

BEFORE THE  
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the matter of  
Full Commission Line-Drawing Meeting

VOLUME I

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

Thursday, July 14, 2011

9:00 A.M.

Reported by:  
Kent Odell

APPEARANCES

Commissioners Present

Angelo Ancheta, Chairperson

Lilbert "Gil" Ontai, Vice-Chairperson

Gabino Aguirre

Vincent Barabba

Maria Blanco

Cynthia Dai

Michelle DiGuilio

Stanley Forbes

Connie Galambos Malloy

M. Andre Parvenu

Jeanne Raya

Michael Ward

Jodie Filkins Webber

Peter Yao

Staff Present

Dan Claypool, Executive Director

Kirk Miller, Chief Legal Counsel

Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

Consultants Present

George Brown, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher

Karin MacDonald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Alex Woods, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Nicole Boyle, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Also Present

Public Comment

Sam Spagnolo

Rionne Jones

Alex Vargas

Sandra Jerabek

Manuel Salazar

Robert Huber

Rachael O'Brien

Jim Provenza

Diane Parro

Don Saylor

Steve Macias

Scott Rabb

Matt Williams

Julio Gonzalez

Leonard Lanzi

Linda Lambourne

Scott Stepanik

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

Tim Watkins

Erica Teasley-Linnock

Four Waters

Alice Huffman

Nik Bonovich

Michele Martinez

Richard Seyman

Debra Howard

Hugh Bower

I N D E X

	Page
Introduction	6
Public Comment	9
Voting Rights Act Counsel - Question & Answer Session George Brown, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher	30
Public Comment	58
Technical/Outreach Discussion topics	74
1. Line Drawing Schedule and Public Comments on Visualizations	
2. Final Report Drafting Process	
Legal Discussion Topics	86
1. Status of RFI for Litigation Counsel	
2. Litigation Counsel - Consideration of Multiple Firms	
3. Chief Counsel Report	
Finance and Administration Discussion Topics	93
1. RPV Contract	
2. Q2 Contract	
3. August Schedule	
Public Information Discussion topics	111
1. Update on Website and Media Activities	
Staff Reports	118
Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Southern California Districts)	120
Order of Districts: Congressional, Assembly, Senate	
Public Comment	160

I N D E X

	Page
Lunch	166
Continuing Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Southern California Districts)	
Break	
Continuation of Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing (Southern California Districts)	
Adjournment	
Certificate of Reporter	

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, good morning, this is the Thursday, July 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. My name is Angelo Ancheta, I'm Chairing the set of meetings this week.

To my left, Commissioner Gil Ontai, who is the Vice-Chair and Chair for next week's meetings.

We want to get things started fairly quickly this morning. For those of you who are watching on the internet, we will be starting with some public comment.

Our Voting Rights Act counsel is here to answer some questions after that public comment period.

And then we'll be conducting a short, sort of regular business meeting before we launch into our line-drawing instructions with Q2, our technical consultants.

So, for those of you who are less interested in business, you're welcome to tune in a little bit later in the morning, probably a little bit after 11:00 or 11:30 we're start in the line drawing.

But we certainly welcome everyone to continue watching us during our business meeting as well.

Let's begin, then, by taking roll.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Commissioner Yao?

COMMISSIONER YAO: Here.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ward?  
2 COMMISSIONER WARD: Here.  
3 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Raya?  
4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Here.  
5 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Parvenu?  
6 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Here.  
7 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ontai?  
8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Here.  
9 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Galambos Malloy?  
10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Here.  
11 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Forbes?  
12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here.  
13 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Filkins Webber?  
14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Here.  
15 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: DiGuilio?  
16 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Here.  
17 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Dai?  
18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Here.  
19 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Blanco?  
20 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Here.  
21 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Barabba?  
22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Here.  
23 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ancheta?  
24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Here.  
25 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Aguirre?



1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Here.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: A quorum is  
3 present forward and backward.

4 (Laughter)

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Mostly backward.

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Alphabetical order has  
7 always been the bane of my existence, I'm always glad to  
8 hear it go in the opposite order.

9 We have to start our session with Voting Rights  
10 Act counsel about 9:30, so I will take as many comments as  
11 we can until 9:30. I think we should be able to squeeze  
12 everybody in, but we're going to have to cut it down to  
13 about a minute and a half in order to stay with our  
14 schedule.

15 So, let me call out the first couple of names and  
16 then the speakers who do wish to come up, there's a  
17 microphone here behind me. And those of you who are in  
18 the line can try to move forward and that will try to help  
19 move things along.

20 So, we have I think it's Mr. Spagnolo, Ms. Jones,  
21 Mr. Vargas, and then Ms. Jerabek.

22 And forgive me if I mispronounce those names.

23 MR. SPAGNOLO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

24 And, Commissioners, thank you very much for this  
25 opportunity to speak to you.

1 My name is Sam Spagnolo and I'm the Mayor Pro Tem  
2 for the City of Rancho Cucamonga. We are located in San  
3 Bernardino County and part of the Inland Empire.

4 I am here on behalf of the city council and the  
5 168,000 citizens of our community in order to strongly  
6 urge this Commission to reconsider its proposed Assembly  
7 and Senate district maps and keep the City of Rancho  
8 Cucamonga whole, and entirely under one Assembly and one  
9 Senate district within San Bernardino County.

10 The proposed maps released by this Commission  
11 shows that the Rancho Cucamonga community will be split  
12 into separate Assembly and Senate districts. We are  
13 particularly disturbed to see that the entire northwest  
14 portion of Rancho Cucamonga would be disenfranchised from  
15 effective representation by being lumped into Senate and  
16 Assembly districts that are almost completely in L.A.  
17 County.

18 Some of these L.A. communities are more than 50  
19 miles from the Rancho Cucamonga and none of them have  
20 commonality or shared interests with our community.

21 Clearly, the proposed draft maps do not meet the  
22 Commission's stated criteria to respect counties, cities,  
23 communities of interests and neighborhoods.

24 In fact, the proposed draft maps separate a  
25 substantial and well-established portion of our community

1 and place it into obscurity with more than a half a dozen  
2 far-flung L.A. County communities.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, thank you.

4 MR. SPAGNOLO: Thank you very much for allowing me  
5 to address you.

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Do you have a copy?

7 MR. SPAGNOLO: Yes, I have that here. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And, also, Commissioners,  
9 I'm going to ask you to not ask any questions at this  
10 point just to maintain the queue and the time.

11 MS. JONES: My name is Rionne Jones and I live in  
12 Imperial County. I've been following the redistricting  
13 process very closely and have previously written to you.  
14 I'm going to condense this down.

15 The Senate and Congressional plans have made your  
16 job relatively easy; the challenge is the Assembly plan  
17 for Imperial County. It is not a challenge that was  
18 created by competing factions who may have partisan  
19 motivations; it is the challenge that was created by the  
20 Voting Rights Act.

21 The Commission's earliest Assembly visualizations  
22 put Imperial County with border communities in Southern  
23 San Diego County. This would have kept Coachella Valley  
24 whole.

25 However, these visualizations were rejected by

1 your legal counsel as they would have precluded drawing a  
2 Section 2 Voting Rights Act district in San Diego.

3 It was that legal decision, not partisanship,  
4 which left the Commission with two options for the  
5 Assembly plan. You could link Imperial with Coachella,  
6 where there are some supporting testimony, or link it to  
7 Eastern San Diego County where there was none.

8 I believe you made the right choice last week not  
9 to disenfranchise Imperial County.

10 Those who oppose this decision and urge the  
11 Commission to instead draw a Assembly district continue to  
12 ignore the simple that legally you can't.

13 Therefore, I urge you to keep your latest Assembly  
14 map. Thank you for your time, Rionne Jones, Imperial,  
15 California. And she submitted this via your e-mail.

16 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: All right, thank you.

17 Mr. Vargas?

18 MR. VARGAS: All right, thank you for the  
19 opportunity to address you. My name is Alex Vargas, I'm  
20 the Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Hawthorne, in the South  
21 Bay, and that's what we would like to keep it as.

22 And I'll get straight to the point. First of all,  
23 I have three justifications for Hawthorne remaining in the  
24 South Bay area. A lot of people refer to it as the beach  
25 cities, but the beach cities are part of the South Bay.

1 First of all, the common boundaries that we share, which  
2 is the 105 on the north and the 110 on the east, and a  
3 lot -- all the cities having the common interests within  
4 that -- within those bounds.

5 I have some folders right there that I distributed  
6 to you all.

7 The aerospace industry is something that we share  
8 in common with the South Bay, and we have Manhattan Beach,  
9 Redondo Beach that north -- and Torrance, El Segundo that  
10 have all these aerospace industry, Northrop Grumman,  
11 Raytheon, et cetera.

12 Hawthorne now has SpaceX. We used to have  
13 Northrop Grumman, but now we have SpaceX, which is the new  
14 rocket company and it's really growing and it's blowing --  
15 this company is blowing up, so it's really awesome.

16 And then the many coalitions that we have in the  
17 South Bay that identify us as a South Bay city, the South  
18 Bay Council of Governments that we're part of.

19 We also have the South Bay Environmental Coalition  
20 that we're part of, the South Bay Workforce Investment  
21 Board that we're part of.

22 And even we now have a South Bay Bicycle Coalition  
23 that we're being drawn into.

24 So, for us it really, really makes sense that we  
25 stay within the South Bay district, which includes the

1 beach cities, of course, and so that it will be easier for  
2 our representatives in the Congress, in the State  
3 Assembly, in the State Senate to be able to have those  
4 common interests and be able to, you know, speak for all  
5 the cities that have those common interests.

6 Thank you. You have some things to reference  
7 there.

8 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you. So, we have Ms.  
9 Jerabek, then Salazar, Huber and Gonzalvez.

10 MS. JERABEK: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm  
11 Sandra Jerabek and I live in Del Norte County, which is  
12 the isolated and remote county next to Oregon on your  
13 North Coast, yes. And even though my drive home tomorrow  
14 is going to be eight hours, I am thrilled to have been  
15 able to be here yesterday and watch you do your difficult  
16 work.

17 Thank you so much. And, you know, your integrity  
18 and compassion that I witnessed is really a proud moment  
19 in California history and I'm honored to be here.

20 The north/south alignment of the North Coast  
21 counties across all districts is, in my opinion, and the  
22 opinion of many in Del Norte County just perfect. It's  
23 perfect, don't change it.

24 You also -- I want you to realize that you have  
25 corrected a terrible case of political gerrymandering

1 which ripped us out of the coastal alignment a few years  
2 ago.

3           You mentioned protecting the integrity of the  
4 coastal range and our coastal economies. When you live in  
5 Del Norte County there's only one practical and direct way  
6 to relate to the rest of California and that is the  
7 Highway 101 corridor which runs north to south, that's it.

8           If you want to relate to the inland counties, for  
9 example Siskiyou County, you have to go up into Oregon,  
10 come back down the I-5, that's about a four or five  
11 mile -- hour -- a four or five hour trek, or you have to  
12 go down through Humboldt County and over. So --

13           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I'm sorry, Ms. Jerabek, we  
14 have to keep the line going. Thank you.

15           MS. JERABEK: You know, I planned for two minutes  
16 because I was here yesterday and I --

17           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: You know, one thing just to  
18 note, I'll allow some public comment, I think, before we  
19 break for lunch, so you're welcome to -- yeah, and I know  
20 you're going to be here for the rest of the say, so we'll  
21 let you come back.

22           And I do apologize to all the speakers, we just  
23 have to kind of move this session. But we will have a  
24 short, additional public comment before lunch.

25           DR. SALAZAR: Good morning, Commissioners; my name

1 is Dr. Manuel Salazar.

2 I want to speak to you about the Antelope Valley,  
3 which is the northern part of L.A. County. I'm a former  
4 resident of that valley, I was a school principal there  
5 and also a planning commissioner for the City of  
6 Lancaster.

7 As you're probably aware, Lancaster and Palmdale  
8 are really twin cities. And in the new maps of the  
9 Senate, the State Senate, you split the Antelope Valley in  
10 two.

11 Now, it's very important that you reconsider that  
12 because of the economic -- really, the geographic aspects  
13 of the Antelope Valley, it's the high desert. If you've  
14 ever been there, it's about 2,500 feet up in the air,  
15 surrounded by mountains.

16 Lancaster and Palmdale really rely on one another  
17 economically from a stand point there's great unity  
18 between the cities. And I want to urge you, I sincerely  
19 urge you to keep that as one Senate district for the good  
20 of the people in Antelope Valley.

21 Let me also say this, as a citizen of California  
22 and a native Californian, I commend you for the great job  
23 that you're doing. And I just want to thank you for your  
24 sacrifice. And I know it's not an easy task, what you're  
25 doing is very, very difficult.



1           But as we level the playing field, as you  
2 represent the people of California, I just urge you to do  
3 what's best for the citizens over any special interests.  
4 Thank you for your time.

5           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

6           So, we have Huber, Gonzalves, O'Brien and Saylor.

7           MR. HUBER: Good morning, Commissioners; I'm Mayor  
8 Bob Huber from the City of Simi Valley. I've traveled  
9 here today to present alternative Congressional district  
10 configurations for our region that would better meet the  
11 Commission's objectives for setting boundaries based on  
12 rational criteria that addresses geographic constraints  
13 and continuity of communities.

14           The Commission is currently considering placing  
15 Simi Valley into the Antelope Valley/Santa Clarita  
16 district.

17           This would unnaturally link Simi Valley across a  
18 mountain range to a population more than 30 miles away,  
19 diminishing representation for the 127,000 residents of  
20 Simi Valley.

21           I'm submitting a series of maps illustrating the  
22 separation and our proposal for a more logical  
23 configuration, a proposal that keeps Simi Valley and  
24 integral part of Ventura County and remains true to its  
25 commonly known historic designation as the gateway to

1 Ventura County.

2           The first draft, Antelope Valley/Santa Clarita  
3 Congressional district maps splits the City of Santa  
4 Clarita between two districts, literally down its main  
5 street.

6           The whole of Santa Clarita and a portion of Los  
7 Angeles could be placed in the Antelope Valley/Santa  
8 Clarita district, thus allowing for Simi Valley and  
9 Moorpark to shift into the East Ventura County district.

10           This would cure the geographic and population  
11 separation by placing Simi Valley into the Antelope Valley  
12 map.

13           Recognizing that the Commission is constrained  
14 from making adjustments at the northern end of Ventura  
15 County and considering continuity of urban areas, the 101  
16 corridor from Thousand Oaks to Agoura -- all right, I  
17 presented the rest of this in writing. Thank you for your  
18 time.

19           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you, Mayor Huber.

20           So, we've got Gonsalvez, O'Brien, Saylor, Provenza  
21 and then Parro.

22           Gonsalvez? No. Okay, Ms. O'Brien.

23           MS. O'BRIEN: Hello, honorable Commissioners;  
24 Rachel O'Brien on behalf of the California League of  
25 Conservation Voters, EdFund, and our sister partner, the

1 California League of Conservation Voters.

2 First of all, I'd like to state that we did  
3 support the recent change, which creates a single northern  
4 Congressional coastal district and will be submitting a  
5 letter in the near future on that point.

6 We are, however, very concerned about the current  
7 visualization of the State Assembly South Santa Monica Bay  
8 districts.

9 We believe that moving the Los Angeles Airport  
10 into the Inglewood district connects it to a community  
11 that's already suffering from some of the worst  
12 environmental impacts.

13 We would like you to remember there are other  
14 environmental communities of interests in the Del Reys,  
15 such as the Playa Del Rey and the Marina Del Rey, that  
16 should not be submerged by losing their communities of  
17 interests in protecting coastal recreation, water quality  
18 and the ecosystems, of protecting the health and quality  
19 of coastal waterways.

20 Chopping up this homogenous Coastal district  
21 splinters the community of interest. The bottom line is  
22 that the coastal communities should stay coastal and we do  
23 ask for your reconsideration of the latest Assembly maps.  
24 Thank you again for your continued efforts. We are, as  
25 always, supportive of what you guys have been trying to

1 accomplish and thank you for your time.

2 Also, there are letters that have been passed out  
3 that are from folks that are living in those communities,  
4 and you will see them as they get passed around.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Let me ask a question -- I'm  
6 sorry. No, you're -- I'm done. Thank you. Just for  
7 the -- I'm trying to see how we can swing the public  
8 comment in. Because of Mr. Brown's schedule we do need to  
9 go from 9:30 until about 10:10. Is there anyone here who  
10 can't stay until that 10:10, if we need to continue a  
11 little bit later? Yeah, it's only about 40 minutes, if  
12 you can -- we'll get everybody in, in other words, if we  
13 can -- just to make sure if somebody has to leave, we can  
14 get them up first.

15 Okay, let's just keep going in order and then  
16 we'll stop at 9:30 and then we'll pick up again after Mr.  
17 Brown's discussion.

18 So, we've got Mr. Saylor.

19 MR. SAYLOR: Thank you, members of the Commission.  
20 This is -- this representative democracy that we enjoy in  
21 the United States is 245, 246 years old. The work that  
22 you're doing, now, is a part of a grand experiment and we  
23 all appreciate the significant investment of your time and  
24 your lives into this process.

25 On June, I guess it was June 28, there was a

1 meeting that you held here, in Sacramento, and about 35  
2 residents of Yolo County made presentations. We've  
3 provided you with extensive comment and position papers,  
4 editorials from our newspapers.

5 I was heartened yesterday, in looking at the  
6 visualizations for the Assembly, Senate and Congressional  
7 districts, to recognize that the Commission has understood  
8 and reflected the Yolo County interest for a community of  
9 interest that includes almost all of our county together.

10 So, thank you for including that in your  
11 visualizations. It's a reasonable compromise to reflect  
12 West Sacramento's presence in the urban area of Sacramento  
13 in the way that you have.

14 What we are interested in now is making sure that  
15 you stay the course. You had the right answer yesterday  
16 morning with the visualizations, in our view. We hope  
17 that that remains in the final -- in the final analysis of  
18 your mapping for our county to be one community of  
19 interest.

20 Last night there was discussion right near the  
21 conclusion of your meeting that caused us some concern  
22 that perhaps that was -- that was a variation that might  
23 not happen, and others will talk more about that.

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Good, thank you.

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: In disclosure, I've

1 known Mr. Saylor for many years.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, thank you. So, again,  
3 Mr. Provenza, Ms. Parro, Mr. Macias and I can't quite make  
4 the name out, is it Scott and Rob, I guess?

5 MR. PROVENZA: Good morning, my name is Jim  
6 Provenza, a Yolo County Supervisor.

7 As I indicated last time, our board has directed  
8 us to urge the Commission to continue to keep Yolo County  
9 together. In particular, our two largest cities are a  
10 County Seat of Woodland and the Community of Davis.

11 Thank you for your work on this. And we did  
12 appreciate the visualization that created a district  
13 together with Solano County that kept Davis and Woodland  
14 together.

15 While we would have preferred West Sacramento to  
16 also be in it, felt that it was a fair compromise and  
17 preserved communities of interest, but also preserved the  
18 county, and those are two really important interests.

19 As Don indicated, we did have concerns about the  
20 visualization that would break Davis off, and Woodland  
21 into separate districts, in what really does not appear to  
22 be as close a community of interest and maintaining the  
23 integrity of our city and our county.

24 So, would urge you to focus on the earlier  
25 visualization that you developed after our testimony at

1 the last hearing. Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Again, in full  
4 disclosure, I've known Mr. Provenza also for many years.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Chair?

7 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yes?

8 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Could we remind speakers if  
9 they could please, also, make a reference to if they're  
10 referring to a particular Assembly, Senate or  
11 Congressional so we have a framework?

12 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Thank you.

14 MS. PARRO: Good morning, Commissioners; Diane  
15 Parro, former Executive Director of the Yolo County  
16 Visitor's Bureau, speaking about Yolo County. And thank  
17 you for listening to the 30 or so community members that  
18 talked two weeks ago.

19 I won't reiterate their comments. But there's  
20 something, a perspective that I haven't seen on the  
21 website, or heard, so in representing the multi-billion  
22 dollar tourist industry in California, Yolo County is the  
23 only group that I've met in this industry that markets  
24 itself as a destination as a whole.

25 So, mostly cities, Stockton, Fresno, Vacaville,

1 even Vallejo and Fairfield have their own organizations.  
2 Yolo County came together voluntarily to form a bureau, we  
3 market as a county, we make tours together that bind UC  
4 Davis with the Heidrick Ag Museum in Woodland.

5 We're funded largely by voluntary business  
6 improvement district contributions by the hotels in Davis  
7 and Woodland, together.

8 So, we definitely feel like we are a community of  
9 interest and that we're promoting a lot of economic  
10 development in our region by working together.

11 So, thank you for any efforts to keep us together  
12 in our representation at the State level. Thanks.

13 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you.

14 MR. MACIAS: Good morning, Commissioners; my  
15 name's Steve Macias, from the Latino Policy Forum.

16 As you know, the Latino Policy Forum has turned in  
17 regional Senate maps for Southern California and has  
18 testified at many of your hearings.

19 After watching the testimony presented at today's  
20 hearing, our group completely agrees with what many of the  
21 speakers have said in as far as respecting the strong  
22 cultural traditions and the multi-cultural alliances in  
23 the Los Angeles urban area.

24 As a group we, too, strongly believe that these  
25 alliances must be maintained with seats that preserve



1 African American political representation, especially the  
2 two State Senate seats that honor the traditions of that  
3 region.

