where we were talking about,  
14 Westside, technically Santa Monica, so we can move into  
15 that area and we do have very little time on this one.

16 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So any comments, Commissioners  
17 Yao --

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The one thing  
19 that I had, and correct me if I'm wrong, Topanga is in  
20 this one, but technically, because we fixed, it's not  
21 really in this West L.A. district?

22 MS. BOYLE: No, this is going to be reconfigured  
23 based on what the direction you gave Jamie.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Based on the community of  
25 interest comments, the separation for the Airport is

1 really not right at the Airport. A lot of people feel  
2 that the Westchester is really part of the South Bay, so  
3 if we're going to basically bring the population along  
4 the ocean side of the Airport all the way up, the way to  
5 really divide it is north of Westchester, and then  
6 everything about that, including Santa Monica, probably  
7 should be tidy and to the Malibu, based on all the  
8 testimony. So that's really where the people living  
9 there show their interest. And I think we have an  
10 opportunity here to do that and maybe try to make that  
11 happen if possible.

12 MS. BOYLE: I will, that's my intention with this  
13 Visualization.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Parvenu, do you  
15 have some comments?

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, there is some fine  
17 tune adjustments that can only be made when you look at  
18 the street level, so if you can look into the street, I  
19 want to go to the west where the Bellona Wetlands are,  
20 before it was divided at Jefferson. I want to make  
21 certain that that environmental community is kept whole  
22 and not split. It looks like it's still --

23 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Culver Boulevard?

24 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Culver Boulevard, okay,  
25 that's right through the middle of that marshland.

1           COMMISSIONER YAO: I think the testimony says to  
2 keep the Marina Del Rey with the Bellona Wetlands.

3           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah.

4           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, it appears like it's  
5 there, okay. There's another fine tune adjustment, too,  
6 north around Thai Town. We have the line up and over,  
7 shifting to another city, but if you shift the border up  
8 to Franklin, as opposed to dividing it right down the  
9 middle, Hollywood Blvd., you'll capture and keep Thai  
10 Town whole, and not necessarily split it. So, if you go  
11 up Vermont -

12           CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's not split right now.

13           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: If that's Hollywood Blvd.  
14 east -- I can't read from up here, so --

15           MS. BOYLE: This is the Hollywood Freeway, 101.

16           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, but what the east-  
17 west street where it says Thai Town?

18           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Hollywood  
19 Boulevard.

20           MS. BOYLE: Oh, Hollywood Boulevard, I'm sorry.

21           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: What I'm saying is it's  
22 split right in the middle.

23           CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, it's not.

24           MS. BOYLE: No, it's not. This is the cap for a  
25 boundary for Thai Town. Our closest district boundary to

1 Thai Town is here. So, in this iteration, we've managed  
2 not to split Thai Town.

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay. And the other area  
4 is around Chinatown, just north of Chinatown, there is  
5 Solano Valley that I don't think was picked up in the  
6 earlier -

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We're going to  
8 move to the downtown area as soon as we finish the west  
9 side.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Do you have any more comments  
11 on the Westside?

12 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's fine.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Anything more  
14 on the west side. I had one inquiry about Westchester  
15 Playa Del Rey and Marina Del Rey, but we can't go there  
16 with Westchester, correct, because of the Airport. So  
17 we're respecting that COI testimony as far as Marina Del  
18 Rey, Playa Vista, and --

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And the wetlands.

20 MS. BOYLE: My current plan is to keep it in the  
21 district to the north, if possible. Based on the  
22 direction from Commissioner Parvenu, I'm going to shift  
23 north through here.

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: How are we on  
25 population for this west side district and Santa Monica.

1 MS. BOYLE: It's current the bubble, it's 98,000  
2 over.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, but that's what we're  
4 adjusting. Any other comments about the west side, if  
5 not, then we'll move back to the Downtown.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Just curious, did Nicole  
7 have enough direction of how much of that section in  
8 Crenshaw to pick up? The other boundary, Commissioner  
9 Parvenu?

10 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I'm not sure because I  
11 can't see the street levels.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I mean, I know she'll  
13 balance us with the population, but I didn't know if you  
14 had a comment on that, just a real quick comment.

15 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: The east-west  
16 thoroughfares, perhaps, I don't know if we can go as far  
17 as the 10.

18 MS. BOYLE: Here is the 10 up here, here is  
19 Culver Boulevard. If you can capture that area just  
20 south or east of Culver City, I think that would be a  
21 community of interest.

22 MS. BOYLE: Baldwin Hills, Leimert Park, View  
23 Park, Windsor Heights, and you would like it with the  
24 Inglewood District to the south?

25 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes. I have to look at

1 the Council maps to determine exactly where those  
2 community boundaries are.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It looks like there are some  
4 boundaries on the map.

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And we're not doing the  
6 valley yet, right?

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That'll be next. Okay, so if  
8 we're done with this, shall we move -- got enough  
9 direction on this area? Okay, let's look at the downtown  
10 and we can finish up.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: West Hollywood  
12 is still technically the Westside and Park La Brea, just  
13 to make sure we've got - is there any further direction  
14 you need in Los Feliz, Studio City, Chula Vista -

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Any comments about Beverly  
16 Hills being out of the Hollywood? Okay.

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And the  
18 population is okay in that Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills?

19 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, we have Los Feliz, Hollywood  
20 Hills, Hollywood, West Hollywood, East Hollywood, and  
21 most of Silver Lake together in this visualization.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And Burbank,  
23 right?

24 MS. BOYLE: With Burbank, yes, in the Burbank  
25 Glendale District. And in this Visualization, Glendale

1 is split, though, but it's split portion is with its  
2 unincorporated areas.

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: We've received testimony  
4 on Toluca Lake, also connected with the Burbank and the  
5 NBC Complex? The Studios?

6 MS. BOYLE: Yes, Toluca Lake is currently with  
7 Burbank, Glendale, the Hollywoods, Griffith Park, Toluca  
8 Lake, and Studio City.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And Studio City is whole now?

10 MS. BOYLE: Yes, Studio City is whole and in the  
11 iteration you saw in Stockton, Sherman Oaks was split, I  
12 fixed that.

13 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's Mulholland,  
14 correct?

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes. Excellent. Good. Okay,  
16 so we still want to do -

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Then we can  
18 move into Downtown.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And the whole issue, we  
20 heard a lot of testimony about Northridge, too, that was  
21 fixed as well, too?

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We're not in the Valley yet,  
23 let's try to go to Downtown. Okay.

