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CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Greetings, Commissioners and members of the public. We are reconvening this session of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. At this moment, we have decided that we are going to work a little later into the night in order to be able to keep making progress in providing line drawing direction to our technical consultants, Q2, so we took a longer break to allow Commissioners to change their travel plans. We are back, and we are joined on the phone by our VRA -- one of our VRA attorney team members, Mr. George Brown. And we are also joined by our gracious host here at the University where we have been meeting this week, and so we would like to invite her to say a couple of words on behalf of the institution.

DEAN RINSKOFF-PARKER: Well, thank you very much. I’m Elizabeth Rinskoff-Parker, I’m the Dean here at the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law. And I can’t tell you what a thrilling moment this is for me. I talked some months ago about the possibility that we might be able to host you, but nothing prepared me for seeing you here today. This is really extraordinary, how can I say this? This is our Constitution in action, our Government in action, in the very very best way. Now, I
have a feeling it would not be appropriate for me to ask each one of you who you are, where you’re from, why you decided to volunteer for this process, because I know you have real work to do rather than just to inform and fascinate me. And so, rather than do that, let me just say thank you. Thank you on behalf of the law school for letting us host you, thank you on behalf of every citizen in California for the extraordinary work you’re doing. I have a feeling I’m not unique in saying that I had, when I first learned of this process, long, I think, before you were selected, I thought this is just wonderful, what a good thing for a state to do. And now I’m looking at the people who are causing it to happen, and I must say, it’s an overwhelming moment for me.

I asked Ms. Sargis when I came in, stupidly, I think, may I tell the campus about this because I think some of us, although we’re not actively in session right now, would like to have the same excitement that I’m having in just watching you; and she reminded me that, of course, you’re streaming this, this is indeed public, and so we can be public not just with the TV and microphones and so forth, but actually having some live people, and I think I may do that, I hope you won’t mind. But let me end where I began and say that this is a really distinct honor for this law school, and I think I could speak on
behavior of every young lawyer, and every citizen in the
opportunity we have to give a little support to the very
very important work that you do. And so, carry on. And
thank you. And thank you for letting me be here for a
minute. [Applause]

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It’s nice to be
inspired when we just realized how long the nights and
how daunting the task is ahead.

DEAN RINSKOFF-PARKER: Where are you having
dinner?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Maybe you could
work with Janeece to identify some options, that would be
excellent. Thank you for your time! Put them all to
work!

So, what I would like to do is to actually pick
up where we left off before the break. As I mentioned to
Mr. Brown, we were getting stuck in this one particular
area that is heavily populated, has some significant VRA
considerations, and I wonder if I could refer to the
Commissioners who have been tasked with taking notes for
this particular area, if they could help kind of
summarize, rephrase back to us from the notes on
questions, what we would like to ask Mr. Brown to weigh
in on and then allow Mr. Brown, who has had the
opportunity to analyze the map, to be able to weigh in.
I think Commissioner Raya?

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay. We’re looking at Downey, Norwalk, Southgate Lakewood, and the Whittier Boyle Heights Districts, and have concerns that we’re creating -- that there is a high concentration in those districts, working from there, the effect that this has -- that they have on each other. The Mappers attempted to unpack the concentrations based on our previous direction and I believe they suggested advice of counsel. And there’s some concern about whether all the districts, in particular, the Downey Norwalk, is compact. So, we’re kind of looking at how could they be divided or rearranged, I guess, would be a better description, and still be in compliance.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think another thing that came up, if I may add to that a bit, was the concept of how we look at unpacking some of these districts, and what that really means in a context where you have a series of districts all abutting each other that do seem to be fairly densely populated with various minority groups, and kind of what is the conceptual thinking or standard that we should apply as we progress through this suggested unpacking exercise. Would there be other questions? Commissioner Blanco?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Hello, Mr. Brown. So there
was the question about the packing is about whether packing is as much a concern when every - all the districts around a district are sort of packed, or whether the concept of packing has a greater application when you’re really dealing with an adjacent district that could become a majority district, but everybody is packed in a district, whether we have to give the same -- whether the same concept applies here. And along those lines, I was wondering if you had suggestions -- I can’t remember now what day it was, whether this was yesterday or the day before, but you had recommended to us perhaps looking at some of these areas in L.A. and not even thinking in terms of Section 2, but thinking in terms of neighborhoods, you know, and proceeding along city lines and neighborhood lines because it really didn’t matter since the population is so concentrated, whether we should even be thinking of this in terms of Section 2, or whether we should just think in terms of neighborhoods in these areas of L.A. and that might lead to integrity and compactness of some of these districts without having to even call them Section 2 districts.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So with that, Mr. Brown, I’ll turn it over to you to provide some thoughts and then we can see what remaining questions exist amongst the Commissioners.
MR. BROWN: Sure. I have had a chance to review the maps that were created in the last iteration for L.A. County for Assembly Districts and Congressional District, and my understanding of how the districts were drawn is that there was an attempt to draw the district following city line, keeping cities whole, and neighborhoods whole, and being sensitive to not over-concentrating a single minority in any particular district. And assuming that the Mappers were successful in doing that, and that is something I would like to work through with them later, then my view is that they’ve done a very good job in creating a set of districts where, with a little more analysis, I believe we’ll be able to conclude that the likelihood of successful litigation under any of the three categories of clients that I’ve talked to you about, is quite low.