4 An east/west oriented Senate district that  
5 stretches from Culver City to Florence Firestone is  
6 essential -- is essential, as is another Senate district  
7 that includes Inglewood, Hawthorn, Compton, Carson  
8 District, and portions of Los Angeles.

9 This plan's feasibility is enhanced by the  
10 prospect of districts that connect East Ventura County to  
11 Santa Clarita, up to Palmdale in one Senate district.

12 As you know, the Latino Policy Forum has stressed  
13 this particular district on several occasions.

14 The plans discussed today will help keep the Santa  
15 Monica Mountains area connected by West L.A., Beverly  
16 Hills, and West Hollywood in a separate district.

17 The comprehensiveness of this regional approach on  
18 a State Senate level will insure that diverse  
19 constituencies receive ample opportunities to advance  
20 their perspectives and their goals.

21 The Latino Policy Forum strongly believes that  
22 maintaining balance is the key to advancing the interests  
23 of all of those in Southern California by simply  
24 connecting East Ventura County up with Santa Clarita and  
25 Palmdale. Thank you for your time.

1           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

2           After this, the next speaker, we have maybe two  
3 more and then we'll have to take a break, and we'll resume  
4 after Mr. Brown's session. So, we have Mr. Williams and  
5 then Gonzalez.

6           MR. Rabb: Good morning, Commissioners. My name  
7 is Scott Rabb and I'm a concerned Californian. And I just  
8 wanted to come here and say after watching yesterday's  
9 testimony that I agree with a lot of the speakers that  
10 were from the Los Angeles area.

11           I agree with the speaker before me in saying that  
12 I think connecting the East Ventura County to Santa  
13 Clarita in one Senate district is the best idea. And  
14 another Senate district that includes the Inglewood,  
15 Hawthorne, Compton and Carson district makes perfect  
16 sense.

17           Drawing the Senate lines this way will preserve  
18 the African American tradition in the area and make sure  
19 that these communities are not disenfranchised. And I --  
20 that is all.

21           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

22           MR. WILLIAMS: Hello, my name is Matt Williams. I  
23 am a resident of Yolo County. And in deference to the  
24 Committee, I will say ditto to what is said earlier.

25           And use my time to say that one of the things that

1 happened last night, as the viral word got out that maybe  
2 you all had changed the visualizations was that I, having  
3 followed this spectacular process, this transparent  
4 process, this really great process, went to the website to  
5 go and see what actually had been said so that I could  
6 come here as an informed citizen.

7           Unfortunately, yesterday's tape wasn't available.  
8 So, if I can give you a suggestion, that I know it's a  
9 technological challenge, but if it's possible to, before  
10 the day ends, the technical folks get what has been the  
11 webcast of that day on the website, so that we can see it.

12           What may happen, if we don't, is we're only as  
13 good as our next mistake and all the good work could go  
14 out because people feel that the process isn't as  
15 transparent as it actually is.

16           Unfortunately, perception is reality and I think  
17 this is something you can solve with a little bit of  
18 technological extra effort.

19           Thank you, thank you, thank you.

20           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you.

21           Mr. Gonzalez: Thank you. Good morning, thank you  
22 for the opportunity to speak today.

23           May name is Julio Gonzalez; I represent California  
24 LULAC for the State of California.

25           I will be speaking for a community leader, named

1 Eric Jimenez, for Rancho Cucamonga.

2 "My name is Eric Jimenez and I am a resident of  
3 Rancho Cucamonga. Listening to your debate, it is clear  
4 that the Rancho Cucamonga will be split in the Assembly  
5 plan and possibly the Senate plan as well. I believe  
6 that's district 62 or 63.

7 While almost every city would prefer to be kept  
8 whole, that is not always possible. However, when you do  
9 split a city, you should be able to do it in a fair way.  
10 I do not believe your current split of Rancho Cucamonga  
11 lives up to this standard and I respectfully ask that you  
12 change it. Specifically, I ask that you use the natural  
13 dividing line of Foothill Boulevard, State Route 66.

14 As you can see, the Foothills Boulevard is not a  
15 small road but, rather, a major thoroughfare. More  
16 importantly, it is not only a physical barrier, but also a  
17 cultural divide. Residents below Foothill Boulevard are  
18 very different from those in other parts of Rancho  
19 Cucamonga. They are more diverse and less affluent than  
20 the rest of the city. They also tend to identify more  
21 closely with Upland and Ontario than the rest of Rancho  
22 Cucamonga.

23 Indeed, the Commission already recognized this is  
24 a dividing line in our city. At your May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting  
25 Commissioner Yao said Northern Rancho Cucamonga is

1 different from Southern Rancho Cucamonga. Commissioner  
2 Filkins Webber added, 'I was going to say that Route 66,  
3 North Foothill Boulevard, and so if we needed to get  
4 additional population would you have any disagreement of  
5 coming a bit further like down, or maybe to the 30 or  
6 Foothill Boulevard?'

7 I do not know why this division is not in your  
8 current plans.

9 The area bordered would do an equal amount of  
10 switching as far as a population of 25,000. Thank you for  
11 your consideration."

12 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

13 So, we'll take one more speaker and then we'll go  
14 into session with Mr. Brown and then we'll resume around  
15 10:10 or 10:15 on public comment.

16 So, do we have -- is it Ms. Poutra? Okay, is it  
17 Mila Poutre out there? It's hard to read.

18 UNIDENTIFIED PUBLIC SPEAKER: Hello, council,  
19 thank you very much. I'm a resident of Simi Valley and I  
20 don't want to speak to you today about the Senate seat for  
21 our area. And I want to thank you for keeping Thousand  
22 Oaks and Simi tied together, I really appreciate that.

23 What I want to challenge you to do is to continue  
24 in that good work and keeping like-minded areas together.

25 As I -- I spoke to you before in Oxnard and I

1 challenged you that I want to be able to vote for somebody  
2 who I know represents me and everybody in my area. Having  
3 me paired with somebody from Malibu, my concerns are not  
4 theirs and theirs are not mine.

5 I think it makes a lot more sense to, from a  
6 Senate district stand point, to have Simi go the other way  
7 with Santa Clarita and have the 118 be a border, it makes  
8 more sense than the 101.

9 If we stay together with Malibu and these other  
10 areas, it will be virtually impossible for us to elect  
11 somebody who can wholly represent that district.

12 Please consider this and I challenge you to keep  
13 up the good work. Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

15 So, again, we'll continue public comment for  
16 about, maybe 10 or 15 minutes a little bit later in the  
17 morning.

18 But what I'd like to do is have Mr. -- well, Mr.  
19 Brown is here. And there was a memo and accompanying  
20 analysis that was circulated among the Commissioners last  
21 night and this is an opportunity to talk to Mr. Brown.  
22 But Mr. Brown, I think, will give a brief summary and then  
23 we'll take a question and answer -- we'll have questions  
24 and answers.

25 And for those of you who are watching on the

1 internet, this memorandum has been posted on our website,  
2 as well.

3 MR. BROWN: Good morning, Commissioners, I'm happy  
4 to be back. I did want to comment at the outset that I  
5 continue to believe that the Commission is doing a  
6 fabulous job of following the criteria in the California  
7 Constitution, listening to public input, and trying to  
8 understand the legal constraints under which it operates.

9 As you know, part of my role is to help inform the  
10 Commission about what the legal framework is and what some  
11 of the constraints are that the Commission faces in  
12 developing maps.

13 And towards that end we've put together a legal  
14 memorandum, which I've handed out and which I believe you  
15 all have seen, that focuses on L.A. County, and in  
16 particular focuses on the Latino population in L.A. County  
17 and the operation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to  
18 that population.

19 And for the most part this memo reflects advice  
20 that we've been giving to you all along, updated as we  
21 continue to accumulate evidence and evaluate that  
22 evidence.

23 Now, as explained in the memo, our view is that  
24 Section 2 likely requires the Commission to create several  
25 Latino majority districts in Los Angeles County in order

1 to avoid dilution of Latinos' effective and equal  
2 participation in the electoral process.

3 In other words, if the Commission does not create  
4 several Latino majority districts in L.A. County, a court  
5 might find that the Commission's maps have resulted in  
6 Latinos having less opportunity than other members in the  
7 electorate to participate in the political process and  
8 elect representatives of their choice, in violation of  
9 Section 2.

10 And as we note, this is also particularly the case  
11 of the south and southwest regions of Los Angeles County  
12 and we talk about that in the memo.

13 Now, to the extent the Commission chooses, for  
14 whatever reason, not to draw certain Latino majority  
15 districts in L.A. County, including in that south and  
16 southwest region, the Commission should nevertheless avoid  
17 placing a substantial Latino population in a district  
18 where racially polarized voting would usually operate to  
19 defeat the ability of Latinos to elect candidates of their  
20 choice, if an alternative configuration exists that would  
21 avoid that outcome.

22 Now, what we do in the memo is in the first few  
23 pages we walked through the legal framework of Section 2  
24 of the Voting Rights Act, and we've been through that with  
25 you before. There are what's known as the three Gingles



1 preconditions, and then if those conditions are satisfied,  
2 a court would consider the totality of the circumstances.

3           So, starting around page 4, near the bottom, we  
4 walked through the application of those three Gingles  
5 preconditions to the Latino population in Los Angeles.

6           Starting with the first precondition, whether  
7 there's a sufficiently large and geographically compact  
8 minority group, we conclude that as to a number of regions  
9 in L.A. County Latinos do comprise a sufficiently large  
10 and geographical -- geographically compact group such as  
11 they could constitute a majority in a single-member  
12 district and, in fact, several such districts.

13           We don't think that that is a close question in  
14 any respect.

15           With respect to the second and third Gingles  
16 preconditions, as you know that issue is the issue of  
17 whether Latinos vote in a politically cohesive manner and  
18 whether there is evidence that the non-Latino majority  
19 votes as a block in a manner that would usually operate to  
20 defeat the ability of the Latino group to elect candidates  
21 of their choice.

22           So, that's the issue.

23           Based on the evidence that has been reviewed and  
24 analyzed by Dr. Barreto, we conclude that racially  
25 polarized voting likely exists in Los Angeles County and

1 that the evidence we've reviewed indicates that a  
2 significant number of Latinos vote together for the same  
3 candidates, while non-Latinos vote in significant numbers  
4 for different candidates.

5 I think perhaps an important point to understand  
6 is that we think the evidence is sufficiently abundant  
7 that we believe that it would be reasonable to infer that  
8 a sophisticated plaintiff, with well-qualified experts,  
9 could develop the evidence to persuade a court that the  
10 second and third Gingles preconditions have been met in  
11 Los Angeles County.

12 So, we don't think that this Commission has to  
13 make an independent determination about this issue. It's  
14 our advice, as your counsel, that there's a sufficient  
15 amount of evidence such that it would be reasonable to  
16 infer that the Commission should take these steps to  
17 comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

18 Now, Dr. Barreto concludes that there's strong  
19 evidence of political cohesiveness among Latinos in Los  
20 Angeles County and there's strong and substantial evidence  
21 of racially polarized voting throughout Los Angeles County  
22 over a period of decades, including in recent elections.

23 We've attached, as Attachment A, a high level  
24 summary of Dr. Barreto's analysis.

25 I just want to point out a couple of things that

1 he notes. One is that he determined that analyses of  
2 voting patterns in Los Angeles from 1997 through 2010 have  
3 demonstrated statistically significant differences in  
4 candidate choice between Latinos and non-Latinos.

5 And he has found, preliminarily, that polarized  
6 voting exists county-wide throughout Los Angeles, as well  
7 in specific regions, such as the City of Los Angeles, the  
8 eastern San Gabriel Valley area, northern L.A. County, and  
9 the central southwest region of L.A. County.

10 Now, beginning on page 6 we walked through some of  
11 the evidence on the totality of the circumstances. So, a  
12 court would have to consider in a Section 2 claim whether  
13 based on the totality of the circumstances Latinos would  
14 be denied an opportunity to participate in the political  
15 process and elect representatives of their choice if  
16 majority minority districts aren't drawn.

17 And we think that the public testimony and the  
18 organized group submissions provide ample evidence that  
19 the totality of the circumstances weigh in favor of a  
20 Section 2 claim in Los Angeles.

21 We put together some of it for you as an  
22 illustration. So, Attachment B is an excerpt of the  
23 testimony of Arturo Vargas, the Executive Director or  
24 NALEO, which was submitted to the Commission on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

25 In that he discusses barriers to Latino

1 participation and representation in California and, in  
2 particular, he points out some evidence about  
3 discrimination relating to voting practices against  
4 Latinos in the electoral process.

5 For example, he notes survey results with respect  
6 to problems with voter assistance, with polling locations,  
7 provisional ballots, unwarranted challenges to voters  
8 based on citizenship status or ID requirements, and the  
9 lack of bilingual poll workers.

10 Furthermore, Mr. Vargas's testimony discusses  
11 Census data that helps point out some of the stark  
12 disparities between Latinos and non-Latinos in Los Angeles  
13 County.

14 As an example he notes that 46.6 percent of Latino  
15 adults in Los Angeles County have not completed high  
16 school, compared with 6.8 percent of non-Latino, white  
17 adults.

18 He notes that 40 -- almost 41 percent of the  
19 Latino population in Los Angeles County is not fully  
20 proficient in English, compared to about eight percent for  
21 non-Latino whites.

22 He notes the percentage of Latinos below the  
23 poverty level is more than ten percent higher than the  
24 percentage for non-Latino whites.

25 And he notes that nearly one-third of Latinos in

1 Los Angeles County have no health insurance compared to  
2 around ten percent of non-Latino whites.

3 Now, these types of facts would be used in a  
4 Section 2 claim to argue that much of this is reflective  
5 of the lingering effects of past discrimination.

6 Now, again, this Commission doesn't need to debate  
7 that issue. What we're doing is showing you that there's  
8 an abundance of evidence that a plaintiff in a Section 2  
9 claim could marshal together to support such a claim.

10 In addition to Mr. Vargas's testimony we've  
11 reviewed and included, as Attachment C, an expert report  
12 submitted in 2002 in voting litigation from a professor of  
13 history at Stanford University.

14 And in that report -- and that was included in  
15 testimony that was provided to the Commission, along with  
16 Mr. Vargas's submission on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

17 And in that report Professor Camarillo discusses,  
18 broadly, the history of discrimination against Latinos in  
19 California, including in the voting context.

20 And as far as we're aware, on the issue of  
21 totality of the circumstances, the information and  
22 evidence in Mr. Vargas's testimony and Professor  
23 Camarillo's report, and other similar submissions that  
24 have been made have not been contradicted by any testimony  
25 received by the Commission.

1           So, our conclusion, as I said at the outset, is  
2 that Latinos in Los Angeles County likely represent a  
3 sufficiently large and geographically compact group that  
4 would constitute a majority in several single-member  
5 districts.

6           There's strong evidence suggesting the existence  
7 of racially polarized voting, affecting Latinos in areas  
8 of Los Angeles County.

9           And the totality of the circumstances indicates  
10 that Latinos would be denied an equal opportunity to  
11 participate in the political process and elect candidates  
12 of their choice if such majority districts are not drawn.

13           So, accordingly, as I've noted, we believe the  
14 Commission should create several Latino majority districts  
15 in Los Angeles County.

16           Now, there's also been issues of what to do in the  
17 south and southwest area of Los Angeles County and we were  
18 asked to be a little more specific about our advice in  
19 that area.

20           So, the memo continues at page 8 to provide a  
21 further focus on that area. And there we note that Dr.  
22 Barreto has focused on available evidence in the south and  
23 southwest areas of Los Angeles County, where Latino  
24 communities are adjacent to non-Latino communities. He  
25 reviews several studies and, again, his summary is at

1 Attachment A, and those studies show polarized voting  
2 between Latinos and African Americans in Los Angeles  
3 County.

4 He notes that there's been significant population  
5 shifts among cities that were formerly majority African  
6 American and that are now majority Latino.

7 In one study he observes that there were large  
8 differences in voting preferences between Latinos and  
9 African Americans in, for example, the 2008 Democratic  
10 Primary Presidential election.

11 He also refers to extensive analysis included in  
12 an expert report by Morgan Couser\* who found strong  
13 differences in voting patterns between African Americans  
14 and Latinos in Compton City Council elections, noting that  
15 Latinos were regularly outvoted under the election system  
16 in the City of Compton.

17 He explains that in the recent Attorney General  
18 election there was again strong evidence of racial block  
19 voting between the Latinos and African Americans, with  
20 African American voters favoring A.G. Harris,  
21 overwhelmingly, and Latino voters favoring Delgado\* and  
22 Terrico\*

23 The summary by Dr. Barreto also considers data  
24 from a 2007 special election for the 37<sup>th</sup> Congressional  
25 district in Los Angeles County. And that data shows, and

1 you'll see in his attachment, that in the primary election  
2 82.6 percent of Latinos favored a Latino candidate, while  
3 92.6 percent of the black vote went to African American  
4 Candidates.

5           Consequently, in light of the fact that Section 2  
6 likely requires the Commission to draw some number of  
7 Latino majority districts in Los Angeles County, and given  
8 the strong evidence of racially polarized voting in the  
9 south and southwest regions of L.A. County, our  
10 recommendation is that the Commission consider drawing a  
11 Latino majority district in areas adjacent to Latino  
12 populations in the south and southwest regions of Los  
13 Angeles County.

14           Now, we know and understand that there are a lot  
15 of moving parts in the judgments you're forming about  
16 where the districts go. So, if it turns out that it's not  
17 feasible, given the Commission's choices and  
18 considerations, to draw a majority Latino district in  
19 those areas, we nevertheless advise that the Commission  
20 should avoid placing a substantial Latino population in a  
21 district where racially polarized voting would usually  
22 operate to defeat the ability of Latinos to elect  
23 candidates of their choice if an alternative configuration  
24 exists that would avoid that outcome, and that could be  
25 drawn in compliance with the U.S. and California



1 Constitutions.

2           So, that's a summary of our legal memo. And in  
3 the attachment by Dr. Barreto, I'm not going to take you  
4 through that in detail, but I wanted to point out that if  
5 you look at it carefully, you'll see that he refers to 16  
6 separate studies of elections. And each of these studies  
7 are studies of -- they're not all elections, but elections  
8 and related issues about Latino voting patterns and  
9 political cohesiveness.

10           But the studies of elections are substantial;  
11 they're published in -- many of them in peer-reviewed  
12 academic journals, and other respected sources. Most of  
13 them he was a co-author of, you'll note, so he's familiar  
14 with these data and these studies. It covers a wide range  
15 of time period and elections, including recent years.

16           And then in particular, near the end of Dr.  
17 Barreto's summary, he provides some more specific data and  
18 scatterplot diagrams for the special election in the 37<sup>th</sup>  
19 Congressional district.

20           So, that's a summary of what we've provided and  
21 I'm happy to answer your questions.

22           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And just to note, Mr. Brown  
23 has to be on a call from about 10:15 to noon, but he will  
24 be joining us in the afternoon session as well. So, if we  
25 can't get everything covered this morning, he'll still be

1 available this afternoon.

2 Commissioner Filkins Webber.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Brown, we appreciate what you've provided to us today.  
5 And I had an opportunity to study it last night, as well.

6 I'm certain that the term "substantial" Latino  
7 population might be subject to interpretation as to what  
8 substantial Latino population might very well mean.

9 What I'm struggling with are the two paragraphs  
10 that you've repeated twice in this memo. The first time  
11 that it's mentioned is in paragraph three, of page 1, and  
12 then it's mentioned again just in your conclusion.

13 In particular, what you're suggesting is that if  
14 we do not decide to do a Section 2 district for Latinos in  
15 southwest region of Los Angeles that we should avoid  
16 placing a substantial Latino population in a district  
17 where racially polarized voting would usually operate to  
18 defeat that ability of Latinos to elect candidates of  
19 their choice.

20 And by the material that we see from Mr. Barreto,  
21 it's evident that in certain areas of South Los Angeles  
22 racially polarized voting exists such that it would defeat  
23 the Latinos' opportunity to elect a candidate of their  
24 choice.

25 So, if this Commission decides, and so I look at

1 it hypothetically, based on the demographic data that we  
2 see in South Los Angeles, we have struggled with many of  
3 the visualizations that we've seen where some of the  
4 districts show, just as a matter of happenstance, as to  
5 where individuals live. That it turns out in certain  
6 areas you may have a higher concentration, higher  
7 percentage concentration of Latinos in one area, which  
8 then we might have some concern with under, again, the  
9 Voting Rights Act, where we don't want to over-concentrate  
10 any district.

11           So, let's just say hypothetically, I understand  
12 that there are certain districts that have been  
13 identified, but I don't want to get into them in  
14 particular, but just hypothetically. If we're looking at  
15 an area, for instance in South Los Angeles, that has,  
16 let's say, a 30 percent black voting age population in a  
17 given district and then the remaining, let's say another  
18 30 percent is Latino, and in an adjacent district we have  
19 about 60 percent Latino in an area -- because this is  
20 what's happening in South L.A.

21           So, what you're suggesting is we don't -- we want  
22 to avoid putting the Latino population into another  
23 district in an area where it would defeat their  
24 opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

25           The only other option would be to then over-

1 concentrate an area directly next to it, which then you  
2 would have a 70 or 80 percent Latino population in an area  
3 right next to it, which then you have a concentration.