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Thirty minutes.

25 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, I'm wondering if we've

1 addressed most of the issues.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Can you walk us  
3 through it?

4 MS. BOYLE: Sure.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Maybe take off the shading?  
6 There we go.

7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Where is Pico Union  
8 divided right now? I can't see it from here.

9 MS. BOYLE: So Pico Union is right here.

10 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's kept whole in  
11 accordance with the Legal Counsel map?

12 MS. BOYLE: Let me see.

13 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: It looks like it is. That  
14 green line is the neighborhood council.

15 MS. BOYLE: We're splitting whichever  
16 neighborhood council this is, there are two neighborhood  
17 councils with the name Pico Union, though.

18 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: What's that north-south  
19 street? I can't make out that street. Is that Hoover or  
20 Vermont? I can't make that street out. Which street?

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Hoover.

22 MS. BOYLE: Hoover Street. So the boundary is on  
23 Hoover Street.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I just can't even see the  
25 Downtown district.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Where the boundaries are.

2 COMMISSIONER RAYA: There's a couple seats down  
3 here if you guys want to move down here.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, it's more a shading  
5 issue.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: You might look at the screen in  
7 the back.

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, if you look at the  
9 screen in the back because of the better quality  
10 projector and screen, it actually shows up a lot better  
11 as compared to this screen in front of us.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So can we look at the  
13 contours of the district again? Okay, so this is the  
14 downtown?

15 MS. BOYLE: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Well, it  
17 doesn't include downtown, even though -

18 MS. BOYLE: Yes, it's the district I've named  
19 "DOWNTOWN," but technically it does not contain downtown  
20 any longer. I have several districts that are missing  
21 its name now.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So we had a lot -- I mean,  
23 I'm a little concerned because we had a lot of testimony  
24 about Downtown, Pico Union, West Lake, being together --  
25 and Korea Town -- as one cohesive unit, a lot of

1 testimony saying that Korea Town, which as has been  
2 pointed out is heavily Latin American immigrant, as is  
3 West Lake with the Salvadorian community, as is Pico, as  
4 is Downtown. So, I'm a little concerned about this  
5 configuration. We received a lot a lot of testimony,  
6 written and oral, to the contrary.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So can I say just  
8 a couple of things about the considerations that have  
9 gone into some of these districts, is that, again,  
10 amongst all of our ranked criteria, there was also a  
11 general feeling of concern around over concentration of  
12 different populations within these core districts and  
13 because of how high the concentrations actually were, and  
14 specific groupings like, I'll point to Korea Town as one  
15 example, K Town is an immense amount of people, so there  
16 are certain things that we could not actually move  
17 around.

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Could you put the  
19 concentrations back again?

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, that would  
21 help to have a little more context.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, actually, I do think --

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, again, it kind  
24 of goes back to this area, I don't know if you could zoom  
25 out a little bit so we're looking at it a little more

1 regionally? So this allows you to see where, you know,  
2 if you remember back to what our previous districts  
3 looked like where we had really heavy over-concentrations  
4 in different districts, I mean, I think we were up in the  
5 70 percents for some of the different minority  
6 populations, and so this is our attempt to deal with some  
7 of those issues.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I guess, I think that's  
9 right and I really think that's important, I guess what I  
10 would want us to talk about is, given that attempt to not  
11 over-concentrate, which of those different communities of  
12 interest should we keep together? In other words, I  
13 don't think we should split Pico Union, so then it's a  
14 question of which one does it go in. You know, it's  
15 maybe a question of just thinking about those areas we  
16 heard so much about, and figuring out which ones should  
17 stay where, and how not to split them, even if they're  
18 not altogether.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I mean,  
20 there's so many details I could say about each of the  
21 districts, but a few other things that might be useful to  
22 know is that we took great strides to keep Korea Town  
23 together, to keep Chinatown, Filipino Town, Thai Town, to  
24 keep all of these intact, and that, where possible, we  
25 tried to put sub-groupings of them together, so you'll

1 notice Filipino Town is actually with Chinatown, so as we  
2 moved things around, you know, Boyle Heights is whole,  
3 it's with East L.A. again, now, so there's some areas  
4 where it worked out really well and there are some where  
5 there is clearly some fine tuning. So, giving some  
6 direction on some of this fine tuning, the Pico split  
7 was, I remember we came up against it as a last resort,  
8 maybe you could talk about a couple of the other  
9 alternatives. We were faced basically you split X or you  
10 split Y.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Right, because I think we're at  
12 the top end of the Korea Town, at the top of that  
13 district. Is that correct?

14 MS. BOYLE: We're right at the border. This  
15 northwestern border is Korea Town and it is in other  
16 Visualizations that we've received from groups, and what  
17 some groups have done is they've drawn it more straight  
18 this way, but a lot of those iterations split East L.A.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Another  
20 question that I had because, again, this is at the  
21 Congressional level, so if we respect, and there might  
22 likely be different configurations for Assembly, so I can  
23 probably see us maybe going even a different direction.  
24 One question I had was I was wondering if we were going  
25 to be getting into this district at all based on the

1 decisions we made about South L.A. If I recall, we're  
2 cutting a little bit of Torrance and we're moving north,  
3 so when we're moving north, do you think that any of the  
4 directives we gave you in South L.A. is going to be  
5 cutting into this district, I think, based on what  
6 Commissioner Parvenu had said about Exposition Park,  
7 possibly, and Vermont Square, and those areas there.  
8 Because we did move this way to decrease the  
9 concentration of some minority groups in this area. If  
10 so, if we look at it in a bigger picture that this is the  
11 Congressional District, and we could still respect Korea  
12 Town with Downtown probably at the Assembly level, there  
13 might be a little balance there.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, no, my concern is -

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Pico Union and Downtown.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- Pico Union. We have  
17 such strong testimony from that area, both about itself  
18 being a historic sort of core district, as well as who it  
19 would want to be grouped with, and so here it is grouped  
20 in two different places, that's my only concern. But --

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Where would you pull from?

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I'm just trying to  
23 think, I mean, for a Congressional District, I don't know  
24 how to draw the line. I do know that part of what people  
25 said was, in this area, in general, whether it's for AD

1 or Congressional, is the similarity and importance of  
2 having an immigrant voice, and it's not one nationality,  
3 so that was a big part of what we were told is there's a  
4 similarity of these newcomers with similar issues, that  
5 have really come together almost as an entity, as an  
6 immigrant community with issues that they work on  
7 together, etc. etc., and they are -- so it's not just  
8 Pico, those are sort of split, but maybe - I don't know  
9 what we're going to do in the Assembly District, I would  
10 hope that in one of our iterations we would respect that  
11 testimony about that whole Westlake, Pico, Downtown  
12 immigrant community being all one because I do think they  
13 have a political voice that is important to them, to have  
14 united.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think if you look at the  
16 whole kind of Downtown area, though, you achieve that  
17 with the districts.