And in particular, with respect to the areas that we’re looking at now, I would not regard them or refer to them as Section 2 areas to the extent that the line drawers -- the Mappers -- have been successful in creating districts that follow the other criteria in the California Constitution.

What my thinking is, in L.A. County, is that there are three areas that require further study, including trying to do RPV analysis and develop RPV data,
so there is the West San Gabriel Valley Area, the San
Fernando Valley East Area, and then we want to study
whether there is Racially Polarized Voting among the
African American population and other groups in the south
and southwest Los Angeles Area. I think with those open
issues, as I mentioned, we’re getting to the point where
we can start to get reasonably comfortable that there is
not going to be a high risk of successful Section 2
litigation or other challenges in L.A. Again, subject to
verifying with the Mappers that they followed city and
neighborhood boundaries and to the extent that followed
communities of interest, that we have good support for
those communities and the boundaries.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Additional
questions from the Commission? Commissioner Yao.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Mr. Brown, by unpacking the
districts and since the Los Angeles County is very
compact, we basically have lumped cities to the east side
of the East Los Angeles into these districts that are
questionable in terms of having common communities of
interest; in other words, we basically have sacrificed
the community of interest in the interest of un-
compacting the districts in question. The question I
have for you is, it may be necessary for us to do it in
terms of coming up with balancing the numbers, but is
that something that is acceptable, or something that is
defendable when we are questioned with regard to the
communities of interest criteria?

MR. BROWN: I’m having some trouble hearing. Is
the question about whether the current iteration
boundaries can be further adjusted to accommodate other
communities of interest?

COMMISSIONER YAO: Negative. In order to unpack
it sufficiently, we basically have extended the district
boundary much much further away from the original
district, including some of the cities that are adjacent
to Orange County. In doing so, we’re lumping cities
together that have absolutely no common interest. In
fact, we violated a number of their expressed intent of
wanting to combine with other like cities, so if that’s
the case, I want to basically get your opinion as to
whether the unpacking can be the justification for
ignoring the communities of interest by these other
cities. Let me give you an example.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I just confirm
that Mr. Brown heard the question?

MR. BROWN: Yeah, I believe I understand it, so
let me try to give a comment here. As with so many of
the issues, some of this will come down to the
Commissioners exercising their judgment. I believe that,
to the extent the Mappers have been successful in drawing
these areas by following the criteria in the other
redistricting criteria in the California Constitution,
then there is a lower risk of successful Section 2
litigation. To the extent there is still a concern that
there is some over-concentrations in these areas, I don’t
think that there is -- at this point, I don’t see a
significant litigation risk under Section 2, but if the
Commission wanted to deliberate over whether they could
reduce some of the concentrations consistent with the
other criteria in the statute -- in the California
Constitution -- I think the Commission would be free to
do that. I don’t think at this point I would be
comfortable saying that the Commission must do that in
order to comply with Section 2.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners Raya,
then Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think -- I don’t want to
speak directly for Commissioner Yao, but I think part of
the concern, we’re both from the same geographic area, I
think what we’re looking at is the cities farther east --
Peter, correct me if I’m wrong -- but that there are
other cities not necessarily related to a Section 2
issue, but other cities whose COI testimony is maybe
disregarded in order to accommodate what we’re having to
do here.