4           So, we're butting up against a situation where  
5 these are where the individuals live and if we draw a  
6 district in one sense we'll be over-concentrating if it's  
7 70 or 80 percent Latino, but at the same time we're -- if  
8 we don't create that as a Section 2, which might be a  
9 violation of the Voting Rights Act anyway, and we try and  
10 spread the population out, we're butting up against  
11 another wall in which you're telling us to avoid placing  
12 Latinos and de-concentrating them into a district where  
13 they will no longer have an opportunity to vote a  
14 candidate of their choice.

15           So, these are the true demographics that I think  
16 that this Commission is struggling with and I'm trying to  
17 understand how do we create -- because I think if we're  
18 looking at some of the districts at 30 or 40 percent -- 30  
19 percent black or 40 percent Latino, with the racially  
20 polarized voting that you provided to us, we are in a  
21 serious, you know, situation here because that potentially  
22 would defeat the Latinos' right to vote.

23           So, you've seen our districts, you've seen our  
24 visualizations and I'm -- again, I'm struggling here  
25 between if we don't create a Section 2 here we can't

1 spread out the population, either.

2           And I know it's long-winded, it's just a very  
3 frustrating issue that I think all of us are struggling  
4 with.

5           MR. BROWN: I think I understand the question. I  
6 think there are at least two options, in my mind, but let  
7 me first fill in some of my understanding of a -- let me  
8 make a few comments before I say what I think the two  
9 options are.

10           One is it is correct that we've advised that the  
11 Commission should be sensitive to not over-concentrating  
12 Latinos in a particular district. And so if a district  
13 was at, say, 70 percent, the advice would be to try to  
14 make it lower, not higher, for example.

15           At the same time or slightly different point,  
16 there's probably never going to be a case in Los Angeles  
17 where there are not some Latinos in a district.

18           So, that may be a bit of an overstatement but --  
19 so, we're not saying, also at the other extreme, never  
20 include Latinos in other districts.

21           But it seems to me there's two choices in that  
22 area with respect to this issue. And that is, one, create  
23 a majority Latino district by moving some of the  
24 configuration and I think that was discussed at one of the  
25 meetings I was at.

1           And the other is if as a result of other choices  
2 you're making, like reducing the concentration in nearby  
3 districts, you end up in a situation where Latinos are not  
4 going to be usually out-voted, even though it's not a 50  
5 percent district, depending on the totality of what you've  
6 done throughout L.A., we think that might be okay, too.

7           What we're trying to caution against is putting  
8 Latinos in a situation where you know they will be  
9 regularly defeated if there's an alternative.

10           And so what I think I've just said is there seems  
11 to be at least two alternatives, maybe there are others.  
12 One is a majority district by, again, making choices.

13           The other is in the process of grouping  
14 neighborhoods together in a way that makes sense and  
15 reducing over-compensation in a particular area, if you  
16 end up in a situation where Latinos are not at a  
17 disadvantage, then that's probably going to be okay, too,  
18 depending on what you've done with the rest of the  
19 population.

20           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Galambos  
21 Malloy, and then Forbes, and then Parvenu.

22           COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you, Mr.  
23 Brown, for providing that, I think gets straight to the  
24 point what are the options before the Commission?

25           I'd like to actually take a step back because in

1 reviewing the memo I have a number of questions or  
2 observations about the data and the analysis that led to  
3 those options that you're putting on the table.

4           So, I have a handful of them, I just want to lay  
5 them out and then you could -- if you could address them,  
6 I would appreciate that.

7           I think the first point is that I had a difficult  
8 time in the memo following what you and your colleagues at  
9 Gibson Dunn, how you really define "normally defeated at  
10 the polls," what does that mean in practice?

11           My understanding of the law and, of course, I'm  
12 not coming at this from the perspective of a lawyer, but  
13 as a citizen Commissioner, is that we don't just need to  
14 provide that there's racially polarized voting, we need to  
15 know is it legally significant enough that it prohibits  
16 Latinos from electing their preferred candidates.

17           So, even if we were to be able to say that RPV  
18 existed on some levels for Latinos to me, to actually  
19 understand what we as a Commission need to do in L.A.,  
20 particularly South L.A., we don't need to just know what's  
21 going on in the Latino community, but we also need to  
22 understand how other minority groups in that area are  
23 impacted by voting history and elections practice.

24           So, I think we have some excellent data, now, on  
25 the Latino side. The piece that Mr. Vargas had already

1 submitted to us, that Mr. Camarillo has, but I still think  
2 that it's only telling us part of the story. It's not  
3 really telling us the nuanced history as it relates to the  
4 African American community. And I think it's of concern  
5 that we would be entering into making some decisions based  
6 on only one part of the story. So, that is my first  
7 question.

8           The second is in regards to the Latino-preferred  
9 candidates that are addressed in the memo, what I see in  
10 that report is that we're looking at the candidates who  
11 lost. And I, also, from following State politics and  
12 local politics have seen a lot of Latinos win. And I  
13 think that, again, we're only getting about half or a  
14 partial story here.

15           What is the other side of the story around Latino  
16 successes in Los Angeles? For example, the L.A. mayoral  
17 race I think -- you know, the challenge about the story  
18 that was told in the memo was that that same candidate  
19 then went on to win twice, and with significant crossover  
20 vote, if you're talking about the Villaraigosa race.

21           I think it's difficult then to say, from my  
22 perspective, that you can look at that Latinos are not  
23 able to run preferred candidates and have them elected to  
24 offices. So, that's the second point about the successes  
25 of Latinos and how we factor that into this equation.



1           The remaining questions I had were my  
2 understanding of how the courts operate is that they're  
3 most likely to look at elections that are at the same  
4 level of our task at hand. So, what's particularly  
5 relevant is looking at Senate races, Assembly races,  
6 Congressional races.

7           And when I look at the examples that were given,  
8 the only directly applicable example that I see is the  
9 special election in the 37<sup>th</sup> district.

10           Now, without having been in L.A. at that time, I  
11 can tell you from having been involved in Oakland  
12 politics, special elections are notorious for low turnout,  
13 their poorly advertised. With that particular election  
14 you're looking at an election that had, if I understand  
15 correctly, you know, nearly -- I think it was 17  
16 candidates or something of that nature that were in that  
17 race.

18           So, in terms of that being the best we've got for  
19 a similar type of district, I'm really nervous if that's  
20 the best we've got.

21           And I think that having more examples at the  
22 Congressional, at the Assembly, and the Senate level, it's  
23 my understanding that is going to hold up better in court  
24 to support any decisions that this Commission makes.

25           My last couple of questions and comments are,

1 again, we don't have a lot at the State or at the  
2 Congressional level to go off of in terms of hard  
3 examples.

4           If we look at some of the local examples, for  
5 example the Compton case, my understanding of the Compton  
6 case is that the issue there was around at-large  
7 elections, and that the remedy in that case has been to  
8 move to district elections.

9           In our case all of the considerations that we are  
10 looking at are all district elections, Assembly district,  
11 Senate districts, Congressional districts, none of them  
12 are at-large elections.

13           So, I'm having a challenge seeing the direct  
14 applicability of those.

15           In addition, I know of many areas in Los Angeles  
16 where you have districts where you do have Latinos in  
17 office, at the supervisorial level, at the sheriff's  
18 level, at the city attorney's level. And so I feel like  
19 even for the local examples we have there are so many  
20 counter examples that it's another area of the memo where  
21 I feel like we're getting a part of the story.

22           And for those of us who know some of the other  
23 parts of the story, it's not necessarily painting a  
24 complete picture. So, that's one point.

25           And then the last, which I think is interesting

1 timing for us as a Commission to be doing our work is that  
2 the political landscape is changing significantly, both  
3 with the reform of having citizens lead a redistricting  
4 process, which is very novel and it will be many years  
5 before we really have a sense of what the long-term impact  
6 of that is.

7           But I think the other piece of reform that's  
8 happening is around the top two provision that is now  
9 going to be in effect at the primary level. And there's a  
10 lot of sense, and even in the way that the Top Two Primary  
11 was promoted to the public, there was a strong sense that  
12 by not having a party affiliation, either on the part of  
13 the voter or of the candidates be a driver in individuals  
14 being able to select their top two candidates, that that  
15 was really going to deal with a lot of the issues that  
16 we've seen with the Democratic Party primaries.

17           And so, you know, I would -- I don't know if it's  
18 something that you've had a chance to look into but to me,  
19 to really understand how moving forward in this new  
20 political landscape RPV is likely to interplay with the  
21 Top Two Primary system in regard to all minority groups,  
22 Latinos, blacks, Asians, I think that's the type of  
23 information that we need to have in order to really be  
24 forward thinking and do the work that we need to do.

25           So, I appreciate all the work that went into this

1 memo, but I do have concerns that it's, in my view,  
2 incomplete and I would be very cautious about how we apply  
3 it.

4 I think it's unfortunate that we are having this  
5 discussion so late into our process because according to  
6 our timeline, we have to essentially turn around and apply  
7 this information, interpret what we've seen, our comfort  
8 level with it and apply it to the maps within the next,  
9 you know, 24 hours, 48 hours.

10 And the public, of course, has access to the  
11 information, but is having a very limited opportunity to  
12 respond.

13 So, I know that also my questions and observations  
14 are long-winded, but I'm also doing my best to try and add  
15 into the record pieces of the story that I feel like are  
16 relevant and important both for myself, my fellow  
17 Commissioners, and for members of the public to hear as  
18 part of this conversation. So, I'll leave it at that.

19 MR. BROWN: Very good questions. I'll give you  
20 several comments but in addition, as you know, the  
21 Commission will have an opportunity to ask questions of  
22 Dr. Barreto, who's deeply knowledgeable about many of  
23 these issues and how they impact the analysis of racially  
24 polarized voting.

25 Part of what's important, I think, to understand

1 is what we're trying to do for you as your counsel. And  
2 that is, as you all know, you're operating under a  
3 significant limitation of both time and resources, and  
4 you're being asked to do an enormous task that's very  
5 complex, and involves a lot of evidence.

6 And necessarily, as a result of that process,  
7 you're not going to be able to do what you would do in  
8 litigation, for example.

9 So, if Latinos brought a Section 2 claim in  
10 Federal Court and there was an objection to it, and a  
11 vigorous defense put onto it, some of the questions that  
12 you raised would be being raised by the person defending  
13 against that Section 2 claim.

14 And then -- and then the court would decide based  
15 on the criteria that we've laid out.

16 And what we're trying to do as your counsel is  
17 that given the limited time, the limited resources, the  
18 fact that we didn't have an RPV analyst until recently and  
19 what we're trying to do is exercise our best judgment to  
20 tell you, on balance, what we think the Commission should  
21 do.

22 That's what we're doing and we're not going to  
23 have perfect information.

24 And so this memo, like all the advice we've given  
25 you, reflects our judgment in light of what we think the

1 evidence is and where we think the evidence would likely  
2 go if fully developed in litigation.

3           Let me start with one of your first questions and  
4 that was doesn't the analysis of the Gingles factors two  
5 and three require that the majority usually operate to  
6 defeat the interest of the minority?

7           The answer to that is yes, we say that in the  
8 memo. What's a little tricky to follow, if you look at  
9 the cases, is that many of the cases arose in the context  
10 of at-large election systems and the most -- you know, the  
11 seminal case laying out the Gingles factors is Thornburg  
12 versus Gingles, and it involved an at-large system.

13           So, in a case decided sometime after that, called  
14 Grove versus Emison, the court decided that, yes, those  
15 factors do apply to redistricting as well.

16           And so then you have to ask the question you asked  
17 well, gee, how do I decide whether the majority regularly  
18 operates to defeat the minority in various contexts.

19           And there's these interesting questions like,  
20 well, if the Latinos were, you know, 80 percent in a  
21 district and they were always winning, how could there be  
22 a violation?

23           I think the answer to that is to look at the facts  
24 about the geographic area, and that's what we've been  
25 doing all throughout the State, and asking your question.

1 If you cut this district in half -- consider the situation  
2 of an isolated group in other parts of the State that  
3 we've formed Section 2 district around.

4 If you consider, if you cut the district in half  
5 in the face of racially polarized voting, what would  
6 happen? Would the majority in that hypothetical area  
7 usually operate to defeat the interests of the minority?

8 If the answer is yes, it's my view that -- and our  
9 view that that would satisfy the third Gingles  
10 precondition.

11 And so that's the judgment that we're making here,  
12 what would happen if you didn't form the district that  
13 protected the minority interests?

14 You asked about successes, Latino success. And  
15 Dr. Barreto notes that many of the Latino and African  
16 American successes, and Asian successes in Los Angeles  
17 County have come -- with some exceptions, have come in  
18 districts that are majority minority districts. So, he  
19 makes that observation.

20 He also thinks it's very important in trying to  
21 understand political cohesion among minorities to look at  
22 the primary elections, because he notes that Los Angeles  
23 County is overwhelmingly Democratic, and that when you get  
24 to the general election you're going to have results that  
25 generally reflect that, that there's an overwhelming

1 Democratic vote. So, he thinks you really have to get  
2 under -- underneath that.

3 With respect to looking at elections that are  
4 identical to the districts at issue, the case law allows  
5 for looking at other elections. There's often a debate  
6 about which elections are relevant.

7 I suspect that Dr. Barreto's view, which you can  
8 ask him about, would be that the strong weight of the  
9 evidence would show what would happen in a district that  
10 you draw, where you've fragmented the Latino community and  
11 you know what the voting preferences and patterns are.

12 With respect to needing more examples, Dr. Barreto  
13 is prepared to do more work. He needs the Commission to  
14 authorize that work.

15 And with respect to the African American  
16 community, we can have further discussions about that.  
17 But as you know, we've evaluated the various input that  
18 we've received to date on the question of whether Section  
19 2 requires a particular remedy for African Americans in  
20 Los Angeles County.

21 And based on the Supreme Court's narrow  
22 interpretation of Section 2, the remedy that -- well, both  
23 in order to establish liability and the remedy that seems  
24 to be required is the formation of a majority minority  
25 district.



1           And our evaluation to date has been that in light  
2 of the overwhelming position of the public input it would  
3 be difficult to conclude, based on the totality of the  
4 circumstances, that you should adopt a majority African  
5 American district in L.A. County.

6           That, again, is a judgment call and could be  
7 subject to debate, but that's the view we've formed.

8           And under the Supreme Court precedent if you --  
9 and I'm always open to hearing specific legal arguments to  
10 the contrary, particularly in writing.

11           If you -- well, let me just say it most directly.  
12 The Supreme Court has not allowed the creation of  
13 influence districts or crossover districts as a remedy for  
14 under Section 2, or as a basis for a claim under Section  
15 2.

16           And so the conundrum that the Commission is left  
17 for -- left with is how do they best respond to the needs  
18 and concerns of the African American community within the  
19 legal framework that the Supreme Court has left for them.  
20 That's the conundrum.

21           I can sense that there's a strong willingness on  
22 the part of the Commissioners to listen to, react to, and  
23 be responsive to the input of the African American  
24 community. And the conundrum is a legal one. It is what  
25 is left, what tools are left in the Commission's toolkit

1 to be responsive to that input?

2 So, that's where we are. I think I'm about out of  
3 time because I have to do something else.

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so --

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are you going to  
6 address the point about the Top Two Primaries, now, or  
7 will you pick that up later?

8 MR. BROWN: I think Dr. Barreto will have much to  
9 say about that.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And I think, again,  
11 Doctor -- I'm sorry, we can call you doctor, if you like.

12 Mr. Brown will be here this afternoon. So, he has  
13 to be on a call right now, so I think if -- we'll maintain  
14 the queue of Commissioner Forbes, and then Commissioner  
15 Parvenu and then others can join it. But we'll resume  
16 that session in the afternoon.

17 Okay, so let's do this, we -- we're moving things  
18 around a little bit, but we want to accommodate all of the  
19 different points in our agenda.

20 So, we will resume our public comment. And,  
21 again, we're sort of limiting it to about a minute and a  
22 half per speaker. We have about -- I think about six or  
23 seven more speakers to go.

24 So, why don't you folks line up? I think it would  
25 be Mr. Lanzi, I guess would be the next person.

1           MR. LANZI: Good morning, Commissioners. I, first  
2 of all, want to thank you for the hard work that you're  
3 doing and I'm glad that I'm not sitting in your chairs.

4           My name is Leonard Lanzi; I'm a resident of  
5 Topanga Canyon, in Los Angeles County and I'm here to talk  
6 to you about the L.A. area Senate districts and present my  
7 ideas on how we can make changes to the districts to  
8 accommodate different groups that have testified so far.

9           I believe my area should be in a district that  
10 includes the Santa Monica Mountains, West L.A., Beverly  
11 Hills and West Hollywood in a compete Senate district.

12           This would also allow to keep our LBGT communities  
13 together in one area.

14           This will also allow you to include East Ventura  
15 County with Santa Clarita, something that has been  
16 presented many times to this Commission.

17           Also, yesterday, many different members of the  
18 African American community spoke about a plan they called  
19 the two-three-four plan.

20           If you draw my district to include Santa Monica  
21 Mountains, West L.A., Beverly Hills and West Hollywood in  
22 one Senate seat, you can also honor the request in the  
23 two-three-four plan.

24           Additionally, for the Assembly districts I would  
25 also urge you to consider keeping Calabasas with the West

1 San Fernando Valley. Thank you for your time.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

3 So, we have Ms. Lambourne, then Mr. Stepanik or  
4 Stepanik, Mr. Watkins, and then Ms. Teasley-Linnock.

5 MS. LAMBOURNE: Good morning, my name is Linda  
6 Lambourne and I'm here to talk about the Senate district  
7 for Santa Clarita Valley. I've lived in Santa Clarita for  
8 the past 34 years.

9 At the hearing on Saturday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, the  
10 Commission instructed the folks who draw the lines to  
11 draft a Santa Clarita Valley to East Ventura County Senate  
12 district.

13 As a Santa Clarita resident, who was raised in  
14 Simi Valley, I've come before you today to endorse the  
15 Santa Clarita/East Ventura County Senate district.

16 Santa Clarita and Simi Valley share so much in  
17 common. Economically, Santa Clarita and East Ventura  
18 County have similar industry, and that includes biotech,  
19 aerospace and defense and, of course, the film industry.

20 Both areas embrace similar land use policies and  
21 are dedicated to protecting the quality of life issues for  
22 their residents.

23 As a horse person, I can tell you that both areas  
24 are dedicated to preserving open space and providing  
25 equestrian and hiking trails for their residents.

1           Additionally, the Santa Clara Valley and East  
2 Ventura County have a long history of being linked  
3 together. We've shared a Senator since 1982.

4           The Commission has received an abundance of  
5 community of interest testimony and I am in support of  
6 that type of Senate district. Yet, to date, the folks who  
7 draw the lines have yet to provide a single visualization  
8 for the Commissioners to consider. Thank you.

9           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you. You can just  
10 hand it off to the next speaker, thank you. Yes, thank  
11 you.

12           MR. STEPANIK: Hi, my name is Scott Stepanik and  
13 I'm a resident of Malibu. I just want to thank you for  
14 your judicious efforts so far, your mindfulness and all  
15 that you've accomplished thus far.

16           I'm here to speak about my specific Senate seat,  
17 in Malibu. The last Senate visualization links Malibu  
18 with Simi Valley and Eastern Ventura County. I would like  
19 you to reconsider this. In fact, I strongly urge you to  
20 keep Malibu intact with Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica,  
21 this coastal region, also West L.A.

22           Naturally, we share common interests, coastal  
23 concerns, environmental preservation. I can guarantee you  
24 that the Surf Rider Committee in Malibu has very little in  
25 common with Simi Valley and their voter interests.

1           Also, small businesses, we want to keep a small  
2 business environment, whereas in Simi Valley and Eastern  
3 Ventura County we have growing amounts of big box stores.

4           Also, just simply commerce and traffic; when we,  
5 in Malibu go out, we go to West L.A., we go to Santa  
6 Monica, we rarely go to Simi Valley. So, naturally, there  
7 is a harmonious bond between Malibu, as residents, and the  
8 coast south of it along PCH into West L.A.

9           Thank you for your time and may you continue to  
10 hear the concerns of our voters. Thank you.

11           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

12           So, we've got Mr. Watkins next.

13           MR. WATKINS: Good morning. I'm here from the  
14 community of Watts, I'm the President of the Watts Labor  
15 Community Action Committee. But as a resident of the area  
16 I've been watching this process very closely and remain  
17 deeply concerned and troubled by what seems to be a  
18 greater focus on how to avoid the interests of African  
19 Americans in traditional African American districts and  
20 trying to make sure that we're taking care of other groups  
21 that stand on the shoulders of African American  
22 communities.

23           African Americans suffer the greatest disparities  
24 in terms of quality of life indicators, health indicators,  
25 general well-being among all groups.

1           And so when I look at how all this is unfolding,  
2 I'm troubled by how groups have been placed, how leaders  
3 have been placed in same districts, meaning that now  
4 they'll have to compete if they want to continue their  
5 representation of the people they've traditionally  
6 represented.

7           I see a focus on the decreasing numbers of African  
8 Americans in districts, but I'm not hearing the same kind  
9 of focus on the decreasing numbers of white populations in  
10 more affluent communities.

11           And so I'm thinking that perhaps if you all hear  
12 us in the spirit of what you've been charged to achieve,  
13 that groups that are in -- the groups that share common  
14 interests and, unfortunately, I'm talking about groups in  
15 this instance that share poverty that we need to be  
16 careful about how we set these districts.