18 MS. HENDERSON: Chair? We can give a little bit  
19 of just kind of off the cuff feedback if that would be  
20 helpful?

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yes, that would be.

22 MS. BOYLE: Part of the problem with Pico Union  
23 is it is attached to Korea Town, so if I wanted to like  
24 reunite the Pico Unions together, I would need to pull  
25 all of Korea Town not to break Korea Town, and so it's

1 160,000 people, so I've been trying to move them around  
2 in a chunk. And it's been a little challenging.

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Because I know that is  
4 Hoover, the majority of Pico Union is east of Hoover, so  
5 that line captures the majority of that area, and you  
6 have a strong immigrant community and a garment district  
7 downtown, they use the Dash Bus, and there's a lot of  
8 transit dependent activity in that area, it's highly  
9 concentrated.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: It's not horrible, I think.

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So you know this area real  
12 well, Cynthia, so is that the divider? No, no, you say  
13 that you -

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I'm relying on Commissioner  
15 Parvenu's that that's a good split.

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: The actual intersection of  
17 Pico and Union is east of where that line is, it's called  
18 Pico Union because that's the core --

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: The reason I asked that question  
20 is I think we're going to be having to pick from a lesser  
21 of many evils in many cases, so the question is, you  
22 know, is it particularly egregious or is this a  
23 reasonable way to deal with the fact that we have  
24 conflicting COI?

25 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Does that include

1 MacArthur Park, which is down by, I think, El Dorado and  
2 Sixth?

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Can we go up to Wilshire  
4 and that area right up there to where the park is?  
5 Westlake?

6 MS. HENDERSON: So that is Wilshire that the hand  
7 is on right now.

8 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Go to the east a little  
9 bit, move it.

10 [COMMISSIONER WARD ARRIVES]

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm going back to  
12 Commissioner Filkins Webber's question about the changes  
13 that we're making below that and trying to figure out how  
14 those are going to have an impact, and whether there is a  
15 way to pull out whatever little piece of Pico Union we've  
16 cut off, but I'm not entirely clear on what the numbers  
17 are making those changes in the areas that Commissioner  
18 Parvenu suggested, when you're farther down pulling out  
19 Baldwin Hills and all of that, Leimert Park, are there  
20 any adjustments that can be made in that southwest area  
21 that would allow you to -

22 MS. BOYLE: The only adjustment I was looking at  
23 possibly doing was looking at how I could possibly move  
24 this area, this line east to take back Exposition Park  
25 and West Vernon per Commissioner Parvenu's suggestion.

1 That starts to create kind of a neck on this district,  
2 though. But, no, not really. I can adjust these, but  
3 this movement over here wouldn't affect - isn't going to  
4 help really relate -- I was mostly planning on shifting  
5 north through here if this wasn't feasible.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So did we ever answer the  
7 question about MacArthur Park? That's in the Downtown?  
8 And Westlake is all in there, too?

9 MS. BOYLE: Yes. And by "Downtown," I think you  
10 mean the East L.A. Boyle Heights District?

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Speaking of Downtown,  
13 there was one community just north of Chinatown where we  
14 missed a little pocket called Solano Valley, so if we can  
15 go zoom into that area?

16 MS. BOYLE: Exactly where?

17 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: It's where Chinatown is.

18 MS. BOYLE: Chinatown is here. So in this  
19 iteration, we've moved the border several several blocks  
20 away from the Chinatown border, so Chinatown is here now  
21 and our boundary runs over here.

22 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, that captures  
23 Solano. Solano Valley is like a little pocket.

24 MS. BOYLE: I haven't seen that on my map, but  
25 I'll look into where the location of Solano Valley is.

1           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I want to isolate that  
2 pocket, that's more -

3           MS. BOYLE: Where should Solano Valley go?

4           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Well, it's downtown, it's  
5 just a small population.

6           MS. BOYLE: And "towards downtown," you mean it  
7 should be in the East L.A. Boyle Heights, or it should be  
8 with the Downtown Area, whichever district --

9           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: It's probably  
10 in there, Commissioner Parvenu, if it's up near  
11 Chinatown.

12           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That looks like it  
13 captures it. It's different from what I've seen before,  
14 okay.

15           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Anything  
16 further on Downtown?

17           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Any other suggestions? Is  
18 there another direction we can pull from?

19           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Where does the line go  
20 before we -- I think we split the entertainment complex  
21 where the Kodak Theatre and the Convention Center, L.A.  
22 Live District is down by the freeway. Okay, this is  
23 different from what I've seen.

24           CHAIRPERSON DAI: This is new and improved.

25           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, it is.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The border goes  
2 along the 10 Freeway and that is all north of the 10<sup>th</sup>,  
3 into the Downtown, which is really our East L.A. Boyle  
4 Heights. You would agree?

5           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I would agree.

6           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, I agree  
7 too. Anything further on this?

8           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Can we live with it? Okay.

9           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Because then,  
10 technically we have two other areas, Region 4, we have  
11 the San Gabriel to the north, and then San Fernando  
12 Valley, so we could probably go into San Gabriel. And  
13 that was Commissioner Raya and Commissioner Galambos  
14 Malloy. And then we might have some of that overlap with  
15 that Long Beach border down there. So what do we have  
16 here?

17          MS. BOYLE: So after we had worked on the core,  
18 we looked at the effect on the adjacent districts to  
19 determine if they were still viable and this is our San  
20 Gabriel Foothill Mountains, the direction as to draw them  
21 more north-south instead of one long east-west. And we  
22 were able to achieve some population balance, however,  
23 the one feasibility issue that has already been brought  
24 up today was with this remainder, and that's been left  
25 here of what was Claremont, Claremont, Upland, San

1 Antonio Heights, and part of Rancho Cucamonga used to be  
2 in this Visualization, so now it's being incorporated  
3 into a San Bernardino County District. This here is a  
4 potential VRA District. And in this iteration, we split  
5 Glendale, but we have the split portion with its  
6 unincorporated areas of La Canada Flintridge, and La  
7 Cresenta Montrose. So I have two other Visualizations for  
8 this area where I attempted not to split Glendale.