MR. BROWN: Erred to accommodate what has already been done? Or what is being proposed --

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yes, well, what’s proposed, the page that we’re looking at now, in order to accomplish what we need to accomplish with respect to Section 2, we’re essentially having to -- I don’t want to really say “ignore,” but we’re having to disregard to some extent the COI testimony from other communities that are not Section 2 issues, but just nonetheless had a fair amount of strong testimony about where they want to be.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Did you hear the question?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I believe so. I would say that the districts that are drawn currently are not required to be drawn that way under Section 2, so the question would be, what other alternatives are there that the Commission wants to consider. If the Commission wants to consider other alternatives, I think they can do that, and I don’t think you are able to assess the litigation risk until we see what the alternatives are. And so, if I’m hearing you correctly, you’re saying that the proposal that we’re looking at, which is labeled “Region 4, Assembly Detail 5,” there is a concern that this proposal maybe is in conflict with some of the other
MR. BROWN: And there’s a concern about that. And my view is that there is nothing that requires the districts to be drawn this way, so if there is further analysis that’s going to be done, that would be an appropriate thing for the Commission to deliberate over if they want to.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I’ll reserve my comment until we shift to another geographic region, until we thoroughly exhaust this.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Mr. Brown, if I can refer you to that same set of maps on page 20, take, for example, the city of Cerritos there right next to Orange County on the purple block.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I see it.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, to say that Cerritos has a common interest with, for example, the City of Bell, which is identified as a city in the same district, close to the -- excuse me -- the duck bill -- is totally contrary to what we have received as the community of interest for Cerritos. So, the only reason we would draw...
this district in this manner is strictly to attempt to unpack the percentages. So, if I hear you right, we shouldn’t be doing that. Is that what you’re advising us?

MR. BROWN: No, that’s not exactly what I’m saying. First of all, I’m assuming that this area that you’re referring to that includes Cerritos, that is labeled Downey Norwalk, complies with the California Constitutional criteria in that it includes whole cities and neighborhoods. And if that’s correct, then the Commission is free to do that and the Commission is free to do something else. The fact that one of the factors involved in drawing it was to reduce an over-concentration of a single minority group, I think that’s okay in drawing that. If the Commission doesn’t want to do that, the Commission is free to come up with some other alternative for how to do that. But as drawn, I don’t -- two points, one is that it’s not required to be drawn in this particular way under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act; at the same time, assuming that all the other criteria are met, there is no reason that it can’t be drawn in this particular manner.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di Giulio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So, to follow-up exactly
on that point, so it doesn’t require us to draw them in this particular way, meaning that if it’s at the expense of some of our other criteria like following COI testimony, but what does it require us to do? I understand that it may not have to follow just like this, but I’m assuming that there’s some baseline that your recommendation is that we do have to draw some type of Section 2? If that correct? And if so, this is the question earlier, what level of packing is allowed? At what point do you balance the prevention of packing with trying to respect COI testimony so that we can do both? I guess I’m asking you, is there a baseline number of Section 2 that you think we have to have here? Because if it has to be drawn - it doesn’t have to be drawn this way, are you saying that we do have to draw it another way, or we’re free to do whatever we want?