17           Perhaps porous borders along the Orange County and  
18 the Riverside liens would help us expand where we need to  
19 expand, without having to disrupt the patterns of 33, 35  
20 and 37. Thank you.

21           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

22           And then after Ms. Teasley-Linnock we have Waters,  
23 Bonovich, then Huffman.

24           MS TEASLEY-LINNOCK: Good morning. I'm Erica  
25 Teasley-Linnock with the African American Redistricting

1 Collaborative.

2           So, I didn't know I'd be following Mr. Brown's  
3 presentation and there are so many things that are sort of  
4 swirling in my mind as I was going through the questions  
5 that you all had and what I was thinking about.

6           And I wanted to address the point, you know, about  
7 accessibility. I have three points, one about Mr.  
8 Brown's -- Mr. Brown's memo and the related RPV analysis.  
9 Second, about basically repeating and amplifying the  
10 concern of the African American community that you are  
11 reducing or eliminating our ability to elect candidates of  
12 choice in South L.A.

13           And then also talk about the ability of -- or the  
14 accessibility of the maps. You know, in the absence of  
15 you all releasing a second draft map, it's been very  
16 difficult for the public to access this information. You  
17 know, we were all getting e-mails this morning, have you  
18 seen the maps, where are they? You know, the Alliance and  
19 the coalition of groups that have been working with you  
20 all and trying to promote the activities of the  
21 Commission, and we haven't been able to find the  
22 information and get it.

23           So, the general public, it's definitely much more  
24 difficult for them.

25           But I just want to kind of quickly go through.



1 You know, I was scrolling through, as you guys were  
2 talking, of the types of elections that were looked at in  
3 terms of Mr. Barreto's analysis. The special election,  
4 again, was raised, there were 15 candidates in that.

5 And Senator Oropesa wasn't elected Senator; she  
6 had gained successful as a Senator and represented Long  
7 Beach and Carson, which are the areas that you all are  
8 concerned about.

9 And there also was support of the African American  
10 candidate by Latino voters as well. So that -- I wasn't  
11 able to see that in the two minutes that I was scrolling  
12 through as you all were talking.

13 But I know it looked at the presidential race,  
14 attorney general race -- did you say time? Okay, we'll  
15 have to submit something in writing or I'll come back.

16 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. And, again, I'm going  
17 to allow some additional public comment right before lunch  
18 so if you -- those of you who are staying around.

19 And also does -- Mayor Vargas, I think because you  
20 had the opportunity to speak earlier, we'll take you off  
21 the queue for this. But you're welcome, again, to stay  
22 and speak to us later.

23 MS. WATERS: Good morning. My name is Four Waters  
24 and I would like to thank you for listening and to  
25 honoring the overwhelming consensus, feedback that came

1 from Yolo County and that feedback was obviously  
2 incorporated in the visualization maps that are posted  
3 right no online.

4 As Supervisor Provenza and Supervisor Saylor  
5 mentioned, it came to our attention last night that kind  
6 of at the last minute there was some notion that those  
7 maps would be kind of torn apart and redrawn.

8 And I would like to speak to that. Last night's  
9 direction, as I understand it, to radically redraw both  
10 the Senate and the Assembly maps for our region is in  
11 direct opposition to the unilateral consensus that was  
12 presented as testimony, and I refer to this entire packet  
13 of unilateral consensus asking us to keep it whole.

14 I live in West Sac, I was willing to accept that  
15 compromise given the tremendous task you all face. It's  
16 difficult to conceive of a circumstance under which you  
17 would so thoroughly disregard the submitted and unilateral  
18 testimony. Now, especially as your Commissioner Malloy  
19 noted, we are so late in being able to have testimony  
20 opportunities.

21 And given that the time that this direction was  
22 given was the time when most people would not have been  
23 paying attention and would not have been able to pull  
24 together some kind of response.

25 We hope that we're in error and that these

1 changes --

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: All right, thank you.

3 So, after this we have Huffman, Martinez, then  
4 Bower.

5 MR. BONOVIK: Hi. Yes, my name's Nik Bonovich  
6 and I'm here representing VICA. And we just want to make  
7 some comments about the latest Congressional maps.

8 We believe that a few communities were split and  
9 left out of the San Fernando Valley, that should be in,  
10 such as Porter Ranch, a portion of Chatsworth, and also  
11 Calabasas. And so we just want to make sure, as you're  
12 drawing the maps and the valleys that these communities,  
13 these neighborhoods remain whole and are in districts  
14 within the San Fernando Valley, and also that they're not  
15 split. And we believe that Burbank could have been split  
16 in these maps as well, so we just want to bring that up.

17 And we'll be submitting more maps to you that can  
18 help adjust these changes. Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: All right, thank you.

20 MS. HUFFMAN: Commissioners, Alice Huffman, NAACP.  
21 I stayed up last night thinking I was going to bring you  
22 some great, helpful information only to find out that when  
23 Attorney Brown spoke the same information he's using to  
24 show polarization, we brought to you today to show that  
25 there's not polarization.

1           So, it occurs to me that maybe we need a working  
2 definition of polarization. Maybe the definition of  
3 polarization in everybody's head might not be the same  
4 that we're all trying to use. So, that is one request is  
5 that we get a definition of polarization.

6           Does it mean -- you know, when we had the Voting  
7 Rights Act, it was about black and white. Does it mean  
8 that when two ethnic groups get together and one win over  
9 the other, or visa-versa, that that's polarization, or is  
10 that what the Voting Rights Act intended was to give two  
11 groups a chance to compete against the oppressor, which  
12 was once white people.

13           So, I'm kind of curious as to know when did  
14 Latinos and black get into this conundrum of one  
15 oppressing the other. I don't think there's evidence for  
16 that, yet.

17           But I did ask you a few weeks ago to give me your  
18 definition or your criteria for the hierarchy that you're  
19 using to make some of the decisions about community of  
20 interest and so forth, and I never got that.

21           But in the final analysis I'm going to ask you,  
22 since there's a great emphasis in representing the  
23 Latinos, where is that same interest in making sure that  
24 you don't turn the clock back to the sixties to oppress  
25 African Americans? That is the conundrum. It is not how

1 you draw one race over the other, but how we define  
2 political process, winning and losing. Does everybody --

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Thank you, Ms. Huffman.

4 And, again, if you're sticking around for a little bit  
5 longer we'll have another session. Thank you.

6 So, just a couple more speakers, so Martinez,  
7 Bower, then Seyman.

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning, Commissioners. My  
9 name is Michele Martinez, I'm a resident and council  
10 member in the City of Santa Ana, and in Orange County.

11 I have been following your meetings online. At  
12 your July 9<sup>th</sup> meeting a discussion was had around  
13 separating Santa Ana and Anaheim in the 47<sup>th</sup> Congressional  
14 district.

15 I came this morning to reiterate, again, to this  
16 Commission my sentiment of region three's meeting at Cal  
17 State Fullerton, and others that provided testimony and  
18 comment to keeping communities of interest.

19 I also support the DeWayne map that was provided  
20 to you, which respects the natural Orange County  
21 communities of interest of keeping Santa Ana with Western  
22 and Central Anaheim, keeping Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa  
23 with Westminster and Garden Grove, and keeping Irvine with  
24 South County.

25 Recent visualizations of the Santa Ana/Anaheim

1 district are quite similar to the DeWayne map except that  
2 the Commission's version includes Eastern Garden Grove,  
3 instead of Western Garden Grove.

4           You might include that the DeWayne map could  
5 easily be modified to keep the commissions of Anaheim and  
6 the Santa Ana district by adding Newport Beach to the  
7 Coastal district and adding Tustin and Irvine to the South  
8 County districts.

9           You know, today I just really want to urge you, I  
10 came this morning from Orange County, that, you know, when  
11 we look at Santa Ana and Anaheim, that is the only Latino  
12 district in Orange County. And I know that the Assembly  
13 district that you may keep intact, but not keeping the  
14 Congressional district is very troubling to the City of  
15 Santa Ana.

16           And that this is why I came this morning to urge  
17 you to please understand that we need to keep communities  
18 of interest.

19           And I do want to reiterate one last thing --

20           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

21           So, we've got Mr. Bower. No? Okay, then Mr.  
22 Seyman.

23           MR. SEYMAN: Richard Seyman, I currently am a Yolo  
24 County resident. I own some property, a home here in  
25 Sacramento County. I was born and raised -- well, born in

1 Sacramento, raised in Solano County.

2 I've been trying to work along to find some way to  
3 resolve some of these overall situations. I'm going to  
4 make my Yolo County fellow citizens probably very unhappy.  
5 I don't think what you just did last night was a great  
6 idea.

7 I would propose that, in fact, that you put all of  
8 Yolo County in with part of Sacramento County. And the  
9 reason for this is, particularly the downtown and north  
10 side, is if you do that and you put the urban parts of  
11 Placer County into the metropolitan area, you then get  
12 four districts. These are -- I basically looked at it how  
13 can we keep communities of interest?

14 Basically, urban areas should be whole, ag areas  
15 should be whole, the mountain areas should be whole, and  
16 the coastal areas should be whole, because those are  
17 basically the choices people have made, or have been  
18 forced to make.

19 And there's a way to do this. You can get all of  
20 the -- Solano County, plus Martinez, and what's it called?  
21 Not Napa Crossroads -- I've forgotten the name. American  
22 Canyon and make a district.

23 Okay. This gives the mountain people, you take  
24 out the urban areas out of those mountain regions, but you  
25 need to add in El Dorado Hills. That's basically a

1 suburb, a commuter version.

2 I would like to let the council or the Commission  
3 have the work that I've done and see what you think.

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great. You can certainly  
5 send us anything electronically, we'll be happy to receive  
6 that. Great, thank you.

7 Okay. So, we want to get into the business  
8 meeting right now. Just as a sort of a preview of what  
9 we're trying to cover, what we'll be doing this morning is  
10 covering some essential business items.

11 We, hopefully, will be able to wrap up the  
12 business work before we take a lunch break and we'll have  
13 some time to work with Q2 before lunch. We'll see how  
14 that goes. We'll take a break in a second.

15 But what I would like to mention to the  
16 Commissioners is that -- Ms. Sargis, can you confirm that  
17 the Dean of McGeorge will be --

18 Okay, we do need to -- well, we'll settle that  
19 later, actually.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: At the very  
21 least a group photo is what they would like, even without  
22 the dean.

23 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So, FYI, our very generous  
24 hosts, the McGeorge School of Law, their magazine is sort  
25 of doing a story on us and wanted to a little bit of a



1 photo shoot. And I think we're trying to get a group  
2 photo as well and, hopefully, with the dean.

3 I know it's more casual but, hopefully, you'll  
4 feel comfortable being in a phone. And, again, a minor,  
5 minor thing given the very -- the enormous generosity of  
6 our host here in giving us this space for so many days for  
7 free.

8 Okay, I think I've got a request for a short  
9 break, so we're going to take a very short bathroom break.

10 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Chair, may I just say  
11 something quickly, before we break?

12 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Sure.

13 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: My cell phone inadvertently  
14 went off and I may have disturbed some of my colleagues  
15 around me. I want you to know that was not my intent. It  
16 was a personal call and not redistricting related. Okay,  
17 I just wanted to make that clear as a personal disclosure,  
18 so there's not misunderstanding.

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: No problem. And no apology  
20 is really necessary. Thank you.

21 Okay, so we'll take a short break.

22 (Off the record at 10:33 a.m.)

23 (Reconvene at 10:40 a.m.)

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: All right, well, good  
25 morning folks in cyberspace and others here. We are

1 resuming our meeting.

2 Let's begin with some of the business items. And  
3 I'm going to move one item just -- or switch an item  
4 because Mr. Miller's going to be giving us a presentation  
5 regarding the legal requirements on the schedule, and  
6 visualizations and comments.

7 So, if we can go to the Technical/Outreach  
8 discussion topics, and I think we've got -- either Ms.  
9 DiGuilio can lead, or we've only got a couple items, and  
10 if we can start with the final report item.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Sorry, you wanted to  
12 start with the final report?

13 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah, and then Mr. Miller  
14 will follow with the line-drawing schedule.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, I think all of  
16 you -- I'm going to turn this over to Commissioner Dai in  
17 just a minute. As you know, Commissioner Dai and  
18 Commissioner Barabba have been working on putting some  
19 examples of our final draft report and have been working  
20 with our individual consultants in developing the  
21 different components of the final report.

22 So, I think I'll have, maybe, Commissioner Dai  
23 talk about the specifics of that right now.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, as the -- I think everyone  
25 has received their draft narrative examples, hopefully,

1 reviewed that. And as you know, as we've been going  
2 through each district we're trying to have each of the  
3 Commissioner pairs kind of do the overview of why the  
4 district was formed the way that it was.

5 So, hopefully, everyone can use that as a  
6 template. So, we would like each of the Commissioner  
7 pairs to go ahead and start sooner, the better.  
8 Obviously, some of the districts are more stable than  
9 others, but you can certainly start writing to, you know,  
10 get the architecture for your region.

11 There's going to be some crossover between regions  
12 and that's fine, you can either negotiate with the other  
13 Commissioners who are in your adjacent regions, or you can  
14 both write something up.

15 Vince and I will go ahead and take care of editing  
16 and merging all of this but -- so, the idea is that by the  
17 time we're done with our final maps we will have a draft  
18 from everyone that we will merge into a single document.

19 You also received the first installment from Mr.  
20 Claypool, who did the first section, which is really the  
21 background on the process, how the Commission was chosen.  
22 You know, how it was done in the past versus now.

23 So, hopefully, everyone can take that home as a  
24 little light weekend reading and provide any feedback to  
25 Mr. Claypool. And then we should be getting another

1 installment early next week from Mr. Miller and Mr. Brown  
2 that will be the legal basis for all of our decisions.  
3 They'll go through each of the Constitutional criteria.

4 So, those are the major components of the report  
5 and you all received kind of the timeline for when you're  
6 going to be receiving all of this. And then the whole  
7 Commission will have an opportunity to edit, and weigh in,  
8 and supplement, you know, in early August, after we've had  
9 a chance to merge the document.

10 Commissioner Barabba, do you have anything to add?

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, I was just saying if  
12 anybody's interested in using the population density,  
13 because of the nature of the districts you're dealing  
14 with, I'll send out a report by county with the population  
15 density in it.

16 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Oh, great.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, that is something that  
18 affected our drawing all over the State. You know, one of  
19 the things that have been brought up repeatedly by the  
20 public is why can't you just revert to the 1991 maps?  
21 And, obviously, the population's changed dramatically in  
22 20 years and so that information is probably pretty  
23 helpful. Okay.

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. So, I think Mr.  
25 Miller, are you ready to go ahead with this?

1 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Do I need to put on  
2 my suit coat? I just sent to the Commission a draft  
3 resolution and there are paper copies also available in  
4 the room.

5 This proposed resolution stems from the decision  
6 not to issue an interim set of draft maps. There was  
7 absolutely nothing wrong with that decision.

8 The purpose of this resolution, if the Commission  
9 believes it is useful, is simply to clarify what the  
10 process is, since that was a change in where we started.

11 And to make very clear that the visualizations  
12 that you're working on and that are posted are not to be  
13 considered draft maps in the same way that the statewide  
14 maps that you approved on June 10<sup>th</sup> for comment are maps.

15 The issue is the requirement in the Voters First  
16 Act that any maps be posted for public comment for 14  
17 days. You fully complied with that, obviously, with  
18 respect to the June 10<sup>th</sup> iteration and willfully comply  
19 with that requirement when the next batch of statewide  
20 maps are approved at the end of this month and are  
21 available, again, for public comment for 14 days.

22 So, what this resolution would do is two things.  
23 One, it would clarify and confirm that the visualizations  
24 you're working on between now and the end of the month are  
25 not statewide maps subject to the statute in the same way,

1 and that when the maps are ultimately approved at the end  
2 of the month, those will be posted as required by the  
3 statute.

4           The draft resolution doesn't expressly say this,  
5 but it also contemplates that at the end of the next 14-  
6 day posting and comment period the Commission will return  
7 on, let's say, August 14<sup>th</sup> or August 15<sup>th</sup> and at that time,  
8 having heard the public comment, make the ultimate and  
9 final approval of the maps and forward them at that time  
10 to the Secretary of State for certification.

11           Yes, Commissioner Barabba?

12           COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I wonder if it would be  
13 appropriate, since we've indicated that these  
14 visualizations will be available, if we were more specific  
15 on where people could see them on the statewide database.

16           CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: It would certainly be  
17 appropriate.

18           COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, thank you.

19           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Mr. Miller, I know that  
20 there's some corrections between your electronic copy and  
21 what may have been passed out; you might want to highlight  
22 the corrections on that, because I think folks may be  
23 referring to the written copy over the electronic one.

24           CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes, the changes are  
25 in the third paragraph, it reads better -- beginning in

1 the third line of that paragraph it reads: "Input and data  
2 from the State Databank and adjusted to depict options" --  
3 the word "to" was absent in the written copy.

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Should that be the  
5 Statewide Database so that people --

6 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes, that's another.  
7 Do you have a written copy so we can note these as we go  
8 along? It should say "Statewide Databank" is a good  
9 correction.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So, that would be Statewide  
11 Database.

12 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: And then --

13 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And I believe there's one in  
14 the final paragraph?

15 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes, I'm trying to  
16 get down there.

17 In the final paragraph I've added the words: "Now,  
18 therefore, be it resolved the Commission will vote on" --  
19 and I've called them "preliminary final statewide maps."

20 The reason being -- well, it's self-evident.  
21 Here's the thinking, the statute contemplates that they'll  
22 be available for public viewing and comment for a period  
23 of 14 days. Now, this is a difficult statute to work  
24 with, as you know, because you have really different  
25 provisions and thoughts, apparently, competing between the

1 end process of Proposition 11 and Proposition 20.

2 In the one you had the opportunity for just a  
3 three-day posting, come back, make changes and move on.  
4 That was eliminated in Proposition 20 so that you have  
5 this one -- well, you have the 14-day requirement.

6 I think it would be inconsistent with Proposition  
7 20 to come back, after 14 days, and make substantial  
8 changes and then be out of time for posting.

9 On the other hand, I think we also need to try to  
10 give meaning to the Constitutional language that says  
11 these are going to be posted and public input will be  
12 taken before they become final.

13 My thought about that, for you to consider, is  
14 that leaves us with, perhaps, the opportunity to make  
15 technical changes. For example, let's just hypothesize  
16 that two Senate districts are side by side and we give  
17 them numbers, I'm making this up, 12 and 13. And we get  
18 public comment back at the end of that time that says if  
19 you were to flip these around, that would be in the best  
20 interests of the residents of that district. I think that  
21 would be an example of a technical change that would be  
22 within the spirit of complying with both Propositions 11  
23 and 20.

24 So, I'm just trying to leave you that narrow  
25 amount of flexibility to give the posting and comment



1 period some meaning and for the Commission then to come  
2 back and make its final decision on the maps on about the  
3 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> of August.

4 Commissioner Raya?

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think we've been trying to  
6 convey to the public that our ability to make changes,  
7 substantive changes, between the end of July and August  
8 15<sup>th</sup> is clearly pretty limited.

9 And so I'm wondering if you would advise on the  
10 kind of notice we might want to post on our website, in  
11 the interests of informing the public, some kind of  
12 general direction as to what input. We're certainly not  
13 going to shut down input if there's some major calamity in  
14 those maps, but at the same time people are going to have  
15 to know that at that point saying keep us whole, or I  
16 don't like my neighbors, is just not going to be possible.

17 So, if you have any suggestions in that regard  
18 that Public Information could work with, I'd appreciate  
19 it.

20 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: We would like the  
21 opportunity to work with you and think about what that  
22 language might be.

23 Commissioner Aguirre?

24 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, and certainly because  
25 of the way the language presents itself that we will --

1 the public will be able to continue to provide public  
2 input. But given that there's no real changes that we'll  
3 be able to make, that input becomes part of the record; is  
4 that correct?

5 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: That's a very fair  
6 way to look at that input as well, yes, and certainly is  
7 part of the record.

8 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Any other comments?  
9 Commissioner Yao.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: If we were working to Prop. 11,  
11 alone, I think we probably would have approximately an  
12 extra month with the schedule. But Prop. 20, because of  
13 the Congressional requirement, we end up having to comply  
14 with the August 15 date.

15 Is there any opportunity in the schedule for us to  
16 take advantage of that extra month on the State maps if we  
17 find it advantageous to so do after we have released the  
18 Congressional maps? Is there any language in the Prop. 20  
19 Act that would give us that kind of opportunity, if it  
20 becomes absolutely necessary?

21 I'm not at all promoting to miss the August 15  
22 date, but I'm just looking for your interpretation of  
23 Prop. 20 over Prop. 11.

24 I have always read Prop. 20 to be comprehensive,  
25 if you will, in its intention of scooping up all of the

1 maps but I'll be glad to go back and look at it with your  
2 thought in mind.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. So, I would just note  
4 just a typographical correction. So, I think you've got  
5 10 and 11 listed as the proposition numbers, just to  
6 change those to 11 and 20, if that's not a problem.

7 So, I'll just -- I'll entertain a motion to adopt  
8 the resolution, if someone will make a motion, please?

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: I move that we adopt the  
10 resolution as corrected.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Okay, second.

12 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Is that language sufficient  
14 for adoption?

15 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, that's fine. And who  
17 seconded that?

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I did.

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Barabba is the  
20 second.