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Could you move this left just  
10 a little bit, please, so we can see the whole San Gabriel  
11 Valley as GVP?

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, because I  
13 had a question about if you pull back to the Los Angeles  
14 County line to the east, and what that Visualization that  
15 you have where you said Claremont to Rancho Cucamonga, is  
16 that based on something that we discussed this morning?  
17 In other words, is that Visualization 1 or Visualization  
18 2 with the Pomona District?

19 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, this was the beginning of  
20 Option 1. It wasn't finished on my map, Alex kind of  
21 took it over and I didn't have it incorporated, our two  
22 areas, yet.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: But it's kind  
24 of my recollection from this morning that - is the border  
25 the same between Claremont in both Visualization 2 and

1 Visualization 1 on the Section 2 for San Bernardino or  
2 Pomona. I don't think it is, or is it?

3 MS. BOYLE: It's my understanding right now that  
4 we do have the same border.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay,  
6 wonderful, so that can work west from there and still be  
7 okay, no ripple effects on either Option we go with the  
8 San Bernardino Section 2?

9 MS. BOYLE: I'm not sure yet what her ripples  
10 will be, I haven't talked to Holly, but I don't think she  
11 has completed meted out that Visualization, Ana?

12 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, the only thing that - the  
13 only kind of asterisks I would put on that is, since  
14 we've been directed to try to look at the possibility of  
15 drawing two Section 2s in that area, the two iterations  
16 that you've seen dealing with this area have the Rancho  
17 Cucamonga and Upland kind of there, and I don't believe  
18 that we'll be able to draw two Section 2 Districts  
19 including those areas. So, that would be another thing  
20 to look at if the Commission chooses to use that option.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: For a little bit  
22 of context, the reason that we have arrived, you're going  
23 to see different Visualizations for this area because of  
24 the feedback that we've gotten from the public, I think  
25 there are different directions that we could go with the

1 Foothills area. We did get the feedback that the  
2 Foothill areas, as I've referenced before, need to be  
3 broken up in more of a north-south configuration. How  
4 exactly we do that, there are some options there. Of  
5 course, you've known from the beginning that particularly  
6 at the Congressional level, we've had a lot of COI  
7 testimony regarding keeping Glendale, Burbank, and  
8 Pasadena whole and together because of this connection  
9 with the Airport. At the same time, we have gotten  
10 significant COI from particularly the smaller cities  
11 along this corridor, many of whom align themselves with  
12 the larger cities, and it was most notable, I think, in  
13 the case of Pasadena, where all these cities that you see  
14 that come in this SGVP District, the small cities are  
15 saying "Pasadena is our hub. This is really where we go  
16 to shop, it's where we go to school," you know, kind of  
17 everything in our part of the region centers around  
18 Pasadena. And so I think there are some tradeoffs,  
19 really competing COI of do we side with the big cities  
20 and keep them all grouped together, and then have  
21 somewhat of a choppy configuration for the smaller  
22 cities? Or do we have essentially Pasadena as a hub for  
23 many of its related cities and then have some combination  
24 of Burbank and Glendale and their surrounding city? So  
25 that's some of the direction that we gave.

1           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So to summarize, if you  
2 keep Pasadena as the hub, because we did hear that a lot,  
3 then that creates which -- what is the outcome of that  
4 again? Just clarify that for me?

5           COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: SGVP.

6           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, but what happens,  
7 then?

8           COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well, I mean,  
9 we're looking at it right now, so they you have Burbank  
10 and Glendale over to the west --

11          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So you're not keeping it  
12 with Pasadena, basically?

13          COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, I mean, the  
14 population numbers are so large -

15          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's what I'm saying. So  
16 it's basically -

17          COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Either/or.

18          CHAIRPERSON DAI: It splits Glendale.

19          COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, either/or.

20          COMMISSIONER RAYA: Excuse me, could you confirm  
21 for me, Nicole, if Monterey Park is still in this  
22 district? It looks like it is.

23          MS. BOYLE: I believe it is, but we can verify.

24          COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay.

25          COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do you mind

1 showing us the other option, the other Visualization just  
2 for broad strokes?

3 MS. BOYLE: Yes, of course. So I looked at two  
4 other options. This is Option 1, Option 1 has some  
5 feasibility issues.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, Nicole, you  
7 said it has some feasibility issues?

8 MS. BOYLE: Yes, I'll show you, it's illustrated.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The one you're going to  
10 show us now, not the one you just did?

11 MS. BOYLE: Correct, the one that I just did  
12 seems to work the best. Option 1 is a potential, I need  
13 direction on it, though. So, here, we keep Pasadena  
14 Glendale Burbank as the hub and we include these areas  
15 here, we maintain this district here however we have a  
16 237,000 hole which could potentially be solved by jumping  
17 over, and picking up communities, but to me, there is no  
18 obvious place to pick up population except to move east  
19 and to pick up Pasadena and Altadena again. So that was  
20 Option 1. So, Option 2 -

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And that was the response to  
22 public testimony about the Airport being a Federal issue  
23 and if they're going to be together, it should be a  
24 Congressional.

25 COMMISSIOENR DI GIULIO: I appreciate you giving

1 us these choices, it's kind of easy to see the options  
2 behind us.

3 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, it's very helpful.  
4 The one we were looking at, I think, is -- I like it a  
5 lot. Besides the hub notion that we heard a lot about,  
6 it also means that in the adjoining district we've kept  
7 together - we had a lot of testimony about Glendale,  
8 Burbank, the entertainment, you know, all of that was --  
9 entertainment industry sector there because it actually  
10 goes over -- is this the one that has --

11 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, I just changed to a different  
12 option. I'm sorry.

13 COMMISSIOENR BLANCO: That's okay. But, anyway,  
14 that one we were looking at where Pasadena is the hub for  
15 the smaller communities, when you look at the adjoining  
16 one, it really did pick up a lot of other testimony about  
17 what needed to belong together.

18 MS. BOYLE: Are you talking about the first  
19 iteration where Glendale is split?

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: This is the second iteration  
22 where Glendale is whole.