MR. BROWN: My view is that, to the extent -- I’m sorry if I repeat myself several times, but my view has been that, to the extent you can draw preliminarily districts in Los Angeles County using the non-Voting Rights Act criteria, and then assess the number of districts you end up with, that have a sufficient number of majority/minority districts in them so that you have minimized your litigation risks, that’s a good position to be in because then you can defend all of the districts
on the traditional redistricting criteria in the
California Constitution, other than race. I think that
there is probably a range of majority-minority Latino
districts that you could draw and have a lower litigation
risk, and I think you’re within that range now. That
doesn’t mean -- as I keep saying, that doesn’t mean this
is the only way to draw it, and so if the Commissioners
believe that Cerritos, based on the public testimony
shouldn’t be grouped with the cities that it’s grouped
with, then the Commissioners are free to have the Mappers
come up with some other alternatives. But I think that,
then, what we need to do is assess, after that other
alternative is determined, how do we feel about the
number of districts at that point in time, as well as how
do we feel about situations where there is a potential
concern about an over-concentration. I hesitate to call
it “packing” where you’re following the other traditional
criteria in the California Constitution.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are there
additional questions at this point? Or does the
Commission feel comfortable that we may be able to
provide some guidance on this district to Q2? I’m seeing
nods in the audience that we may be able to provide some
direction on this specific cluster of districts. So with
that, I’ll open the floor. Commissioner Dai.
COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I think, for example, if we look at the Downey Norwalk district, you know, if we were to add La Palma, that would respect the COI testimony we had about Artesia, Cerritos, and La Palma. I think I recall some testimony in Long Beach that said, you know, kind of north of Long Beach you can kind of put these districts together, it probably would not have been in this particular configuration, and there might be some concerns about compactness here. So I guess my question to the Mappers would be, and my So Cal Commissioners can help me out here, if we were to keep Artesia, Cerritos, and La Palma home, and then what, include Lakewood, Bellflower, Norwalk? I mean, if we went up in a different way, I’m just wondering what the LCVAP would be for a district that went a little more east-west, even though it’s not as much of a concentration, I’m just wondering if we’re going to be at over 50 percent anyway.

MS. BOYLE: I believe I can do it, it’s going to be the low 50s. When I was investigating this area, that’s what the configuration looked like that actually went the other way, and then you get more of a “U,” so that Walnut Park, Bell Gardens would go up with Pico Rivera. And then this boundary right here would go more this way.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I guess my question to the
Commissioners, if you know this area better, is that a little better grouping from a neighborhood standpoint? I think it still achieves the same goal, I mean, at the end we would still end up with two districts that have a majority Latino CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And if we were going to do that, in looking at other -- in looking at sort of the traditional criteria of communities of interest, I think it was Commissioner Yao who urged us to look at some of these cities, or maybe it was Commissioner Parvenu, and maybe you can speak to this, Commissioner Parvenu, that there are cities in this whole Southgate Bell Commerce area that have some -- that form a unit, and so maybe we could even get tighter on the COI nature of some of these configurations.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, there is. There is a concerted effort among some of these cities, I know, in Southeast Los Angeles County, they have transportation management organizations, for example, they have other associations, that are well established to address congestion issues and so forth, but their Chambers of
Commerce, there is interaction among the chambers, there
is a great deal of interaction among some of these cities
on the west. But I concur with Commissioner Yao about
Cerritos and Artesia presenting that unique ethnic and
geographic difference in that area, the Asian population.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we received
some initial direction from Commissioner Dai. It seems
like our locals are in general agreement with this
concept. Are there any additional nuances, feedback?
Okay, excellent. Let’s move on -- why don’t we stay in
this general cluster and kind of focus on seeing if we
can resolve some of these districts.

MS. HENDERSON: I just want to clarify, for the
Whittier Pico Rivera, do we need to revisit that?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
Guilio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I have a question, if we
do the suggestion of Cerritos and Artesia, what’s that,
50,000, 65,000, 66,000, I’m assuming we have to put
population back in that area? We have to look at the
surrounding areas, including Whittier, Pico Rivera, and
others to put something back in. Or, of course,
Southgate Lake, but obviously we need to consider
something.

MS. HENDERSON: So the direction is to move
Cerritos and Artesia to an Orange County District, or to try and bring La Palma into the L.A. County District?

COMMISSIONER DAI: My thought was to bring La Palma in, but it sounds like Commissioner Di Guilio is suggesting something different.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I guess I thought I heard Commissioner Yao say that that would be an ability to break a county line there and bring it into Orange County, and my understanding is that Cerritos, Artesia, La Palma and Cypress, that’s a very close area there, but I’m going to defer to Commissioner Yao to give more detail.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, at this stage of the game, the Downey Norwalk district is squeezed between Whittier, Pico Rivera district, and the Southgate Lakewood district. There really isn’t any enumerable room to do anything significantly different, and bringing La Palma across the county line into the L.A. County issue probably would be the wrong thing to do, so at this point in time, this is probably the best that we can do in terms of -