21 Okay, any additional discussion?

22 COMMISSIONER RAYA: There are just a few little  
23 cleanups, like that need to be taken care of. They're not  
24 substantive, but please --

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Do you want to identify

1 those, now, just really quickly?

2 COMMISSIONER RAYA: In the third paragraph, well,  
3 there's like an extra comma. I mean I'm talking about  
4 little things like that.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Oh, okay. Yeah, okay.

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: And at the end it says "and  
7 adjusted to depict options."

8 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes. Yeah, that  
9 change is made already.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Oh, is it? Okay. I couldn't  
11 access the electronic version so maybe I'm -- sorry.

12 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. And again, the change  
13 in the last paragraph is "preliminary final statewide  
14 maps," which seems like an oxymoron but, regardless.

15 I once was at a restaurant and someone ordered  
16 farm-raised wild boar. That doesn't seem to make sense.  
17 It reminded me of that occurrence.

18 (Laughter)

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Do we have any public  
20 comment on the motion?

21 Okay, seeing none, why don't we call roll then on  
22 the motion.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Aguirre?

24 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ancheta?

1 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yes.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Barabba?

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Blanco?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Dai?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: DiGuilio?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yep.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Filkins Webber?

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Forbes?

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yep.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Galambos Malloy?

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

16 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ontai?

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yes.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Parvenu?

19 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Raya?

21 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yes.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ward?

23 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yes.

24 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Yao?

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: And the motion  
2 passes.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, very good. We don't  
4 have anything -- and nothing else on Technical at this  
5 point, or Outreach?

6 Okay, let's go to Legal then. Commissioner  
7 Filkins Webber, want to just go through these items?

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: At this time I would  
9 like to hear from our Chief Counsel, again, regarding the  
10 status of our RFA. In particular, I'd like to know when  
11 the deadline is and what results we have received thus  
12 far?

13 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Thank you. The --  
14 we've requested the law firms to respond by Monday of next  
15 week. One -- and I've provided the Legal Advisory  
16 Committee the list of those firms that we've sent it to,  
17 and we have also posted the RFI.

18 Only one has thus far indicated that it will not  
19 respond. Another requested some additional information.  
20 And, essentially, that's where we are in that process.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only other  
22 issues that I had raised, that I think we need to discuss,  
23 is the status of how we had done it previously, with  
24 Gibson Dunn & Crutcher, the Legal Advisory Committee had  
25 taken the responses to the bid for VRA counsel and then

1 narrowed it down, and the conducted interviews and made a  
2 recommendation to the Commission.

3           The process for selection of RFI litigation  
4 counsel I don't believe has been addressed by the  
5 Commission and that's something that we should look into,  
6 given that the deadline is on Monday, and so this  
7 Commission should make decisions in that regard.

8           Do you have a recommendation on the process?

9           CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yes, and I certainly  
10 invite Commissioners Blanco and Forbes to join in the  
11 discussion. In this instance the Commission has requested  
12 those two Commissioners to take the lead in the initial  
13 screening of the responses that we received. And it's  
14 intended that their recommendation would come back to the  
15 full Commission for review.

16           The precise steps between receiving the response,  
17 Commissioner Forbes' and Blanco's review, and the return  
18 to the Commission has not been specified.

19           Commissioners, would you like to weigh in on how  
20 you feel that process should work in between?

21           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Well, I'm trying -- you  
22 know, we're -- part of it's the timing. There was the  
23 process we used -- there are two things to draw upon.  
24 Most recently how we handled our hiring of the -- our  
25 expert for racially polarized voting, where two

1 Commissioners, Ancheta and Filkins Webber, went through  
2 the applications and then made -- interviewed the two of  
3 them, and I think maybe Chief Counsel was involved, I  
4 don't remember, and then made a recommendation to the full  
5 body. That's one process we used.

6 Now, when we did our initial hiring for the VRA  
7 attorney, we had also a screening committee, but we didn't  
8 do it like that. We had the Legal Advisory Committee meet  
9 as a whole and then brought back recommendations to the  
10 full Commission.

11 So, I think that part of the problem here is  
12 timing. We're not in the same position we were in when we  
13 started this process and we hired our VRA counsel, where  
14 we had a full-day meeting of just the Legal Advisory  
15 Committee just to, you know, review applications and then  
16 put forth. And then we had a separate meeting of the  
17 Legal Advisory where we interviewed those people and then  
18 we came to the Commission. So, there were three steps.

19 I don't know that we can do that given the timing.  
20 I think that it is -- it would be -- this doesn't seem to  
21 me to be the same as the racially-polarized voting  
22 analysis where, you know, two Commissioners could just  
23 come and say here's the recommendation for one and just  
24 vote on it. It feels much higher stakes in terms of these  
25 are the -- these are the firms that are going to represent



1 us in our litigation, so I don't think it should be a two-  
2 Commissioner decision. Even if it's a recommendation,  
3 still I feel uncomfortable with that.

4 But partly I think I feel uncomfortable with that  
5 because I think we haven't had a full discussion of what  
6 we're -- we've talked about we want a big firm, we've  
7 talked about Federal and State Supreme Court experience.

8 But one thing that hasn't been discussed, for  
9 example, is in full Commission, which we've discussed in  
10 the smaller -- in the smaller working group, is do we want  
11 two firms as opposed to one firm, and why?

12 And would that be a combination of our existing  
13 firm and a new firm, or two new firms? You know, there's  
14 all these things that we haven't really talked about that  
15 I think make it hard for two of the Commissioners to just  
16 make the -- do the review and come back with a  
17 recommendation.

18 So, that's a long-winded answer, but I think we're  
19 a little short on discussion to get -- even if we were to  
20 agree with the two-Commissioner model, we're a little  
21 short on guidance to those two Commissioners as to what  
22 are the essentials that those two Commissioners should be  
23 looking for.

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Maybe what I could  
25 suggest for this, because we are going to go into closed

1 session tomorrow with Mr. Brown and Dr. Barreto, and I  
2 have allocated sometime after that session if we have to  
3 do some action items. We can certainly start the  
4 discussion in closed session and then if it's, at some  
5 point, necessary to take some action we'll -- we can do  
6 that in open session.

7 So, I think that will cover a lot of the ground  
8 that Commissioner Blanco's discussing.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think Commissioner Blanco  
10 laid out the issues quite well. I think to some degree  
11 it's going to be how many people apply. I mean if we only  
12 have one firm that's interested then, you know, that may  
13 make the choices -- it's a different discussion.

14 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But what are our options  
16 in terms of if whoever, or whatever, or nobody applies,  
17 what are our options if that firm is not acceptable? I  
18 mean this is just -- because, in essence, if we're saying  
19 only one applies, then it has to be default that we give  
20 that to them? I mean I don't particularly -- I'd like to  
21 just know what our options are.

22 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Well, we'll have to discuss  
23 it. I mean at some point we will need to retain counsel.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Of course.

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: That goes without saying,

1    yeah.

2                   COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO:   I'm just wondering if we  
3    have a contingency plan?

4                   CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA:   I don't think we have one at  
5    this point.

6                   COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO:   Okay.

7                   CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA:   As far as I know.

8    Commissioner Filkins Webber, you can expand on that.

9                   COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER:   We have not had a  
10   discussion regarding potential contingency plans primarily  
11   because of, you know, our efforts to draw lines, and  
12   really, actually do that.

13                   And it's really a struggle for us now to have  
14   business discussions over this issue.

15                   I think there are quite a number of considerations  
16   that need to be discussed in closed session and,  
17   obviously, in anticipation of litigation.   So, we can  
18   probably defer the discussion for closed session tomorrow  
19   regarding -- and then, obviously, we can talk further  
20   about the process and the procedure.

21                   So, at this point, those were the two items that I  
22   had for the status of the RFI and, obviously, Item Number  
23   2, consideration of multiple firms.   So, there isn't  
24   anything further from Legal at this point, so I'll just  
25   conclude my discussion, and then we'll likely have to pick

1 it up tomorrow.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao?

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question for the Chair. Do we  
4 have a business discussion opportunity on Saturday, is it  
5 agendized for such?

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Well, I haven't prepared the  
7 detailed one, yet, but the standing agendas allow for  
8 business, so we can incorporate that. Is there something  
9 you wanted to actually --

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: So, I would -- I would suggest  
11 that perhaps if we -- finish is a pretty tough word to  
12 use, but if we've completed the line-drawing session and  
13 have an opportunity, we can initiate the discussion on the  
14 hiring of the law firm without talking about specifics.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Sure. Probably the way to  
16 think is this is under the calendar in unfinished -- any  
17 unfinished business items after we've completed line  
18 drawing and, if we have the time, we'll cover that.

19 Commissioner Galambos Malloy?

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: According to the  
21 communication that you'd sent out to us earlier, I had the  
22 impression that we would be discussing the possibility of  
23 whether we were going to retain Dr. Barreto for additional  
24 work in L.A. County and that we would be -- because of the  
25 time urgency that we would need to begin that discussion

1 today, as opposed to tomorrow.

2 Did I understand that correctly or will we be  
3 doing that tomorrow morning?

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: We're going to -- well, if  
5 we're done with legal, we're going to go into that. But  
6 the answer, the short answer is yes.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We're done with  
8 Legal and then I see Finance coming up next.

9 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. So, I had originally  
10 wanted to do this in the sequence of having a discussion  
11 with Dr. Barreto and then have an action item following  
12 that.

13 Mr. Miller conferred with Commissioner Ontai and  
14 I, in the meeting yesterday, regarding the timing of that,  
15 which is why it's on the agenda today.

16 Now, I'm not entirely comfortable doing it today,  
17 but I think given the timing issue, we can certainly start  
18 a discussion. If there is sufficient support to pass a  
19 motion to grant additional work, we'll have to see about  
20 that.

21 But in any case, to frame the issue Dr. Barreto's  
22 contract contemplated a certain set of -- or a certain  
23 scope of work, which included both targeted work outside  
24 of L.A. County and then work on L.A. County that did not  
25 include the granular sort of analyses for a lot of the

1 districts that we might apply to the ones outside of the  
2 county.

3           And Mr. Brown has recommended that in order to  
4 bolster our evidentiary basis for these districts, should  
5 we choose to draw them, and prepare for potential  
6 litigation, that we ought to have Mr. -- Dr. Barreto  
7 perform some additional work.

8           Now, my understanding from Mr. Brown, and he can  
9 confirm this later, as well, but my understanding from Mr.  
10 Brown is that this work is not necessarily going to change  
11 Mr. Brown's legal opinions or conclusions regarding what  
12 he believes ought to be done, or recommends should be done  
13 in Los Angeles County, or in other parts of the State.

14           It would be primarily to make sure that the  
15 evidentiary basis is stronger for the Commission's  
16 potential defense -- well, one for the record, but two for  
17 the potential defense of any Section 2 litigation. So,  
18 that's primarily the reason for doing it.

19           I did send around -- and it's a one-pager that  
20 sort of describes where the work would be done and it is  
21 primarily in the southwestern and central L.A. County  
22 areas and looking at polarized voting involving multiple  
23 racial and ethnic groups.

24           And the dollar figure that he's quoting is  
25 \$15,000, which would be inclusive of all -- I think all

1 staff or consultant costs, plus overhead expenses.

2 Commissioner Parvenu?

3 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: My concern, my only concern  
4 about this proposal is with both the approach and the  
5 potential outcome of this extended amount of \$15,000 if  
6 the net result will be more of a reinforcement of what has  
7 already been given to us, and not a comprehensive approach  
8 that looks at examples of potential non-racially polarized  
9 voting examples as well, to give us a more comprehensive  
10 view as a result of most recent electoral results showing  
11 examples how, for example, that there were Latinos that  
12 were indeed voted into office with a cross-section of non-  
13 Latino voters, African American, white and Asians. That  
14 would be something to look at.

15 But if it's just to more further entrench us in  
16 this one-sided perspective or angle, I'd be concerned  
17 about us paying additional money to add more reinforcement  
18 for the minimization of litigation risk with regard to  
19 creating new Section 2 districts.

20 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So, several in the  
21 Commissioners in the queue. We'll go Dai, Barabba,  
22 Galambos Malloy, then DiGuilio.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I had a couple -- a  
24 question and then a comment. One is my understanding is  
25 we retained Dr. Barreto on an hourly basis with some

1 targets, so can we assume that he's essentially run out of  
2 the hourly under our original contract amount for what  
3 he's currently worked on? That's the question.

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I can't confirm on that, one  
5 way or the other on that, but Mr. Miller, do you have any  
6 insight on that?

7 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: He has indicated that  
8 that is the case and has completed the assignment he  
9 received. That said, this money would be available  
10 subject to a more thorough vetting of the actual dollars  
11 incurred to date.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. And then I guess my  
13 other comment is, you know, although \$15,000 might not  
14 seem like a lot in a three and a half million, four and a  
15 half million dollar overall budget, we are running into --  
16 we are running into out-of-scope work with some of our  
17 other contracts. And while we have a small contingency, I  
18 think that these are some things to be considered,  
19 especially if it would not actually change -- it would not  
20 actually change, you know, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher's legal  
21 opinion.

22 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Barabba?

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, I would prefer making  
24 a judgment on this after we've had a chance to meet with  
25 Mr. Barreto -- Dr. Barreto, and have him answer some of



1 the questions that have been raised.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner DiGuilio  
3 and then we have -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Galambos  
4 Malloy, then DiGuilio, then Blanco, then Filkins Webber,  
5 and then Yao.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I share similar  
7 concerns to what have been raised in terms of, you know,  
8 what will we be getting for this money. It seems that our  
9 opinion from our Voting Rights Act attorney is fairly  
10 solid and I think without significant tweaking of what the  
11 scope of work for Dr. Barreto is that it's unlikely to  
12 have much influence.

13 I also would like to have more of a perspective  
14 from the Technical Committee, perhaps from Commissioner  
15 DiGuilio, of how any additional work on Mr. Barreto's part  
16 would actually fit into our race against the clock here.

17 My -- the types of things I would want Dr. Barreto  
18 to look at in more detail, quite frankly, we need them  
19 tomorrow. And so, if we are to be able to move forward  
20 with our maps, I'm not sure how this fits in.

21 I feel like what is more needed is for us to have  
22 the time built in, as a Commissioner, to deliberate and  
23 debate both the nuances that are addressed in the memo  
24 from Gibson Dunn, the many issues that are not addressed  
25 in that memo, and what is our scope of comfort in moving

1 forward of how we apply these issues in the Los Angeles  
2 context.

3 Not necessarily that that would be changed  
4 substantially by new information from Dr. Barreto.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio?

6 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah. Well, I think it's  
7 probably clear, if we need to have something done  
8 tomorrow, it's not going to happen. So, I think I don't  
9 have to consult the calendar for that.

10 But I think on the larger issue, I think that's  
11 kind of what the conversation that Commissioner Barabba  
12 and Commissioner Galambos Malloy had also said, that it's  
13 just simply is what -- what will we be getting for this?

14 I think if it's already -- if there's evidence  
15 that there's racially polarized data, and we have that,  
16 and it's our legal opinion's advice, you know, I don't --  
17 maybe this is a discussion for tomorrow about in terms of  
18 even if a little bit exists, are we legally at risk then  
19 because it exists regardless of the context?

20 I mean I'd like to know, and this will be a  
21 discussion for tomorrow is, you know, if the court's say,  
22 you know, you could have ten cases where it doesn't and  
23 two cases where it does, and once you have two game over,  
24 right? Once it exists, it exists.

25 If that's the case, then I feel like do we need to

1 have more done by Mr. Barreto?

2 So, you know, on one hand I hear -- I hear that we  
3 need to do more, to get more level of detail to see if  
4 it's really accurate, but on the other hand, you know, we  
5 have enough already, it's established so we don't need to  
6 go any further.

7 So, I guess maybe it seems like right now, waiting  
8 until tomorrow, since we won't get additional data, we can  
9 have a discussion about this in closed session.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. So, Commissioner  
11 Blanco, Filkins Webber, Yao, and then back to Galambos  
12 Malloy.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, a couple of comments.  
14 One, I think the timing issue kind of may make a lot of  
15 this moot, and to the extent we want to look at more  
16 information for L.A. it's kind of like to what purpose?

17 So, I think it might be fair to say that the best  
18 we can do is discuss this, ask him some questions in our  
19 session with him.

20 I do want to address a couple of things in the way  
21 that people have discussed his report as one-sided, and as  
22 entrenching us in a position. I would completely disagree  
23 with that characterization.

24 Mr. Barreto -- people may not like the results of  
25 what he presented, because it makes them uncomfortable,

1 but it doesn't make it one-sided. He had a methodology.  
2 People might not agree with his methodology, but it  
3 doesn't make it one-sided.

4 He made a decision that primaries are the issue to  
5 look at when you're dealing with elections in Los Angeles  
6 because generals are predominantly Democratic. And so you  
7 have to go beyond the general to the primary and he  
8 presented examples of racially-polarized voting as between  
9 African Americans and Latinos.

10 Now, people may want him to do another analysis  
11 that looks at whether there are instances in primaries  
12 where that hasn't been the case, but that doesn't mean  
13 that what he presented is one-sided.

14 And if we use his analysis, it doesn't mean we're  
15 entrenched in a position, it means that we're going to  
16 take this information into account when we're looking at  
17 this complicated situation.

18 So, I feel that it's important for our sake, as a  
19 Commission going forward, knowing that we will potentially  
20 face litigation, to not characterize this testimony as one  
21 sided or that the Commission's getting entrenched in  
22 something.

23 What we had was a report from an expert that we  
24 commissioned. And if people feel that they want him to  
25 look at something else, then I think that's a different

1 matter.

2 But to say that what he presented is one sided, I  
3 would disagree.

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Filkins  
5 Webber?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'll keep it short  
7 because I think it may just come down to asking Mr.  
8 Barreto as to what further information he hopes to uncover  
9 and analysis to perform.

10 But I would like to just bring the Commission back  
11 several months. I mean we've always talked about whether  
12 there was a necessity to do racially-polarized voting to  
13 begin with. Because, essentially, this is evidence that  
14 is raised by a plaintiff in litigation against the  
15 Commission. And what this Commission has done, with the  
16 exception of a few potentially controversial districts in  
17 South Los Angeles, we've made quite a few decisions just  
18 based on the Gingles requirements that we understood as  
19 far as geographically compact minorities. And, frankly,  
20 we created those districts and now we created them before  
21 we had the analysis, and now we have the analysis to back  
22 it up.

23 But in reality I don't know that there's a  
24 necessity any further for us to incur the cost and the  
25 expense. I do feel that we are on a tight budget. I

1 think that we've been proud in the sense that we've been  
2 able to manage this budget, even though we are looking at  
3 potential augmentations. And this is in the Finance and  
4 Administration portion of this discussion.

5 So, I also am familiar with Mr. Barreto's  
6 background, having looked at his resume and interviewed  
7 him, and looking at of the materials that he's provided us  
8 today I'm not certain that he's going to give us anything.

9 If there's something that's needed to bolster  
10 litigation, you do that after litigation has started, not  
11 now. So, I think that we have sufficient information at  
12 this point and I would like to further explore it with  
13 him, but I would not be inclined to consider an  
14 augmentation on his contract at this point. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Yao and  
16 then Galambos Malloy.

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think my point has already  
18 been previously stated, it's the whole issue is what  
19 problem are we attempting to solve with this additional  
20 contract? I think we need to define that very carefully.

21 Based on what I heard, it doesn't sound like it's  
22 part of our current scope of work in terms of drawing  
23 maps. It may fit into the next phase of our  
24 responsibility, in which case I think there's a separate  
25 budget associated with that.

1           So, merging the two thoughts together,  
2 anticipating the problem and spending our current money  
3 may not fit into our overall scheme of things, so I just  
4 want to remind ourselves what decision we're making, what  
5 problems we're solving and how we should proceed forward  
6 with it.

7           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Galambos  
8 Malloy?

9           COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I just wanted to  
10 say, in reference to Dr. Barreto's report, in relation to  
11 the conclusions that he draws, based on the methodology he  
12 uses, his conclusions make perfect sense to me. I'm not  
13 calling into question his qualifications as a researcher,  
14 nor necessarily the content of what he provided to us. I  
15 think it is certainly an important piece of our context  
16 for understanding the L.A. area and we certainly should  
17 take it into consideration.

18           However, when we look at the memo that Mr. Brown  
19 and Gibson Dunn provided to us, by his own admission, he  
20 acknowledges that it is less than complete, that we're  
21 working against the clock, with limited information and  
22 limited resources.

23           And I think that knowing that, as a Commission,  
24 what I would be interested in, rather than funding Dr.  
25 Barreto to provide additional similar information to

1 confirm the opinion that we have been told will not change  
2 by our VRA attorney, that this is a moment where we could  
3 invite interested members of the public where there are --  
4 if this is an areas that is contested, where there are  
5 competing legal opinions, that now is the moment to submit  
6 any additional information that the Commission should take  
7 into consideration.

8 I think both on our part, as Commissioners, and  
9 directly from Dr. -- from Mr. Brown, he has always  
10 welcomed where we have provided case law or  
11 recommendations on issues that we'd like him to explore.

12 So, I think that would be a better use of our time  
13 and a much less expensive use of our time, given where we  
14 are at in the process.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Mr. Miller, did you  
16 want to add anything? I'm getting a sense from the  
17 Commissioner that either several Commissioners would  
18 either not want to move forward or at least may want to  
19 wait until tomorrow morning to get some more information.  
20 And, again, we could simply calendar it as an action item  
21 or leave it open for an action item tomorrow.