23 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, in this one, Glendale is whole  
24 and in this one Pasadena is the hub, again, however, we  
25 have this 20,000 person hole which I think we may be able

1 to find 20,000 people, but we need to figure out where  
2 exactly we would want to pull them from. We could jump  
3 over and get Laverne or we could possibly pull out parts  
4 of Glendora Azusa. I don't think we would want to go any  
5 further south into here. So if we could potentially use  
6 this and this solves the boundary problem, here we pick  
7 up all the way back again to the L.A. border, so we could  
8 keep L.A. and L.A. and San Bernardino and San Bernardino,  
9 but we did jump over to get Claremont. And we still need  
10 20,000 people from somewhere.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And what was  
12 the basis for this iteration?

13 MS. BOYLE: The basis for this was to try to keep  
14 Glendale and Burbank whole, in a district together with  
15 their unincorporated areas, and to keep Pasadena Altadena  
16 together with the smaller communities that formed the hub  
17 around Pasadena.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And how did this differ  
19 from the very first one you showed us?

20 MS. BOYLE: Glendale is split.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Was there any changes on  
22 --

23 MS. BOYLE: So the difference in the first option  
24 is it stops here. And Covina extends parts northward and  
25 Claremont goes with San Bernardino, and Glendale is

1 split, but the split portion does remain with its  
2 unincorporated communities of La Crescenta Montrose and La  
3 Canada Flintridge, which is how I justified splitting  
4 there.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: This is basically better for  
6 Glendale, this option.

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Leaving aside, because I  
8 haven't figured out what we're going to do on it --

9 MS. BOYLE: This also would solve my remainder  
10 problem, potentially, on the Orange County border. I had  
11 this population before.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, Commissioner Raya, then  
13 Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, leaving aside that  
15 eastern issue that we have in the other iteration, the  
16 whole -- it was Glendale, Pasadena, Burbank, that was  
17 really the question regarding certain issues, so it  
18 doesn't look like we have an opportunity to have all  
19 three together in any configuration.

20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER RAYA: So taking that into  
22 consideration, I think the other iteration better  
23 reflects our effort to draw down from the Foothills into  
24 the surrounding communities, and does less damage going  
25 east until, of course, we get to that area where maybe

1 Commissioner Yao is going to address. And I think that  
2 some of the issues around the relationships that all the  
3 cities have -- in what is my area -- really are probably  
4 addressed a lot more on the State level and, you know,  
5 having them together in the Congressional is maybe not as  
6 critical. I mean, the particular configuration of all  
7 the little cities is more important, I think, on a more  
8 local level.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Yao.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: One of the issues, I think we  
11 heard a lot of testimony very early on in our process is  
12 the goods movement issue, the goods coming up from the  
13 Los Angeles Port, the Long Beach Port coming out, 710  
14 Freeway, and it gets distributed to the 210 Freeway, 10  
15 Freeway, and the 60 Freeway, going east toward the rest  
16 of the country, and most all of the cities in the San  
17 Gabriel Valley are attempting to basically work together  
18 to try Federal funding and so on and so forth. Having  
19 this north-south configuration, basically we kind of  
20 broke that working relationship apart from a  
21 Congressional level. We just need to understand it.  
22 There was some rationale in the Foothills District  
23 because that, again, allowed all those cities to work  
24 together on the newest freeway, as well as somewhat the  
25 light rail transits, and by having deeper north-south

1 district, we basically force them to work together a  
2 little harder at the Congressional level because of the  
3 number of Representatives involved.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Di Guilio and then  
5 Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Two points. I guess I  
7 hope that, I think there, again, tradeoffs with  
8 everything and I think our first initial reaction was to  
9 try and have a Foothills District and I guess we kind of  
10 saw what happened there, and even though I think it would  
11 be easier for them in terms of what Commissioner Yao was  
12 saying, working together, I think the tradeoffs weren't  
13 quite worth it. I just feel like the only other question  
14 I had prior to that was, I'm just curious maybe for  
15 Commissioner Raya, whatnot, in that part of the south  
16 below Burbank, Glendale, in probably the original  
17 iteration, I guess, is the one we're kind of more leaning  
18 towards, there was a lot of testimony about - wasn't  
19 there a lot about kind of the entertainment industry over  
20 there and I'm not sure if that's where Griffith Park is,  
21 I'm just trying to put my bearings here, if that kept  
22 those COIs, well, with the first --

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: The other iteration does have  
24 the split.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, we had a lot in Los

1 Feliz, all that area.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Studio City, Los Feliz.

3 COMMISSIONER RAYA: The other one, I think,  
4 acknowledges that more.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The original one is  
6 more, okay, I just was checking on both ends of this,  
7 thank you.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: We can make up  
9 some time if there is anything further.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So can we see the one -

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Ward had a  
12 comment.

13 COMMISSIONER WARD: I'm just curious to see, do  
14 we have a city/county split count between our  
15 Neighborhood split count between the two visualizations?

16 MS. BOYLE: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

17 COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just wondering if we  
18 had a split count between the two to compare the two as  
19 far as the Neighborhood boundaries, city boundaries.

20 MS. BOYLE: I don't have a neighborhood split  
21 count, but in this particular Visualization, none of the  
22 cities are split, at least the Foothill cities in these  
23 two districts. Actually, let me rephrase that, the tail  
24 of Duarte is split off here. That is something that  
25 could potentially be fixed.

1 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Galambos Malloy,  
2 sorry, I skipped over you.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm fine, I mean,  
4 I think our work stands for itself, there are competing  
5 COIs, I think it is fair to say that when we released the  
6 Draft Maps with our Foothills District that there was a  
7 public outcry about the district, and the outcry was to  
8 the tune of "Keep our cities whole, yes, connect us to  
9 the Foothills, but not at the expense of our city's  
10 integrity." And that's what we have really tried to  
11 respond to in this iteration, so if there is any fine  
12 tuning around the edges, I think we would be happy to  
13 entertain that, but really feel like this is solid.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: When you say  
16 "this," you mean the first one.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can we just look at it?

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And in the first one, is it  
20 population balanced?

21 MS. BOYLE: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The piece I would  
23 be interested in hearing a little bit more, Commissioner  
24 Yao, you've seen the impact of the various iterations as  
25 we get over to the L.A. San Bernardino border. Would you

1 have anything you would want to comment?

2           COMMISSIONER YAO: Again, in the San Gabriel  
3 Valley, the funding source for transportation is all  
4 within the county. And by lumping the Los Angeles County  
5 with the San Bernardino County, that's a brand new  
6 experience for whatever city that moves back and forth,  
7 and that really is probably the most disturbing part of  
8 the new split. But based on the Visualization we just  
9 passed, if you combine the remaining cities in the Los  
10 Angeles County, even if you have to basically use the  
11 hillside to connect them, then pretty much you keep the  
12 Los Angeles County small cities intact and that would  
13 address, from a Congressional standpoint, address the  
14 transportation/money -- transportation issues.

15           CHAIRPERSON DAI: And they'll have multiple Reps.  
16 So we're reasonably happy with this?

17           COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm interested in  
18 what Commissioner Yao was saying about, you know, the  
19 possibilities of linking Claremont over to the west. My  
20 initial thinking was, when we had looked at the  
21 configuration that did that, there's a fairly big  
22 geographic distance and just difference in the types of  
23 cities they are when you hop over from Claremont to some  
24 of those Central cities, so it was not my first  
25 inclination to do so, but given --

1           COMMISSIONER YAO: Basically, you're really only  
2 talking about one city and not multiple cities, and given  
3 the choice of whether they be grouped into San Bernardino  
4 County or stay with the Los Angeles County, I can vouch  
5 that the majority of them would support staying in Los  
6 Angeles County.

7           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Do you have a  
8 recommendation for Q2 to look at a Visualization with  
9 putting Claremont in, where would you take out 34,000  
10 people?

11           COMMISSIONER YAO: I thought that was a  
12 population shortage?

13           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, it's 2,500  
14 over right now in the Covina District because you'd be  
15 moving to the west.

16           MS. BOYLE: There was Option 2 where I jumped  
17 over and picked up Claremont and it needed 20,000 people,  
18 which we could potentially find, but it would likely  
19 require a split somewhere of one of these communities.

20           CHAIRPERSON DAI: Isn't it true you're going to  
21 have to split some anyway since it's not a one-person  
22 population balance, right?

23           MS. BOYLE: Yes.

24           COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I know we're trying  
25 to do some COI, but there's, I mean, honor some COI, but

1 there's no way to kind of put Claremont into the blue and  
2 move Azusa over?

3 MS. BOYLE: That would probably depend on what  
4 Gibson, Dunn has to say about the districts, yeah, it's  
5 at 49.68 now. If it's okay to bring it down further, I  
6 could find room for it in the district.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, if it brings it  
8 down, I didn't know what the population was, Azusa vs.  
9 Claremont, in terms of --

10 COMMISSIOENR BLANCO: I'm uncomfortable with the  
11 jumping over to grab Claremont, I have to say that.  
12 We've had things a lot closer than that that we've not  
13 wanted to look at and that really feels, it doesn't feel  
14 right.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: How far down  
16 north is the Covina District, or south does the Covina  
17 District go?

18 MS. HENDERSON: Its southern boundary is at  
19 Industry and Avocado Heights, and El Monte.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Can you  
21 separate those two? It seems like the blue runs all the  
22 way down.

23 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, I've got two blue districts  
24 right now, I apologize.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And correct me if I'm

1 wrong, too, but if you jumped over, then we're splitting  
2 the part, whatever the mountain range is up there, right?  
3 So there's different communities that have some different  
4 say in that, and if you jump over, you take the blue  
5 mountain range away from them, so they don't have any say  
6 in the mountains anymore?

7 MS. BOYLE: I believe that is how it would work,  
8 yes.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, okay, so that  
10 whole green section plus a little of Claremont would have  
11 the predominant amount of influence over those mountains,  
12 you're taking away part of that idea of having different  
13 chunks connected, yeah, the San Gabriel Mountains.

14 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: In looking at the  
15 population numbers, how is the population of Azusa  
16 distributed? Like, is there a way that you could, I  
17 don't know, trim some of Azusa off the top to create  
18 space for Claremont to actually stay within L.A. County?

19 MS. BOYLE: That is possible. In the previous  
20 Visualizations, that kind of cut it off at the Freeway,  
21 we did get some blowback for that, but that is an option.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Would other  
23 Commissioners be open to seeing an option that did that?

24 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I would like to see an option  
25 where we keep Claremont in and, yeah, taking something

1 off the top of Azusa, I don't think, would -- I'm not  
2 certain, but it's the question we have to ask Gibson,  
3 Dunn, I guess, but --

4 MS. BOYLE: It would involve moving the districts  
5 kind of east by 30,000 people to Claremont. So it would  
6 kind of close that split, but we'd have to kick something  
7 out on the southwestern border, so that is where the  
8 Hollywood COI is.

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The other  
10 aspect I was looking at is, because of the CVAP that we  
11 have right here, and still being able to respect that,  
12 whether a part of El Monte with South El Monte, I don't  
13 know what ripple effects it has down into the downtown or  
14 the Boyle Heights District because I think that's what is  
15 below. But is that something we might be willing to look  
16 at with El Monte and South El Monte together, if we put  
17 Claremont in, and take some population out on that south  
18 blue district, where would we do it?

19 MS. BOYLE: Are you suggesting moving El Monte?

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, if we put  
21 Claremont into the blue district, we'd have to remove  
22 some population someplace, and I was trying to identify  
23 in this blue district where we would be removing  
24 population, but, yes, still we would probably still --

25 MS. BOYLE: We do have a split here. This Covina

1 or West Covina is split with this Diamond Bar District,  
2 so we could remove more from here and put it with what is  
3 currently in the Orange County District here. We  
4 dismantled that long Diamond Bar District that we had in  
5 our first Draft Map, and this was the remainder of what  
6 was left, so now it's gone with Orange County.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Is Chino Hills part of that?

8 MS. BOYLE: Yes, it is.

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: And it would be better if you  
10 could take something, I think, off the bottom of the  
11 blue. Maybe you'd still need to take a little bit off  
12 the top, as well.

13 MS. BOYLE: My concern about taking from this  
14 area is pulling down our Latino CVAP more until we get an  
15 okay from George Brown, or Gibson, Dunn, that it is okay  
16 to do that.

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I also don't think we want to  
18 split that area.

19 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, I would recommend, if we had  
20 to, to remove from here. And we could get 30,000 people  
21 from here.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Commissioner Di Giulio.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can we basically say  
24 that we have some parameters for Nicole to work within  
25 that we're not going to jump over, we'd like to keep

1 Claremont in its county, be respectful of other VRA  
2 Districts that are there, and then have her come back  
3 with some options? I think she knows the parameters that  
4 we've set and some of the options, and I have a feeling  
5 she might be able to come back with an option or two,  
6 instead of us trying to hypothetically assume where the  
7 switches go, give her the permission to come back with  
8 her expertise.