22 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I completely agree  
23 with the Chair's conclusion that any discussion would be  
24 better served after meeting with Professor Barreto.

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, very good. So, let's



1 move on to the next item. Go ahead, Commissioner Dai,  
2 you're on top of this already.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Thank you. So, Item 2 is the  
4 Q2 contract. As you know, Commissioner Galambos Malloy  
5 was the lead for Finance and Administration and for our  
6 last meeting had started to look at some out-of-scope  
7 items for the Q2 contract.

8 So, I just want to remind the Commission of the  
9 contract that we did sign with Q2, for example, it  
10 included 18 public input hearings, with an option for 10.  
11 And as all of you are painfully aware, we did 34.

12 So, there are some obvious issues there, so we are  
13 going to be looking at -- you know, staff will be  
14 reviewing some invoices for work that was out of scope and  
15 bringing that to the Commission to approve.

16 Also, in the contract the contract included ten,  
17 attending ten Commission meetings, so that includes both  
18 line drawing and regional wrap-ups. We've requested Q2's  
19 presence at several business meetings, with an option for  
20 ten. If you are willing to perform math in public on  
21 that, you will also see that we've exceeded that.

22 So, there are a couple of items there I just want  
23 to, you know, give everyone a heads up that we will be  
24 looking at some approvals in the future for that.

25 We do have, if you look at the financial report

1 that Ms. Davis has kindly provided us, we've actually  
2 encumbered \$600,000 for the Q2 contract. The original  
3 contract was, I think, about half-million. So, I mean  
4 there was some expectation that there would be some  
5 overages because this is a first-time process and we  
6 really had no idea, when we started way at the beginning  
7 and had to sign a contract. So, we can up with something  
8 that we thought was reasonable, we added some options.  
9 They clearly weren't enough.

10 So, we have been planning for this and, you know,  
11 I think the contract with DGS has an even higher cap, so  
12 we don't have to go back to the well to redo the contract.  
13 But there will be some overages that the Commission will  
14 have to look at.

15 Would you like to add anything, Mr. Claypool?

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No, other than that  
17 we -- as with all of our contractors, we want to make sure  
18 that when this is over that they're fairly compensated for  
19 what they're doing. And Q2 has done an overwhelming  
20 amount of work for us and so we want to make sure they're  
21 compensated as well.

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, thank you.

23 Yes, questions, Commissioner Filkins Webber?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, I have a  
25 question. Last week, during my brief tenure as Chair,

1 there was an issue that had come up and it was deferred,  
2 wherein we required some additional information from Q2 in  
3 order to analyze potential options.

4 What you've mentioned today, clearly  
5 understandable and outside of contract, and likely outside  
6 of scope and that's understandable.

7 Is there still an expected analysis as to other  
8 augmentations to the contract regarding the public input  
9 and are we still waiting for information to discuss those  
10 options, and will those be brought up at another time?

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: That will come -- yeah, it will  
12 come up together.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: All together?

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, because there were also  
15 issues -- I mean we don't want to go into the details  
16 here, but the contract also envisioned a certain staff  
17 support for the meetings and due to Commission requests  
18 that, you know, there were situations where Ms. MacDonald  
19 had to bring all of her mappers.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So, I guess my point  
21 is that this is still an ongoing issue and we're going to  
22 be -- we're going to look at it in one augmentation, or  
23 will this be piecemeal?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, right now Ms. MacDonald  
25 is submitting invoices. They have to be reviewed by staff

1 and staff will, you know, present an analysis and present  
2 it -- sure, Mr. Claypool?

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: As we're going  
4 through I would envision that we're going to have at least  
5 one sweeping, this is the way everything came down and  
6 this is what we're paying for, what we're not, and so  
7 forth, and we will bring that forward to you.

8 In the meantime as -- if we have smaller --  
9 smaller questions and so forth, like additional staff at  
10 meetings, we will undoubtedly bring that forward just to  
11 make sure that we can keep the invoices flowing and keep  
12 the money flowing.

13 What we don't want to do is hinder, if you will,  
14 the funding of work that's already been performed. So, if  
15 we have a question, I just would put it this way, we may  
16 have a couple of different times when we come to you with  
17 small issues and then in the end we will just resolve the  
18 overall contract.

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Any other questions?  
20 Commissioner Yao?

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'm not interested in getting  
22 into the details, but just as a top-level picture, is it  
23 going to impact our budget that we have today, based on  
24 the contract negotiations that we're talking about?

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: As I mentioned, we've already

1 encumbered 600,000 and the original contract was for about  
2 500,000, so it's already been --

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I heard that, but does  
4 that impact our bottom line number, three and a half  
5 million dollars.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No, and in fact  
7 I'm --

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, that's all I want to  
9 know, thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Any other questions on this  
11 item? Okay, so it's mostly just to make sure the full  
12 Commission's aware that this is going on.

13 And the final item is the August schedule. So, I  
14 know Commissioner Yao, in particular, was hoping to go on  
15 a two-week vacation. That's not going to happen.

16 (Laughter)

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: And it won't happen after  
18 August 15<sup>th</sup>, either. As you know, we have an RFI out for  
19 litigation counsel and the expectation is that --

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: There you go, now you're  
22 thinking.

23 (Laughter)

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Remember, we did sign up for a  
25 ten-year commitment so --

1           So, there are a number of items that have been  
2 deferred and deferred over and over again because,  
3 obviously, we are spending our precious limited time in  
4 the days leading up to August 15<sup>th</sup> to actually get these  
5 maps right.

6           But we owe it to our staff to look at how the  
7 Commission's going to operate moving forward. You know,  
8 we are going to -- you know, like I said, in fairness to  
9 our staff, going to evaluate what kind of staff structure  
10 we need moving forward and, obviously, there have been  
11 numerous other items that have, you know, again been  
12 delayed. We've been getting a lot of public records  
13 requests that probably will continue.

14           So, I know that Commissioner Galambos Malloy had  
15 pleaded with everyone before, but if you can, especially  
16 the leads for the Committees, you know, take 15 minutes of  
17 quality time and look at the Google doc that we're using  
18 to develop agenda items for August so that we can come up  
19 with a schedule, figure out venues, and figure out flights  
20 that actually would allow everyone to make 14-day advance  
21 purchases so we can continue to save money on travel,  
22 which is the only thing that's saving us right now.

23           So, please go ahead and put those items forward.  
24 If you don't, I am certain the chairs of the upcoming  
25 meeting would be happy to populate the agenda for you.

1 So, please provide your input so that we can nail the  
2 schedule for August.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, very good.

4 Before we go to public information I just want to  
5 let the public know, that are sort of waiting to get the  
6 files online, they're now online. So, you can check out  
7 both the Statewide Database and you can also download the  
8 files if you're using some software like Google Earth, or  
9 more advanced software. So, please feel free to do that.

10 So, Public Information.

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, basically, we've been  
12 working on trying to keep the public informed, via the  
13 website, as to the changes following our decision not to  
14 introduce -- or not to issue the second draft map.

15 Going -- we realized, I think even from some of  
16 the testimony we've heard this morning, and I'm sure it's  
17 true, that some people may be having difficulty with the  
18 new system so we're going to try to -- Mr. Wilcox is going  
19 to work with Ms. Shupe to try and get some basic  
20 instruction posted on the website that might help people  
21 use the tools that we're making available, to keep up with  
22 us during the line-drawing process.

23 Mr. Wilcox, anything else?

24 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: I think that's  
25 great and also just working with many of the press and

1 keeping them informed of when the visualizations in their  
2 areas are going up, and letting them know the schedule,  
3 and working with all of those calls.

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Barabba?

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Relative to public  
6 information, I was interviewed a couple of days ago and I  
7 inadvertently misplaced -- I made Yolo County a Section 5  
8 district, rather than Yuba and I wanted to apologize to  
9 Commissioner Forbes and correct the record.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And probably Yolo and a few  
11 other counties as well.

12 Okay, any other public information items?

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I just have maybe a  
14 question for Mr. Wilcox and Commissioner Raya, too. I  
15 know we've been talking a lot in our meetings and trying  
16 to get the word out in terms of, you know, even though  
17 there are no draft maps, but we will have these  
18 visualizations to comment on.

19 But there's also -- I think we heard that this  
20 morning about if you're not watching, sometimes it is hard  
21 to know the changes.

22 But I think, unfortunately, in an ideal world  
23 we've have a better way to let people know what's going  
24 on, but we have to kind of emphasize to people that this  
25 is a moving target, it's happening fast and rapidly. And,



1 unfortunately, someone has to be dedicated to watching  
2 these processes, not just to look at a visualization  
3 because it could change, too.

4           So, I think we not only have to encourage people  
5 to do that, but also to understand the concept of the  
6 process, because it's not fair to get their expectations  
7 to think that they can see something and that's a static  
8 visualization. Again, it really is a moving target.

9           Maybe they have -- we have some great press corps  
10 that will be able to dedicate themselves to watching this  
11 and disseminating the information to California.

12           COMMISSIONER RAYA: Just a brief response to that.  
13 Some of the talking points that you've received in recent  
14 days, I think -- you know, you can read them again and  
15 pull out a couple of things.

16           I did two interviews yesterday and my mantra was  
17 trying to get out, you know, exactly what you're saying.

18           So, I would suggest to all Commissioners, if you  
19 get an interview of any kind to please try to emphasize  
20 first the fact that we are operating in the light of day,  
21 and that it is that ongoing process that is accessible to  
22 the public. And if they need assistance, you know, that  
23 they can go to the website.

24           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so I think  
25 Commissioner Galambos Malloy and then Commissioner Yao had

1 a question or a comment.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I wasn't sure which  
3 committee to bring this up under, but I know that I have  
4 gotten inquiries from friends and colleagues who are  
5 trying to access the maps. And so I think the technology  
6 we're using with the Statewide Database is pretty  
7 revolutionary, but not everybody is up to speed.

8 And I like the way we now have the links on our  
9 home page, right when you pull it up.

10 But what I found helpful was actually the tutorial  
11 that Commissioner Ancheta provided to Commissioners on how  
12 to set up your computer so you can actually view the KMZ  
13 files.

14 So, I don't know if some version of that could be  
15 available or linked to somehow from our home page, because  
16 is someone just tries to click on the statewide database  
17 site and they don't have their system set up, then that  
18 would prohibit their ability to engage.

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And I did suggest to Ms.  
20 Shupe that she might want to do something, take some of  
21 that or develop something, as well, both for Commissioners  
22 and just for the general public, yeah.

23 Okay, then Commissioner Yao.

24 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Yes, I am working  
25 with Ms. Shupe on that, that we can update that.

1           COMMISSIONER YAO: I think the -- I think the  
2 public's need for faster update of what happens on a daily  
3 basis is really important.

4           May I suggest perhaps even using something as  
5 simple as a portable recorder that can be downloaded to a  
6 computer as a file and make that available on the website,  
7 even though it's nowhere close to being a transcript, it's  
8 nowhere -- it doesn't replace the videotape and so on, but  
9 an audio is better than waiting three to five days, or  
10 whatever the period is for the information to show up on  
11 the website.

12           So, if there's a chance that we can discuss this  
13 option of just getting faster information updated onto our  
14 website, I would encourage us to consider it.

15           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Commissioner Raya,  
16 you're sort of on top of that, but I can see people so  
17 I'll let them know when they can speak, but go ahead.

18           COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, go ahead? I'm trying to  
19 pull it up right now, but I know we did get a public  
20 comment I think suggesting that we try to use how we used  
21 to do our -- or we've done our, you know, end-of-the day  
22 summaries. I'm not exactly sure how we could do it with  
23 respect to the maps but, you know, there might be some  
24 kind of summary that we could post, which would at least  
25 give a little bit of direction until people are able to

1 access all the visuals.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so Commissioner Dai  
3 was -- oh, was that it? Okay.

4 Ms. MacDonald, did you want to chime in here?

5 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify  
6 that, actually, the files for download have been available  
7 since last night. It was basically the visualizations on  
8 the Statewide Database website that have not been uploaded  
9 and that is there is some lag time every -- every file  
10 takes about two hours to process before it can go into  
11 that engine

12 So, basically, they're now up with the exception  
13 of one file, which is the Senate L.A. file that we're  
14 still working on, so the other ones are on.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, and we'll make that a  
16 lower priority, obviously.

17 MS. MAC DONALD: Correct, and so we actually --

18 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: For our discussion, I mean.

19 MS. MAC DONALD: And then, also, we actually have  
20 two set of instructions. We have one set of instructions  
21 that you came up and then we had another one that we came  
22 up with, so there's already significant document that  
23 could be worked into something, I think.

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah, and we can get --  
25 staff can kind of compile those.

1 Commissioner Galambos Malloy?

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm really  
3 interested in Commissioner Raya's suggestion around having  
4 some sort of summary available. I have also been  
5 considering the very high level summaries that Mr. Wilcox  
6 had been providing at the end of our meetings, those are  
7 things that I receive via e-mail because I'm subscribed to  
8 our interested parties list.

9 But I think the level of interest from the traffic  
10 on the website vastly exceeds the number of people who are  
11 actually signed up for that list.

12 So, I was wondering if that was something to be  
13 feasible to both expand the content of what's in the  
14 summaries and to have them archived somewhere simple on  
15 the website so someone could -- you know, so they live on  
16 beyond just the folks who are receiving them via e-mail.

17 So, you know, something to consider.

18 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

19 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Yes, and they are  
20 archived under -- under the press releases, and we might  
21 be able to come up with a way to just have something for  
22 meeting summaries.

23 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, anything else on  
25 Public Information at this point?

1           Okay, so maybe, Mr. Claypool, if you have a report  
2 or some additional staff reports?

3           EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Just a very brief  
4 report. I wanted to let you know that while you are  
5 working on this we're trying to keep moving you forward in  
6 other arenas.

7           I'm working on a staffing plan right now for the  
8 next fiscal year, that as soon as you are free from your  
9 line-drawing duties we can, hopefully, go over very  
10 quickly.

11           We have a meeting planned with the Department of  
12 Finance to discuss the funding mechanisms for when we move  
13 forward into the next fiscal year.

14           This was -- actually, we had had a discussion with  
15 the legislative staff that have been assisting us, and so  
16 we're working between the three groups to kind of  
17 facilitate that process.

18           We're also drafting a letter of justification to  
19 release the \$1.5 million in provisional language for this  
20 current fiscal year and we will be running that through  
21 the lead of the Finance and Administration Advisory  
22 Committee.

23           We're contemplating language for the supplemental  
24 appropriations that we would expect we would need if the  
25 \$1.5 million is not sufficient to cover our expenses in

1 the fiscal year.

2           And then staff have just been doing all the things  
3 that staff do for you. And our contracting, we continue  
4 to look at the different invoices that come in and we held  
5 a successful negotiation with our videography, everyone  
6 was pleased with the outcome, and so that's concluded.

7           Our budgets, Ms. Davis is already starting on the  
8 next budget that rolls around, we're in that budget cycle.  
9 And she and Lisa Halderman continue to work on your per  
10 diems, and your TECs and the invoices against the  
11 encumbrances that we have, and then there's always the  
12 preparation for the business report that they gave you.

13           Kirk has given you some idea of the many things  
14 that he's working on. He's also heavily involved with the  
15 review of our agendas and Commission documents presented  
16 to the public and review, and approving all of the  
17 documents that are on the Commission's website.

18           I think often we forget that we lean on him  
19 heavily for that, in addition to his oversight of our VRA  
20 and our PVA contracts.

21           And, finally, I think that you all know how  
22 much -- how much Christina Shupe and her group are doing  
23 for you. We've had over 20,000 written comments.

24           I want to just tell you that they completed the  
25 processing of the backlogged documents about four days

1 earlier than we had anticipated, they're doing amazing  
2 work in there. We just keep the door shut.

3 And our field staff, Janeece and Lon, you see what  
4 they do for you ever day, and Rob's given his summary, and  
5 he's a great guy. So, that's all we have.

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, any questions for Mr.  
7 Claypool? Okay, very good.

8 Let me just, for scheduling purposes, how many  
9 individuals were planning to give us some additional  
10 public comments before we take lunch? So, just one, two,  
11 three. So, we'll probably be taking a -- we'll allow  
12 until around 12:30 or so I think is -- or thereabouts  
13 works.

14 Okay, before we launch in, we do want to move  
15 things along and try to keep a timely set of discussions  
16 going but, obviously, there are some -- as we know, some  
17 difficult and challenging areas of Southern California  
18 that we're going to have to go through.

19 Let me sort of poll the Commissioners right now so  
20 we can identify what I think are probably the clearer --  
21 or we know some are -- we've already been talking about  
22 some of them, but if there are some particular problem  
23 spots that we want to have -- we'll have to go through, I  
24 want to gauge that and see how we're allocating over the  
25 next few hours and then going into tomorrow and,



1 obviously, part of Saturday.

2 We certainly have the southwest, south central at  
3 the Congressional and I think at the State level as well,  
4 so that is one.

5 Others that folks want to raise?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes. Last week we  
7 did not have solutions as to Orange County, particularly  
8 the Senate district. As you recall, we had a significant  
9 over-population and a lot of that was dependent on Los  
10 Angeles.

11 We also did not have final visualizations on the  
12 Congressional districts in Orange County and we had  
13 provided some directions in that regard.

14 I just checked the Statewide Database and I don't  
15 see any Congressional districts for Orange County, so I  
16 don't know if we were going to get into them today, at  
17 least it's not on the list.

18 I see Assembly SoCal, Senate SoCal, but I don't  
19 see any Congress for Southern California, so that might be  
20 an area for region three and region two. And so those  
21 were the primary areas I recall from last week, as being  
22 chair, that we did not have any visualizations to work  
23 from, so I can see that that will be also some significant  
24 discussion on those areas, as well.

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, other Commissioners?

1 Commissioner Blanco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That's the same concern I  
3 have is the Orange County Congressional districts, we need  
4 to spend some time on those.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't know if it's going  
7 to be today or tomorrow, but we need to spend time.

8 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Other questions, or  
9 issues, or concerns? Again, they're -- not that we're --  
10 I'm not necessarily postponing the hard ones, I'm trying  
11 to figure out where they might best go.

12 Because one strategy is sort of hit the less  
13 controversial ones, first, and then go -- but, obviously,  
14 we have to go through the whole thing at some point, so  
15 it's not as if we can avoid the issues.

16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think it's probably sort of  
17 like one big, huge thing, right? We've had a substantial  
18 amount of public comment on the South Bay via e-mail.

19 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And I guess one  
21 other, we've had a substantial amount of public comment  
22 and as well as visitors yesterday, on Imperial County at  
23 the AD level, so we'll need to discuss that, briefly,  
24 again.

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Certainly. Okay, so maybe

1 just to confirm, because we want to make sure that it  
2 aligns with what the public has access to. So, if certain  
3 things aren't quite up, yet, maybe we should confirm that  
4 we can work with what is up and clearly available to the  
5 public, that's -- that there aren't any gaps in terms of  
6 what we might be looking at on screen and what the public  
7 would have access to.

8 MS. MAC DONALD: If that's okay, we could start  
9 with the ADs. I know the Congress is ready to go, I think  
10 they're just in the process of still uploading it.

11 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so why don't we do  
12 that, then. And we're going to go for about 45 minutes or  
13 so, now, so why don't we start with the Assembly  
14 districts.

15 MS. MAC DONALD: So, ADSOCAL, would that be  
16 acceptable?

17 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah.

18 MS. MAC DONALD: For SoCal there actually is only  
19 one option, I'm sorry.

20 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so for those of you  
21 online, I think we're going to go -- if you're using the  
22 interactive tool on the Statewide Database, this would be  
23 the -- I'm hoping I'm doing this correctly, it's the July  
24 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011, 3:48 p.m. Assembly SoCal file.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: There's a file dated July 14,

1 2011 on the wedrawtheline website. Is that the same file  
2 or is that a late file?

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I think for downloadable  
4 purposes I think that's the same file. If you're using  
5 the interactive tool, it's Assembly SoCal, but I haven't  
6 looked at our website quite yet.

7 And again, for those of you who are online, we'll  
8 try to post something very soon regarding an alternative  
9 version. Which is if you wanted to use Google Earth,  
10 which is a free program and you want to download that and  
11 up -- and then you can use the KMZ files, which are  
12 available at the Commission's website, and you can  
13 download those into Google Earth and run it as a layer.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I looked -- I was  
15 assuming that what was on our website at the KMZ files  
16 would be the same as what's on the Statewide, but I only  
17 saw the Nor Cal KMZ files on the Statewide Database,  
18 still, so unless it's in a different location?

19 MS. MAC DONALD: No, I think, maybe try to refresh  
20 the browser.

21 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, like within the  
23 last five minutes or --

24 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, they're --

25 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah, some of those are just

1 coming on. So, I think just for those at home, who may  
2 encounter the same problem, if you refresh, or you can  
3 either close and reopen your browser, or refresh the  
4 screen, the update links should appear and you should be  
5 able to access those files.

6 I might get a job as a tech consultant.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Hey, I didn't get paid so you  
8 don't get paid, either.

9 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. And, again, just as a  
11 reminder of what the process will be, because we are still  
12 trying to document these, as we'll go through each  
13 district, the mappers will certainly highlight what's  
14 contained in the district. But we do want the two  
15 Commissioners, who were sort of the team lead for each of  
16 the regions, to provide some narrative to describe the  
17 district.