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And, I'm sorry,  
10 Commissioner Yao, but if we really can't do that for  
11 Claremont, I think we just have to --

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: No, I acknowledge it, I mean,  
13 we're caught between two Section 2 very heavily minority  
14 districts, areas. So it is what it is.

15 CHAIRPERSON DAI: And actually, the way it is now  
16 is much more compatible with the Visualizations in San  
17 Bernardino, so that's the other consideration.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: And, Nicole, do  
19 you need anything else in this area from us?

20 MS. BOYLE: Not at this time.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Anything else  
22 on San Gabriel before we move to Lancaster?

23 MS. BOYLE: I do have one question, should I have  
24 questions about this Visualization, who can I direct them  
25 to? Who is handling this four corners area.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Commissioner  
2 Raya and Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

3 MS. BOYLE: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Although that's going into  
5 Orange County, too.

6 MS. BOYLE: Yes, this district is a four corners  
7 district, it includes --

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, that's  
9 Commissioner Ward and Commissioner Forbes.

10 MS. BOYLE: Okay, thank you.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, so the  
12 next area for Region 4 is San Fernando Valley, and then  
13 we would be moving up into San Clarita and Lancaster, so  
14 we can start in the Valley area and work our way north,  
15 and this is Commissioner Barabba and Commissioner  
16 Parvenu.

17 MS. BOYLE: So this is similar to the  
18 Visualization you saw in Stockton, except that the  
19 population deviation has been fixed, it's pulled up here.  
20 It has a deviation now of 7, it's 50.73, and we've pulled  
21 out of Reseda and we've pulled out of Lake Balboa,  
22 they're both whole now with the west. San Fernando Valley  
23 District, which was very consistent with the second round  
24 of testimony that we received, requested that we do that,  
25 and the Visualization you saw in Stockton, this was

1 17,000 under-populated, and Sherman Oaks was split and  
2 pulling Sherman Oaks in actually fixed our population  
3 deviation. There will be some changes to this district  
4 based on the direction given to Jamie, but this eastern  
5 portion will remain the same, the changes will be through  
6 this area here, Calabasas.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: You mean -- is  
8 Calabasas out? Or in?

9 MS. BOYLE: It's in this iteration, but because  
10 of what's happened here, I may need to do some changing  
11 through here.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So was  
13 Calabasas going to go with Agora Hills and Westlake  
14 District? Or was it going someplace else?

15 MS. BOYLE: I think that the current direction is  
16 to have Calabasas with Agora. Westlake goes with East  
17 Ventura.

18 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Unless Commissioner  
19 Barabba has any comments, I'm comfortable with this.  
20 This looks like it coincides with the VICA maps we  
21 received.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Where is  
23 Newhall?

24 MS. BOYLE: I believe Newhall is the southern  
25 part of Santa Clarita Valley.

1           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So we did have  
2 - so it's in this district and it's separate from Santa  
3 Clarita?

4           MS. BOYLE: It is.

5           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So I had one  
6 question, do we have a Section 2 with the San Fernando  
7 ET, just right there to the east?

8           MS. BOYLE: Yes, that's my understanding.

9           COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

10          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Because we did  
11 have some testimony in the written public comments about  
12 405 being the border between east valley and west valley,  
13 and then we did have a lot of testimony, at least I think  
14 on the Web, as I recall, about keeping Newhall with Santa  
15 Clarita, so did you explore that, Commissioner Barabba or  
16 --

17          COMMISSIOENR BARABBA: Well, the Newhall with  
18 Santa Clarita, it depends on who you talk to in that area  
19 there, but the reason we went over the 405 was because of  
20 testimony that there were some Hispanic population on the  
21 other side of 405.

22          VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Does that keep  
23 north hills whole? Or do we still have a split of north  
24 hills there?

25          MS. BOYLE: I believe it's whole, but I'll check

1 right now.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yeah, because before we had  
3 split it.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Correct.

5 MS. BOYLE: It's whole.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, we had split it on the 405  
7 before, I think.

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Looks good.

9 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Can you zoom those tables  
10 out a little? I can't see those numbers from here.

11 MS. BOYLE: The District numbers?

12 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

13 MS. BOYLE: You would like them to be larger so  
14 you can see them.

15 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: A little larger, yes.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Do we know what  
17 the difference was between the testimony that was  
18 considering Newhall with Santa Clarita? Was it more an  
19 Assembly level, Senate level, Congressional, all of the  
20 above?

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: I think it was all of the  
22 above, they just said it was part of Santa Clarita.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Do we keep it  
24 together, maybe, in other iterations at the Assembly  
25 level or Senate level, do you recall, Commissioner

1 Barabba?

2 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I don't recall. Newhall  
3 was there first and that's where the high school is, and  
4 then the other places all came in later. So I'm not sure  
5 that everybody in Newhall would feel that they're a part  
6 of the newer community, but there's a lot of difference  
7 of opinion with the community on that one.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Then where does  
9 this go on the south end of this district?

10 MS. BOYLE: Pardon me?

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: What is the  
12 south boundary for this San Fernando Valley district?

13 MS. BOYLE: It's Calabasas and what I believe to  
14 be the Mulholland Ridge.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Any other  
16 recommendations, suggestions, changes?

17 MS. BOYLE: I just want to point out, this will  
18 incorporate Agora Hills, so there is possibly going to be  
19 some changes if I need to, I'm obviously going to want to  
20 put these areas with Calabasas and not with Malibu.

21 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Into this  
22 district? Or do you need to pick up population when  
23 Calabasas is taken out of this district?

24 MS. BOYLE: This district is perfectly balanced  
25 now, but based on the direction that was given to Jamie

1 for East Ventura, I need to incorporate Agora Hills into  
2 my district, I believe.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So you need to  
4 cut out 20,000 people when Agora Hills is added in there?

5 MS. BOYLE: Correct.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Any  
7 recommendations?

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I thought we did Agora  
9 Hills, Calabasas, Topanga, Malibu downward.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's what I thought.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Down with Santa Monica.  
12 So that's actually - you're losing Calabasas into the  
13 Santa Monica, and Agora Hills is being lost by Jamie into  
14 -- and Malibu.

15 MS. BOYLE: I'm sorry, could you repeat that? I  
16 don't know if I followed that.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So the idea is that,  
18 kind of along the Ventura L.A. county line, from west  
19 Lake village, Malibu, Agora Hills, Calabasas, Topanga was  
20 supposed to go into Santa Monica.

21 MS. BOYLE: Oh, right, everything except  
22 Westlake.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, except for  
24 Westlake.

25 MS. BOYLE: Oh, so you want Agora with Malibu,

1 not with the West Valley. Oh, okay, I'm sorry, that's  
2 easier for me. So you want me to maintain this boundary  
3 here --

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: No.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: No, Calabasas  
6 and Agora Hills go together.

7 MS. BOYLE: Okay, I see.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: But you will lose  
9 Calabasas for you.

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So we need to  
11 make a recommendation where to pick up the other 23,000.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Since we're taking from  
13 the white Calabasas and the blue going into the green,  
14 I'm going to imagine the population has to push back up  
15 to the back into the white, we have to push from the  
16 green back up into the white, right, because we've over-  
17 populated the Santa Monica District now, or whatever it's  
18 called -

19 MS. BOYLE: I'm sorry, I can't speak to this, I  
20 need to wrap my mind around it before I can give you a  
21 reasonable advice on what's going on here. But I was  
22 promised that their population exchange is within my  
23 district, so it should be doable.

24 COMMISSIONER PARVENUE: One option, too, is  
25 Studio City being connected.

1           COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: That's what I'm  
2 thinking, that area right there, there's some switches  
3 that could happen there because I think the rest is  
4 Mulholland Drive, right?

5           MS. BOYLE: Yeah, this is the guy that would  
6 move, this is kind of where the population moves through  
7 here.

8           VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: What is the  
9 population of Studio City? Just real quick.

10          MS. BOYLE: Just a moment.

11          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I was going to say, we have  
12 a lot of testimony here about Tarzana, Encino, Studio  
13 City going together. Some of the people who recommended  
14 -- we had a lot of testimony on this, lots, and the  
15 people who wanted this Agora Hills, Calabasas, they were  
16 talking about looking at Studio City, Universal City, you  
17 know, they were sort of looking in that area for the  
18 population exchanges.

19          COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Uh huh, which I think  
20 that is what Nicole is highlighting. Again, we could  
21 just give our general direction to work on this a little  
22 bit.

23          COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can I - I can send a couple  
24 of these emails that have that swap if you want.

25          MS. BOYLE: Yes, please.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay, I'll send those.

2 MS. BOYLE: I'm having difficulty finding mine.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: I guess, just  
4 keep in mind that the testimony consistently is not to  
5 split Studio City, so in that swap, hopefully the  
6 population is -

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right, now these are the  
8 ones that are about keep Studio City whole and put it  
9 with blah, blah, blah, and do Agora blah blah blah, it  
10 was like a whole package. [Laughter]

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Great. Do you  
12 need any other direction of this Commission on the Valley  
13 District, maybe, or the one next to it?

14 MS. BOYLE: No, not at this time.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Does anybody  
16 need to see the East San Fernando Valley District or have  
17 that highlighted? Does anybody have any questions?

18 CHAIRPERSON DAI: That one looks pretty clean,  
19 that was a Section 2.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: The 50.73?

21 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Yep.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Any other  
23 questions about the Valley before we move to Santa  
24 Clarita and Lancaster? Do you have any other questions  
25 for us, Nicole?

1 MS. BOYLE: No, I don't, thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, moving north.

3 MS. BOYLE: This large district here is the  
4 Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita District. This portion of  
5 Lancaster and Quartz Hill goes with Kern County. This is  
6 going to change based on direction that was recently  
7 given. I believe we're taking Moore Park out, is that  
8 correct, and part of Simi Valley?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think so, yes.

10 MS. BOYLE: Okay, so that will allow me possibly  
11 to pick back up Newhall, as long as there is no change up  
12 here.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAI: So Jamie hasn't told you  
14 anything about a possible change up there?

15 MS. BOYLE: I'm very open to a possible change up  
16 there, I would like to have that back. We were trying to  
17 pull out of East Ventura County.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We were trying to give  
19 it back to you, that was one of the things we gave her  
20 direction to do, but -- we might be able to pull the line  
21 up a little bit, but I'm not sure what population.

22 MS. BOYLE: She, I believe, was going to have  
23 difficulty rotating that population back down to -- if  
24 she gives that back to me, she would have to get 80,000  
25 people from us someplace else.

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, I think we could  
2 give you --

3 MS. BOYLE: We have [Inaudible]

4 CHAIRPERSON DAI: You already have it?

5 MS. BOYLE: We already have it. So she would  
6 have to go into San Bernardino to get them, or if she has  
7 to come back to the Ventura County border to get them.  
8 Or, if the Commissioners would like to make a population  
9 exchange like through someplace else, like through the  
10 corner here? Not likely.

11 CHAIRPERSON DAI: No, I think the Ventura border  
12 is the obvious one.

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: So where do you  
14 need population if Moore Park comes out? You'll need  
15 additional population, correct?

16 MS. BOYLE: Yeah, and it would have to be within  
17 my region, so hopefully I can put back Newhall.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, I see, I'm  
19 sorry. Any other questions about this area?

20 MS. BOYLE: I believe the Newhall split is about  
21 70,000 people. So we'll be able to pick up back some of  
22 it, I don't know if we'll get all of it.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, one  
24 question I have is Wrightwood [phon.] split in that  
25 Covina District? I didn't notice that before.

1 MS. BOYLE: I'm not sure what that is, we can  
2 look at it, but I didn't know that there was a city there  
3 that bounded the L.A. County.

4 MS. HENDERSON: I think it does.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Otherwise a pretty good  
6 district?

7 MS. BOYLE: It looks like it's solely a San  
8 Bernardino County Census place. I guess the answer is  
9 no, it is not split by that.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay. Are we ready with this?  
11 We actually have a Court Reporter change, I think, so  
12 actually we're going to take a technical break for about  
13 15 minutes, this is also an opportunity to take a bio  
14 break.

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Chair, if we have an  
16 opportunity, I'd like to go back to San Diego County and  
17 just to make sure we're clear on the directions to the  
18 Mappers on the Congressional Maps.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAI: We can do that. Do you want to  
20 do that after the break?

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, sure.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so we'll come back in  
23 about --

24 VICE CHAIRPERSON FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, just as  
25 far as timing goes, we've allotted 45 minutes to Orange

1 County. We wanted to hit our business meeting at 6:00,  
2 so you've got pretty much an hour and we'll probably have  
3 time to pick up San Diego.

4 COMMISSIOENR ONTAI: Yeah, that's fine.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAI: Okay, so we'll come back at  
6 4:10.

7 (Adjourned at 3:55 p.m.)

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24