18 MS. MAC DONALD: Okay. So, we're going to start  
19 at the MISBK district and then we're going to rotate  
20 through.

21 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Chair?

22 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Parvenu?

23 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Is this an opportunity for  
24 us to look at fine-tune street level detail or should we  
25 wait with that until later, for further refinements.

1           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I would try not to do that  
2 in open session. Obviously, there are a number of areas  
3 where the borders are very important.

4           What I would recommend, certainly, and this is for  
5 all the Commissioners and as well as the public, is try to  
6 use the mapping tools to get down to that level and then  
7 if you have specific concerns, as they come up in the  
8 session, to raise them.

9           But I think, generally, we don't want to sort of  
10 have the mappers go looking at streets during session  
11 because it is fairly time consuming.

12           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay.

13           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: But, certainly, given the  
14 tools to try to get those looked at in advance and then  
15 raise the issue as we get to the district as a whole.

16           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Very good.

17           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: And again, we're trying to  
18 save the sessions for next week for sort of the much more  
19 specific modifications at that level.

20           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you.

21           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Go ahead.

22           MS. WOODS: So, I just wanted to point for the  
23 SoCal districts, the districts may not have been renamed  
24 so, you know, this district originally included Mono and  
25 Inyo and might still have some of those letters as

1 district identifiers.

2 So, this includes most of the County of San  
3 Bernardino, including the mountain communities. It does  
4 not include 29 Palms, Joshua Tree, Yucca Valley, but it  
5 does include Big Bear and Hesperia, Victor Valley,  
6 Victorville, Apple Valley. And it does include Crestline.

7 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I'm sorry, I don't have my  
8 list in front of me, which Commissioners were -- this was  
9 Commissioners Dai and Filkins Webber?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. So, I think she did a  
11 good job of explaining that. Based on public testimony,  
12 Mono preferred to be with the Foothills district, so we  
13 were able to do that at the Assembly level, so this keeps  
14 kind of the high desert and mountain communities together.

15 Originally, Crestline had been split off, we were  
16 able to keep them back in the district and keep the whole  
17 Big Bear area together.

18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This also is  
19 consistent with the Victor Valley community of interest in  
20 the high desert, also consistent with respecting the San  
21 Bernardino County lines at the top as well.

22 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Any further questions or  
23 comments? Okay, very good.

24 MS. WOODS: The next district we'll look at is the  
25 Pomona Valley district, which has still remained

1 unchanged.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: And as you can see by the  
3 numbers this does happen to be a Section 2 district,  
4 however, it was supported very strongly by community of  
5 interest testimony that put Pomona, which is actually in  
6 L.A., but surrounded by mountains, that they had a strong  
7 community of interest to the cities to its east, in San  
8 Bernardino County. So, we put them together and it also  
9 turns out to be a Section 2 district.

10 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, very good. The next?

11 MS. WOODS: The next district is RLTF0. It  
12 includes Fontana, Bloomington, Colton, San Bernardino,  
13 Rialto, and the unincorporated part of Rialto. It also  
14 includes Grand Terrace. And this is similar to what  
15 you've seen before.

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: This was supported by a lot of  
17 testimony from the Inland Empire African American  
18 Redistricting Coalition, about an Ebony Triangle, so we  
19 were able to keep that community, preserve that community.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It was also  
21 consistent with the community of interest testimony, so it  
22 wasn't just a -- their input was very helpful in making  
23 sure Rialto and the unincorporated areas of Rialto were  
24 whole, but also recognizing as well as my familiarity with  
25 the area, as well as Commissioner Galambos Malloy's input,



1 significantly due to her knowledge of this area of  
2 Bloomington, Colton, Grand Terrace, Fontana, just all  
3 those communities running together into the core of San  
4 Bernardino, and, also, taking a look at those  
5 transportation corridors which assist many citizens in  
6 this area as well.

7           And this has been a consistent district that we've  
8 had I believe since even pre-draft map stage, and we have  
9 consistently received wonderful comments from the citizens  
10 in this area regarding this district.

11           VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Commissioner DiGuilio?

12           COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I believe, just to  
13 refresh your memory, too, originally we had tried to keep  
14 that whole triangle, but then we actually got permission  
15 to take the yellow out by the African American community  
16 because it didn't necessarily match, and so it helped us  
17 to keep a more intact district without going into other  
18 places.

19           VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Commissioner Parvenu?

20           COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I just want to say with the  
21 City of San Bernardino it's -- although the city, itself,  
22 is split, it's not an entirely disruptive split. I think  
23 it was done as gingerly as possible so as not to really  
24 split the lower-income community that's north and south of  
25 that purple district line right there. So, if it had to

1 be split, I think it was split at an appropriate location.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Very good. Any others?

3 Okay, let's go to the next.

4 MS. WOODS: The next district is SBCUC and this  
5 district includes the other portion of San Bernardino,  
6 Highland, Redlands, Rancho Cucamonga, Lytle Creek, and the  
7 area of the San Bernardino Forest above Rancho Cucamonga.

8 And it also includes -- it actually splits the  
9 Census place of Mentone and that was done to insure  
10 Redlands was intact.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, this is the San Bernardino  
12 Valley, it respects the community of interest between Loma  
13 Linda, Redlands, Highland and San Bernardino. We did  
14 receive some public testimony about school districts  
15 there.

16 It, of course, also puts -- puts this with Rancho  
17 Cucamonga. We understand there's probably not much of a  
18 community of interest there. This was constrained by some  
19 of the districts coming out of L.A. We did put Rancho  
20 Cucamonga with the foothills, consistent with our policy  
21 to try to match users of open space with the open space.  
22 And that's --

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Actually, what we  
24 heard this morning, as well, and that might have been from  
25 an earlier visualization that -- two things, there was two

1 concerns. They did not want Rancho Cucamonga to be with  
2 Los Angeles County, they wanted it to be in San  
3 Bernardino. And so we are trying and we made the changes  
4 here to include Rancho Cucamonga.

5 So, I do believe that this would be more supported  
6 by the recent testimony that we received to add Rancho  
7 Cucamonga into the San Bernardino County district.

8 One recommendation we may wish to consider is that  
9 another gentleman that spoke this morning recognized  
10 Commissioner Yao's familiarity with the area, as well as  
11 mine, regarding the potential split for Rancho Cucamonga.  
12 And the proposed map and new boundaries that we received  
13 just this morning we may wish to take a look at because  
14 this particular public comment that we received recognized  
15 the debate and the difficulty we had with Cucamonga.  
16 That, again, it comes down to population.

17 And so there may -- and we've had to struggle with  
18 these splits regarding cities, previously, and it appears  
19 that Rancho Cucamonga may need to be split here. So, this  
20 may be the less intrusive split and maybe consistent with  
21 my understanding of the area and would likely be  
22 consistent with the community of interest testimony, so we  
23 can take a look at those details later on.

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Is it split? It's not split in  
25 this, is it?

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, it is.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: What's that full outline of the  
4 city?

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The little white  
6 square that goes over the top is Rancho Cucamonga as well,  
7 but she can highlight it.

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: It's approximately 20 to 25  
9 thousand people in that white block there.

10 And also, the speaker from this morning suggests  
11 that the population should be in the lower half of Rancho  
12 Cucamonga, as compared to above Foothill, which is what  
13 Commissioner -- what we have proposed much earlier.

14 So, I'll look at it in greater detail and I'll  
15 give some feedback offline to Q2, before we look at it in  
16 greater detail the next week.

17 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: But the positive thing is the  
19 bulk of Rancho Cucamonga is in the San Bernardino County  
20 district and that, above all, is most important to them.  
21 So, we're able to accommodate them in the Assembly map.

22 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, the next district.

23 MS. WOODS: The next district is RIVJU, and this  
24 includes the Jurupa Valley, part of the City of Riverside,  
25 Eastvale, Corona, Norco, El Cerrito.

1           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This particular  
2 district, again, was configured just shortly prior to our  
3 draft map. We produced our draft map and the only  
4 difference that we have is maybe Perris but, again, I  
5 don't remember what level that was at, but we have  
6 corrected for that.

7           And what we have consistently received from the  
8 citizens of Riverside County for this area essentially  
9 have been kudos. They recognize that we put together the  
10 Good Hope area, Perris, Moreno Valley, recognizing also  
11 Mead Valley, their relationship with the Joint Powers  
12 Agreement that they have over March Air Force Base, which  
13 is included in here as well, and Riverside.

14           And speaking of the individuals that came before  
15 us, in San Bernardino, I'd ask specifically, recognizing  
16 that Riverside is a very large city, if they concur with  
17 the population split and where we split Riverside. They  
18 recognized the large city and that it would be difficult  
19 to abide by the community of interest with Perris if we  
20 were to put Moreno Valley and Riverside together.

21           So, they appreciated the split, the split is safe  
22 in the sense that it goes down a river and separates two  
23 distinct communities of Rubidoux and Riverside.

24           So, overall, this appears to be consistent with  
25 the testimony we have received from the citizens in that

1 area.

2 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Any other comments?

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, I spoke about  
4 the wrong one, I spoke about Metro, didn't I?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, you did.

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: I was wondering about that.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: RIVJU puts the rural areas  
8 together.

9 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Now, let's go to my  
11 home.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: The equestrian, RIVJU.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I was talking about  
14 NORCO.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Now, we can get to  
17 NORCO. Sorry, I mixed them up.

18 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So that was MTRNV.

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That was MTRNV.

20 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: RIVJU, yes,  
22 disclosure, I do live -- Norco's in this district, I do  
23 live in this district. I also went to high school in this  
24 proposed district, technically, so I've been there quite  
25 some time.

1           Again, it's consistent with the testimony that we  
2 received from the new City of Jurupa Valley, which we're  
3 very proud of them, which is the Pedley, Glen, Avon, keeps  
4 that city together.

5           Also, the second newest city in California, which  
6 is Eastvale and keeps them whole as well.

7           And we received testimony at the Norco hearing  
8 that respects the interests of Norco/Corona area; they  
9 have a close relationship and recognizing, for population  
10 purposes, the split of Riverside. So, it looks good and  
11 we haven't received any negative comments on this  
12 district, either, from any citizens that I'm aware of to  
13 date.

14           COMMISSIONER DAI: And you forgot to mention the  
15 equestrian lifestyle.

16           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, there is an  
17 equestrian lifestyle in Jurupa Valley and Norco, primarily  
18 so.

19           COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And by the way, where  
20 have you not lived?

21           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have a long  
22 history.

23           COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Apparently so.

24           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Well, maybe we could sneak  
25 horse town into the report at some point.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Horse Town, USA,  
2 they'll be proud that I said that.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: There you go. Commissioner  
4 Galambos Malloy.

5 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Just so it doesn't  
6 appear that Commissioner Filkins Webber has drawn her own  
7 districts here, I also lived in this area for many years,  
8 went to college there, at La Sierra University, and  
9 this -- these districts are really solid in reflecting  
10 both the public comment that we have received in person,  
11 and written, and also my understanding of how the area  
12 really functions.

13 I like the grouping of having some of the smaller,  
14 more quasi-rural towns together and having them in a block  
15 where they essentially are a significant portion of the  
16 district, as well as having the balance of Corona, which  
17 is a larger city within the district.

18 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Any other comments?

19 I did want to note the deviation is a little  
20 closer to our limit but, certainly, if it's done to  
21 maintain the integrity of the cities or the Census places,  
22 that's fine.

23 Okay, next.

24 MS. WOODS: The next district is BBCOH and this is  
25 the district that starts in San Bernardino County, with 29



1 Palms. Joshua Tree, Yucca Valley, Morongo Valley, and it  
2 moves south into Riverside County and it includes  
3 Calimesa, Cherry Valley, Beaumont, Banning, Cabazon, and  
4 the western portion of Palm Springs.

5 It does split San Jacinto from Hemet or Hemet is  
6 split in this configuration. It also includes Yucaipa and  
7 Oak Glen and, again, this Census place of Mentone is  
8 split.

9 And these are the eastern boundaries in Riverside  
10 County. And I believe La Quinta is split in this  
11 configuration.

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: By how much?

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: It doesn't look split.

14 MS. WOODS: So you can see this is the portion  
15 that's split, and we can look that number up.

16 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And can you  
17 clarify, you mentioned the split, I thought I heard you  
18 say that Hemet, the City of Hemet was split but that,  
19 also, that you had split Hemet off from San Jacinto, is  
20 that true?

21 MS. WOODS: Yes. So, part of Hemet is in this  
22 district, BBCOH, and the other portion is in MGO -- MGOBN.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: It looks like you're under-  
24 populated, is that right?

25 MS. WOODS: In MGBON?

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah.

2 MS. WOODS: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I guess I'm just a  
4 little -- I'm just wondering if there are any options here  
5 for a little -- for such a small community. Is it split  
6 into just -- is it just two districts?

7 MS. WOODS: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It's not the third, okay.  
9 I mean it's still little but --

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: One thing to keep in  
11 mind is that the smaller portion is with San Jacinto,  
12 which is a community that wanted to be with Hemet. So, I  
13 do think we need to get into some other larger discussions  
14 that affect this region, but just on this point, alone, if  
15 they have to be separated -- in one sense part of Hemet is  
16 with San Jacinto, which is a larger populated city in this  
17 particular district, even though they might be competing a  
18 little bit with Palm Springs.

19 The other part is also in a district that is  
20 closely aligned to their community of interest in that  
21 valley, in the agricultural area. So, even though they're  
22 split, both sides of this district likely recognizes their  
23 importance on both districts.

24 I haven't really seen this before, actually, but I  
25 think equally their interests would be aligned on both

1 sides of that district.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: If I'm reading our  
3 deviation correctly, though, wouldn't we have the  
4 opportunity to bring more of that Hemet, the split Hemet  
5 population down into that southern district?

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I missed the number,  
7 so I wasn't sure what you --

8 MS. WOODS: They're both under-populated so --

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Oh, I didn't see  
10 the top one.

11 MS. WOODS: And I think that there's a significant  
12 population that's in MGOBN

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: But in La Quinta? It seems  
14 like that will be small.

15 MS. WOODS: I think -- I think that's something we  
16 can look into since it is currently over-populated, or by  
17 three.

18 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Yao.

19 COMMISSIONER YAO: If we move up to the Desert Hot  
20 Springs, there appears to be either a hook or a finger  
21 pointing to the west side. Is that simply the city line  
22 or is that --

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Desert Hot Springs is a Census  
24 place, it's not a city.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay. When I expanded the

1 Google map it doesn't appear to be any people living in  
2 that entire finger. Is there any reason why that finger  
3 is drawn the way it is? Not this one, but the one where  
4 the label is, yeah, on top.

5 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: It's the one that's next to  
6 Whitewater. I'm sorry, did you catch that? You may have  
7 missed that. So, Commissioner Yao is pointing at the  
8 finger incursion into the blue going into the yellow,  
9 right underneath the label.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Not the one that you're --

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: Desert Hot Springs.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: The one on the opposite side of  
13 the screen. Yeah, this one right here.

14 MS. WOODS: I think for population reasons and to  
15 no split any of these other cities, this was included in  
16 the Coachella/Imperial District.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, let's --

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: So, that is a city or a city  
19 line, or a neighborhood line, that hook right there?

20 MS. WOODS: Yes. Yes, it is.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: It was split earlier and it  
23 appears to have been made whole.

24 So, this keeps the desert together. It also  
25 includes the Beaumont and Banning area, and not quite all

1 of San Jacinto Valley.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This does lead to a  
3 greater concern that has been raised by recent public  
4 comments. What you see on the eastern portion of this  
5 district is Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert,  
6 Indian Wells.

7 Yesterday, we received public comment from several  
8 city members, the Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Indio.  
9 We've also received written comments from the Mayor of the  
10 City of Desert Hot Springs. Also, from council people  
11 from Desert Hot Springs. The mayor of Cathedral City,  
12 former mayor of the City of Coachella, the mayor of Indio,  
13 which is a chair of an Imperial County district, also,  
14 and city council members from the City of La Quinta. Just  
15 to name a few, not to mention all of the other members of  
16 the public that have expressed concern regarding the split  
17 of the Coachella Valley, which also leads into the  
18 discussion of the COACH district, which is to the blue --  
19 to the east, in the blue area.

20 I think the Commission, as we have done yesterday,  
21 has to recognize the significant magnitude of the number  
22 of comments that we have received and the concern of the  
23 Coachella Valley being split and put with Imperial County.

24 In particular, these council members and mayors  
25 represent, obviously, the citizens. They were voted into

1 office to represent these citizens in this area.

2 And I also share their concern and have, as of the  
3 last couple of weeks when we've discussed this district.

4 The Coachella Valley does have a distinct  
5 community of interest in regard to tourism. Their  
6 ethnicity, their education, their income levels, common  
7 medical facilities, just to name a few, as well as the  
8 tourist destination.

9 They have been combined with Imperial County in  
10 the past and one thing that they were asking for in this  
11 redistricting process is to recognize that the County of  
12 Riverside did have a 40 percent increase in population  
13 and, as such, this Assembly district to combine and keep  
14 Coachella whole was an opportunity for them to stay whole  
15 and have a combined voice among all of these cities.

16 The only community of interest that is linking  
17 Imperial County with Riverside County is the contention of  
18 the similarity between agriculture, and we've discussed  
19 this before. The primary economic component of Imperial  
20 County is agriculture, as well as the geothermal aspect,  
21 of which they've gotten into some contracts with.

22 The Imperial County Economic Partnership actually  
23 linked with the San Diego Economic Development  
24 organization primarily because of the distinct difference  
25 in the economic interests of geothermal energy in Imperial

1 County in comparison to the Coachella Valley Economic  
2 Partnership. And I studied this two weeks ago and it's  
3 confirmed by the mayor of cathedral city who's very  
4 concerned as having been separated from Coachella Valley  
5 in this COACH district.

6 As such, Imperial specifically did not want to be  
7 with Coachella Valley because they have a distinct  
8 difference in their economic interests in dealing with the  
9 natural resources of this area. In particular, Imperial  
10 is selling their geothermal energy to Arizona, as well as  
11 to San Diego and there's a strong economic interest that  
12 goes between Imperial and San Diego Counties. And that  
13 interest is distinctly different from the interests of  
14 Coachella Valley and their Economic Partnership that  
15 they've been working on in this area.

16 So, the only reason that we combined these areas  
17 were several citizens testifying to the agricultural  
18 nature of Mecca, Thermal area on the northern part of the  
19 Salton Sea, in comparison to a 100-mile-away agricultural  
20 area.

21 We've also heard testimony of migrant workers that  
22 work in the agricultural areas of the South Salton Sea  
23 area of Imperial County, or even reside in Mexico and go  
24 up over the border, and then travel up to Coachella. And  
25 we received that written comment in San Diego.

1           One other thing we should mention is that the  
2 board of supervisors for the County of Imperial submitted  
3 documents to us while in San Diego, and also pointed out  
4 in his materials that the U.S. Department of Commerce  
5 recently designated the San Diego/Imperial/Baja California  
6 area as an economic "mega region" because of the mutual  
7 dependency of these areas for economic development. That  
8 did not include Riverside County.

9           And this is from the County of Imperial Board of  
10 Supervisors.

11           So, I'm inclined, in looking at all of this  
12 material to suggest, in accordance with our first draft  
13 map, to consider the possibility of reverting this  
14 district back to the first draft map and keeping Coachella  
15 Valley whole.

16           COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I will note that there was  
17 a lot of conflicting testimony and we've often seen  
18 situations where the testimony from the citizens differ  
19 from the local elected officials.

20           I, you know, personally would say it was about  
21 50/50. I think there are compelling arguments on both  
22 sides, which is why this is the one incarnation where we  
23 recognize Eastern Coachella with Imperial. We have  
24 maintained them as whole, both in the Senate and in  
25 Congressional districts.



1           So, I think that's the way that the Commission can  
2 recognize basically conflicting communities of interest.

3           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner DiGuilio.

4           COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, I mean again, I  
5 think we have revisited this. And there are -- there are  
6 very compelling COIs on both sides, it's not as if there's  
7 one dominating the other. And I think we very much  
8 understand the issues but, as we've heard in other places,  
9 this is really a tale of two valleys. There are some  
10 differences here, there are some very different -- you  
11 know, there's a side that's agriculture, there's a side  
12 that's tourist based. I mean there are some differences.

13           And we went through this last week and we also  
14 looked at the option of what would happen -- it's not just  
15 about this area, it's about the repercussions beyond that  
16 as well, too, and we explored keeping Coachella Valley  
17 whole in the Assembly.

18           And, again, those ripple effects went all the way  
19 through San Diego and up to Orange. It was a choice that  
20 we made having gone through all of the consideration last  
21 week. And I don't want it to sound like it's a default; I  
22 think we saw a lot of links between Imperial and Eastern  
23 Coachella.

24           And, again, for this area it's whole in the  
25 Senate, it's whole in the Congressional and I think this

1 is an example of the balancing act that we, as a  
2 Commission, do throughout the whole State. There are many  
3 places that are geographically close that have to have  
4 been broken up. It's just -- it's one of these balancing  
5 acts we have to do.

6 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Galambos  
7 Malloy.

8 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. I know this  
9 is one of the areas of the State that has generated the  
10 most lively conversation, I think, because we've had very  
11 conflicting and compelling COI on both sides of the aisle  
12 in terms of which direction to link up.

13 I certainly did not leave our decisions around  
14 these districts with the impression that we only had one  
15 basis on which to draw this type of district.

16 I know that agriculture had been one of the  
17 compelling arguments, but we have heard a number of issues  
18 raised, such as the fact that both Imperial and Coachella  
19 are connected because of their desert climate, they have a  
20 common water district, they have the issues around the  
21 Salton Sea.

22 Interestingly, although tourism has been raised as  
23 one of the key arguments on why to keep the Coachella  
24 Valley whole, we also heard from Imperial and Coachella  
25 that they both share tourism as well. So, there's

1 actually a tourism industry in Imperial that I think we  
2 have heard about, not to the extent that we've heard about  
3 it in Coachella, but it is significant.

4           There were some issues around green energy, a  
5 common utility district between Imperial and Coachella.  
6 And so, while I agree there's competing COI, I felt like  
7 we had enough information to support the configuration we  
8 landed on last time, that I feel comfortable moving  
9 forward with what we have as opposed to reverting.

10           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Aguirre  
11 and then Commissioner Blanco.

12           COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. Without going over,  
13 you know, my previous comments about this, I'll just  
14 reemphasize the indigenous nature of the three to five  
15 thousand farmworkers who live in this area, primarily  
16 Purepechas from the State of Michoacán who, because of the  
17 substandard housing and all of the ailments, and ills,  
18 social ills associated with being low income,  
19 unrepresented, and disenfranchised then are forced to live  
20 in trailer parks, some of those within Indian  
21 reservations.

22           So, in that regard then they are a invisible  
23 population. And illustrative of that invisibility is a  
24 statement that was made yesterday that Indio, in fact,  
25 does not have any agriculture.

1           So, I would contend that that invisibility really  
2 continues to disenfranchise this community and so I would  
3 agree with the present configuration of this district.

4           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, Commissioner Blanco?

5           COMMISSIONER BLANCO: A quick two points. One, I  
6 would agree that we did not draw this solely to  
7 accommodate to agricultural regions.

8           The testimony that Commissioner Filkins Webber  
9 referred to about San Diego and Imperial, which we heard  
10 in San Diego -- we've heard it twice -- didn't refer to  
11 Imperial being grouped with the East County of San Diego,  
12 people talked about that they would go over to the border  
13 regions and into downtown San Diego, but not into the only  
14 option available to us in terms of whom we would have to  
15 group Imperial County with, if we didn't group them with  
16 East Coachella, which would be Eastern San Diego and all  
17 the way up. It was not a possibility to link them to the  
18 communities in San Diego; they are speaking of being  
19 connected to.

20           In addition, we heard strong testimony from the  
21 residents of East County San Diego, saying that they did  
22 not want to be linked and had nothing in common with the  
23 Imperial Valley.

24           So, you know, we tend to forget that, but those  
25 citizens did not want to be connected to the Imperial

1 Valley and, in fact, thought that they had very dissimilar  
2 economies and lifestyles, as opposed to an agricultural,  
3 poor, desert community and an Eastern San Diego which is  
4 not agricultural in that sense and is a rural community.

5           The last thing I want to point out is that this  
6 idea that this area is tourism and not agriculture, the  
7 agriculture -- the statistics on the Coachella Valley are  
8 that it is \$5 billion agricultural economy and \$1 billion  
9 four tourism. And if you look at the employment in the  
10 Coachella Valley, the majority of the employment is in  
11 farming, construction, cleaning, maintenance.

12           In other words, the people who clean and work in  
13 the tourist resort area or who work in agriculture that is  
14 the primary source of employment in Coachella. So, those  
15 are my two points.

16           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay. Now, is there any  
17 proposal or a motion to change this configuration?

18           COMMISSIONER DAI: My only suggestion is that  
19 we -- and I believe Ms. Woods already has this, is look at  
20 fixing the split in La Quinta, if possible.

21           MS. WOODS: So, I looked at that and the  
22 population of the split is about 8,000 people, so in order  
23 to balance that we might need to move population from a  
24 different area in the Coachella/Imperial district into the  
25 yellow district.

1           COMMISSIONER DAI: So, go back to the split in  
2 Desert Hot Springs, which is a Census place.

3           MS. WOODS: I'll look into that, thank you.

4           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So, is that a direction to  
5 do that? Got nods there. Is that it, then? Okay, no  
6 proposals for any further changes, let's go on then.

7           MS. WOODS: So, we've covered the COACH district.  
8 The next district is ISAND, which is Eastern San Diego  
9 County including, from the border, Jacumba, Campo Potrero,  
10 Jamul, Rancho San Diego, Santee, Descanso, Alpine, Rancho  
11 San Diego, Ramona, Julian, San Diego Country Estates. And  
12 it goes north into Riverside County and it includes  
13 Aguanga, Lake Riverside, Anza, Idyllwild, and Valle Vista.

14           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Didn't we ask  
15 about -- I think it's -- I don't know how you say it, it's  
16 not "Valley" but I think it's Valle Vista, up in the  
17 northern part, didn't we discuss the possibility of trying  
18 to work something out with them to put them in the San  
19 Jacinto, or was that not possible?

20           MS. WOODS: It's 14,000 people, so there's not  
21 really a place unless you go into the -- unless you  
22 exchange with part of the Western Coachella Valley,  
23 there's not really another place to get that population.

24           COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And that's too  
25 geographically dissimilar to do that. Okay. I just

1 wanted to see because we did discuss it last week.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: We did.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: So, Commissioner Ontai?

4 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yeah, I think this  
5 district respects a lot of COI that we got from East  
6 County cities, so it does bring them all together in this  
7 district, so I think it's a good map.

8 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Raya --  
9 Commissioner Raya, you were also on this team, feel free  
10 to chime in as well.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: And I would just say it  
12 includes kind of the more mountainous and sparsely  
13 populated areas in Riverside County.

14 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, looks good. Next?

15 MS. WOODS: The next district is SSAND. And this  
16 starts at the border and includes the City of San Diego  
17 south of Chula Vista, it includes western portions of  
18 Chula Vista. It includes a western portion of National  
19 City, part of Paradise Hills and Barrio Logan.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And this was a Section 2?

21 MS. WOODS: The Latino CVAP is 50.93 percent.

22 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yes, it is. And I think  
23 what's good about this map is that it covers a lot of the  
24 COI that we received from the public hearings, it goes all  
25 the way into Golden Heights, into Logan Heights, and

1 Barrio Logan, and we do have the 51 percent Latino CVAP.  
2 It respects a lot of the cities along the Highway 805 and  
3 5 corridor and I think this is a great map.

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And, Commissioner Ontai,  
5 did this -- this includes some of those adjustments we had  
6 talked about in that kind of the greater -- the northern  
7 part of the district. Does that include some of them, I  
8 can't --

9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: I'm sorry, what was the  
10 question?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We had been talking about  
12 this district last week about some of the changes, I'm  
13 just trying to remember, it looks like they were taken.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: They were the Talmadge area  
15 with -- that we wanted to put together with Kensington. I  
16 don't know if that's happened.

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Well, I think the  
18 Talmadge/Kensington area had to do with the LGBD community  
19 and under -- under the map that is shown in green that  
20 brings it basically together, as you can see College West  
21 that whole area brings in the LGBD community, which  
22 includes the Talmadge/Kensington area.

23 So, when we get to that map, the green one, we can  
24 talk about them as well.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Great, okay.



1 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Any further comments?

2 I did want to note, as we've noted before, that  
3 Coronado and Imperial Beach would be contiguous by ferry,  
4 since we changed the configuration regarding the bridge.  
5 But there is a regular ferry service that runs hourly,  
6 from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

7 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, next?

8 MS. WOODS: The next district is LMSAND, it  
9 includes Eastern Chula Vista, Bonita, Bay Terraces, Ultra  
10 Vista, Encanto, Oak Park, College East, and it goes north  
11 to Del Cerro, Allied Gardens, Serra Mesa and Linda Vista.

12 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, in this map I think  
13 it really captures a lot of the API COI that we received,  
14 requesting that they be kept together. And I notice that  
15 it covers Linda Vista, as well, and removes it from the  
16 coastal area which is -- which is great, and goes all the  
17 way down to Chula Vista.

18 It also includes City Heights area, which has a  
19 fairly large African American and African Immigrant  
20 community, as well as a Cambodian/Lao community. So, I  
21 think this map is great.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Is Skyline in there?  
23 That's an African American community that also had been  
24 asked to not be --

25 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: It is.

1 MS. WOODS: Yeah, it is included. It's right  
2 here, above Bay Terraces.

3 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner DiGuilio?

4 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, I was going to say  
5 I think it might be worth noting in our description of  
6 this, too, that this district -- it has some few funky  
7 shapes. Part of those are based on the cities and the  
8 neighborhoods, and part of it is its location between a  
9 Section 2 district and the integrity of the eastern, you  
10 now, more mountainous areas. And so it was -- you know,  
11 part of that is just a reflection of its location. As  
12 well as I think the very northern part we had again,  
13 intentionally -- there's kind of a blue that goes west,  
14 and a green that had gone east, and it was to try and keep  
15 the communities of interest in both of those districts  
16 together.

17 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, any further comments?  
18 Okay, let's move on to the next district.

19 MS. WOODS: The next district is CNSAND and this  
20 is the one that links Kensington, it looks like with most  
21 of Talmadge. I'll look into the border of that. And it  
22 includes Balboa Park, University Heights, Normal Heights  
23 corridor, South Park, MidTown, Old Town, Coronado,  
24 Imperial Beach, Pacific Beach, La Jolla. It includes  
25 University City, Torrey Pines, Del Mar, and ends at Solano

1 Beach.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: And this is also a good  
3 map. What it does is it brings together coastal areas  
4 where there's a significant amount of recreational and  
5 military uses, naval uses and brings it all together. And  
6 it recognizes the central core of San Diego.

7 It also brings in the LGBD community that goes all  
8 the way to College West. WE had some strong COI on that.  
9 And it's a good map.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm looking for Claremont, is  
11 it --

12 MS. WOODS: So, Claremont is included in the  
13 district --

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay.

15 MS. WOODS: -- RCHMM, with Scripps Ranch, Mira  
16 Mesa district, Tierrasanta, Kearny Mesa.

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And your assessment  
18 is that we would be able to adjust and put all of Talmadge  
19 together?

20 MS. WOODS: Based on the deviation, I think it  
21 will be possible, but I need to look at it.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Let's just do one more  
24 district and then we'll have some public comment, and then  
25 we'll break for lunch.

1 MS. WOODS: So, the next district is RCHMM and  
2 this is the district that starts south in Claremont,  
3 Kearny Mesa, Tierra Santa, Lake Murray, and goes north  
4 into Miramar, Scripps Ranch, Mira Mesa, Carmel Valley,  
5 Poway, Rancho Bernardo, and goes north into San Pasqual,  
6 which this is the -- this is the border of the City of San  
7 Diego. And it also includes Rancho Santa Fe and Fairbanks  
8 Ranch.

9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: And this is also a great  
10 map. It brings together all of the API COI testimonies  
11 within this district and does a really good job on that.  
12 And it also brings Rancho Santa Fe community, that wanted  
13 to be part of the eastern side, so it recognizes that  
14 testimony as well.

15 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Blanco?

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, Commissioner Ontai,  
17 the only thing -- I think that there's nothing we can do  
18 about it but I just want to know, and I do feel that  
19 Claremont, down on the lower southwest corner of the  
20 district is -- is sort of dissimilar to, you know, some of  
21 those -- not so much to Kearny Mesa, but to, you know, the  
22 higher income areas further up north. You know it's --  
23 Claremont's a fairly middle to low income community  
24 in a lot of parts.

25 But I just want to note that, you know, we're --

1 as you noted once before, in San Diego we've had this huge  
2 population explosion and then you have a county that's  
3 shaped the way it is, very up and down and narrow, and we  
4 end up with these districts that basically run north/south  
5 and you -- it's very hard to have neat communities of  
6 interest.

7 But that's the only part that feels a little  
8 different being grouped together, but I don't -- given all  
9 the other factors that we had to take into account, I  
10 think it works. But I just was curious what your --  
11 whether you actually think it works regardless, the  
12 Claremont area?

13 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: I think it works,  
14 Commissioner Blanco. We did get some COI testimony that  
15 residents wanted to be together both north and south  
16 Claremont, south of Highway 52 and going all the way down  
17 to Linda Vista. And that, traditionally, has been one  
18 community so it does make sense.

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: I had a similar comment. I  
20 mean there were -- there was some public testimony from  
21 the API community wanting to be kept together, but also  
22 not to be with Rancho Santa Fe, again because of income  
23 disparities.

24 I know that the Rancho Santa Fe folks, at least  
25 from some of the folks we heard from, had wanted to be in

1 an inland district, instead. So, again, competing  
2 testimony on that and I'm just wondering what your  
3 thoughts were?

4 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Commissioner Ontai?

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Again, what was the  
6 question? Rancho Santa Fe, I think the COI was --

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, there was testimony from  
8 some of the API communities about not being with Rancho  
9 Santa Fe.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, you know, the  
11 interesting thing about that, though, is that the  
12 population of Rancho Santa Fe is so small in comparison to  
13 the rest of that community of interest.

14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: It's an extremely  
15 affluent community and the population, it is extremely  
16 small. And the average lot there is 20 to 40 acres.

17 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. So, you know, when  
18 there's affluence often your numbers are less important.  
19 But I just want to note for the record that that was some  
20 of the testimony we got.

21 We got conflicting testimony from the Rancho Santa  
22 Fe residents that they wanted to be in an inland district,  
23 so we've put them together here.

24 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I do want to ask whether -- we  
25 were, I think, satisfied where Claremont is just because

1 on balance, I don't know what else you could do with it.  
2 But I don't know whether there's -- you know, how much  
3 population is in that little corner and whether, you know,  
4 we'd want to give consideration to any swaps for that. Is  
5 it important enough, Commissioner Blanco?

6 Oh, I'm talking to a chair.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Actually, it was  
8 Commissioner Dai who made the comments so --

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Oh, about Claremont?

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, no, not about  
11 Claremont, about Rancho Santa Fe.

12 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah. No, no, no, I meant  
13 about Claremont.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I thought you were  
15 proposing a swap with Rancho Santa Fe?

16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: No, no, no, I was talking  
17 about --

18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: No, no no. No, I think  
19 it's a good position where it's located within that  
20 boundary. Kearny Mesa, Tierrasanta, all along that Aero  
21 Drive area, they really have a long, long history of being  
22 together.

23 CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, any further comments?  
24 So, I think -- I think the sense of this is that we'll  
25 leave it as is.

1           COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I mean I think in the  
2 write-up we should note that there are some, you know,  
3 socioeconomic disparity, it's a large district, but it is  
4 kind of a Central San Diego district.

5           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Okay, so let's stop for now  
6 and what I want to do is have some public comment for a  
7 couple minutes and then we'll take a lunch break.

8           So, folks who are planning to speak, if they could  
9 come up to the microphone? I think it's just three  
10 speakers, so just please line up.

11           One and a half, we're adhering to the one-and-a-  
12 half minutes.

13           MR. VARGAS: Mayor Pro Tem, Alex Vargas, from the  
14 City of Hawthorne. And I just want to make it clear from  
15 the outset, before my minute and a half run out, is that  
16 the City of Hawthorne would like to be included with the  
17 South Bay cities and the Beach cities, it goes back and  
18 forth, interchangeable, south of the 105, west of the 110.

19           And what I heard a little while ago, and with  
20 three of the speakers was a statement saying we do not  
21 want to disenfranchise Latinos and African Americans, so  
22 let's keep these districts African American led.  
23 That's -- we have to serve them because that kind of adds  
24 to the whole discussion as to are we -- who are we really  
25 disenfranchising.



1           And I don't know if this is guided by emotions or  
2 fear, but we need to base these decisions on fact. We  
3 have some studies, you can commission more. I know  
4 there's some timelines that we have to hit and we need to  
5 get this finished with, but I could tell you about my  
6 city. In 2000 we were 44 percent Latino. Now, ten years  
7 later, we're 53 percent Latino, 27 percent African  
8 American and 50 percent white.

9           Okay, that's something you can't ignore, those are  
10 facts. And we feel that there could be the possibility,  
11 if the wrong decisions are made here, that we could be  
12 further disenfranchised. Some of our residents, in our  
13 community, could further be disenfranchised.

14           We gave you three strong reasons with regards to  
15 why we should be included in the South Bay and beach  
16 cities, the coalitions that we're part of, naturally, the  
17 Aerospace industry that we're also part of strongly.

18           And we'll further -- we'll give you some more  
19 information through e-mails, but that's basically the gist  
20 of it.

21           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

22           MS. JERABEK: Hi, again. I'm Sandra Jerabek and  
23 I've lived in Del Norte County for almost two decades and  
24 I appreciate your indulgence, I think I'm your first  
25 citizen from Del Norte to visit you.

1           So, I wanted to -- I think I was just saying that  
2 the only direct way for us to get to Siskiyou County is to  
3 backpack wilderness trails past 8,000-foot mountains, and  
4 then we would be in Siskiyou County, in the wilderness  
5 area.

6           So, I was going to tell you the story of what  
7 happened to us a few years ago and we -- Del Norte County  
8 has always been, as far as I know, with the coastal  
9 counties to the south. A few years back the president,  
10 the leader of the -- let me just say it this way, the  
11 Democratic and the Republican leadership of the State  
12 Senate decided to make a deal to further solidify the  
13 reliability of their respective parties.

14           And they traded us to the inland counties so that  
15 we were with the -- with Siskiyou and the inland counties,  
16 and we still are.

17           And, instead, the Democrats picked up a very  
18 reliably Democratic district in the Bay Area, a little  
19 piece of reliable Democrats in the Bay Area.

20           So, okay, even though we pled and cried, nobody  
21 wanted to listen to us. Thank you for listening, thank  
22 you for undoing the crime of gerrymandering and I really  
23 appreciate what you're doing.

24           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: Great, thank you.

25           MR. WATKINS: Once again, Tim Watkins from Los

1 Angeles. And once again I find myself hurting because  
2 what I'm witnessing is this crumb from affluent interests  
3 being tossed between members of minority communities, and  
4 crumb is a struggle for representation.

5 Black and brown people share, in common, the  
6 pursuit of environmental, social and economic justice.  
7 Removing airports and harbors from their districts,  
8 through redistricting, that contain high levels of poverty  
9 doesn't help the pursuit it only makes it harder, it makes  
10 it more difficult.

11 The truth is that while these perceptions form the  
12 basis for our reality, there are two classes of  
13 perceptions, one that's virtual and the other factual.

14 And I'm hoping that the Commission will make that  
15 important distinction as the dialogue continues.

16 I took some notes while I was sitting up there  
17 because in two minutes it's hard to remember and to say  
18 everything that we want to say.

19 With the conversation about the Southern  
20 California region getting so focused on black and brown  
21 demographics, I'm concerned about the fact that there is a  
22 huge black under-count in the population.

23 And the fact that a rising tide floats all votes.  
24 When African Americans had the option to vote for Latino  
25 candidates in sheriff, governor, lieutenant governor's

1 races they supported Latino -- Latino candidates and  
2 Latinos did so, vice-versa.

3           What African Americans and browns share in common  
4 is a shared actual community that includes all of the  
5 kinds of poverty that we've talked about before. And so  
6 I'm hoping -- okay I'm hoping that the districts will stay  
7 virtually the same.

8           CHAIRPERSON ANCHETA: All right, thank you.

9           MS. TEASLEY-LINNOCK: Thanks. Erica Teasley-  
10 Linnock from the Collaborative, again, I just -- I was  
11 encouraged by the debate you all had when you were  
12 discussing the racially-polarized voting study and your  
13 engagement with Mr. Brown's work and I think it's  
14 important that we all be critical of the information that  
15 you all receive, and that the information is also made  
16 available to the public.

17           We haven't seen the racially-polarized voting  
18 studies and we, you know, have seen this -- the excerpts,  
19 I guess, in the executive summary. But I think it's  
20 important that it's made available for the public to look  
21 at, and to analyze, and to have their experts analyze as  
22 well.

23           One of the things that's mentioned and there were  
24 some questions about the studies that were looked at is  
25 Morgan Couser's study with the Gonzalez case in the City

1 of Compton.

2           And the court found that study to be unreliable  
3 and also, for some reason I haven't, I don't know why, but  
4 the judge also called into question the credentials of the  
5 expert as well, and called those credentials sketchy.

6           So, if these are things that are being relied  
7 upon, I think you should look a little closer at the  
8 information that you're getting and make sure that you  
9 have a fuller picture. And, hopefully, tomorrow you'll  
10 get that. And, hopefully, that information will be made  
11 available to everyone else as well, so we can study it as  
12 well. Thanks.

13           MS. HOWARD: Hi, Debra Howard here. It's a theme,  
14 a continuation of a theme on the racially-polarized  
15 voting. I do appreciate that you've posted the  
16 information that is available from Mr. Barreto, included  
17 in the memo from Gibson Dunn & Crutcher.

18           I would like to suggest that the letter and spirit  
19 of the Bagley-Keene or Brown and, I'm sorry, I'm not an  
20 expert on both of those laws, but is really that you make  
21 available to the public the information that you are using  
22 to make your decisions.

23           And I'm not inquiring to what your discussion with  
24 your legal counsel is or your discussion with your  
25 racially-polarized voting consultant regarding that