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m confused, I just want to clarify, I think I had heard a couple of different things, one, that we were moving in the direction of establishing a priority for keeping Artesia,
Cerritos, La Palma, and potentially Cypress in a cluster, in a unit, and then we’re secondarily trying to identify if we had a preference of which side of the County line you’d like to cluster them with? But then, at the end, I heard you say maybe that it was not as priority of a cluster to begin with. Let me allow Commissioner Filkins Webber to weigh in.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: As I understood it, and based on the COI testimony that we received, it was not a circumstance where Orange County wished to be with Los Angeles, it was that those Los Angeles districts did not mind being separated from Los Angeles and being put with Orange County, and not vice versa, so I would not recommend that La Palma be put into a Los Angeles County district, it’s more that Artesia and Cerritos would be more than willing to go into an Orange County district. That’s how I saw it, based on the COI testimony and based on my familiarity with that area.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you for that clarification. Any additional -- Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, I think one thing, we’ve heard about how this area has excess population, so if these were to go into Orange County, that might be the safety valve that allows the other lines to be moved around and make the numbers work out.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. With that, let’s move to the next district. Mr. Brown, I also wanted to clarify, when we had made this appointment, you initially mentioned your availability was from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. Are you still available for that full block?

MR. BROWN: Uh, better if I could leave at 5:00.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: You’ll need to leave at 5:00?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, that’s good to know. We’ve made a decision as a commission that we are going to push forward later into the night and wanted to know at what point we would need to say good-bye.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so just a quick comment about the population being able to go into Orange County and Commissioner Forbes’ comment, just so we understand, that also means the population will whip back around and have to go up north at some point, so it’s that good old balloon, it’s a little bit squirrely, it’s like one of those little ones that you make into a dog and you squeeze it, so -- while we have Mr. Brown on the phone, I’d like to do a few more districts in L.A. and then, depending on where we are with time, may want to slip down to the south just to take advantage of him on the
phone, if that’s okay with you, Commissioner Galambos Malloy?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so we’ll move over to Compton, Carson, and let me find the page for you, 18 -- actually, 19 is better, it will show you the complete district. And we’re going to be changing the map theme to show Black CVAP. On your handout, it appears as the blue district and we’re going to add some shading to this one just to clarify which one we’re talking about. This district includes Willow Brook, Compton, Carson, it includes several neighborhoods within L.A., yeah, I can do the neighborhoods, Gramercy Place, Vermont Vista, Green Meadows, Figures Park Square, Century Palms, Cove, Watts, Willow Brook, California, as well, West Rancho Dominguez, Compton, which I think I already mentioned.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are all of the cities that you’re mentioning whole?

MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment. Yes, only the City of Los Angeles is split in this district.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What are the color codes again, I’m sorry?

MS. HENDERSON: So this is now showing black, Citizen Voting Age Population, the darkest red color is 70 percent to 100 percent, anything above the kind of
medium orange is 50 percent or more. We heard COI testimony about this area, the various neighborhoods in L.A.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And what is the purple?

MS. HENDERSON: The purple is just showing you what the district is.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I seem to recall in that COI testimony that Linwood was also included? I know that was probably affected by what you were trying to do with the other district there, but do you have any comment on that, Ms. Boyle?

MS. BOYLE: It was included based on COI testimony to keep it above the 50 percent CVAP mark in this case, I chose not to do that. If the Commission is comfortable with going below, Linwood could probably be included in this configuration, it would probably be removed from the north, the boundary would come down in the northeast corner.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, as I recall, there was some discussion in Northridge on Saturday about having a set of alternative ultimate visualizations for this area of Los Angeles based on the COI testimony we
received from the African American Redistricting Coalition -- Collaborative -- as well as the NAACP, Ms. Alice Huffman, as recent as yesterday, and Mr. Sam Walton, and even as recent as today, Ms. Wilma Pinder, making a strong case for the fact that these areas are not required to be -- for Section 2 to be applied. And I’m looking here at some of these percentages here, 51 percent, 52 percent in the neighboring, but I know we’ll focus on this one, the one at hand. Based on the fact that this area has a long history of coalition building and also there’s been experience with influence districts in this area, and the key point is that there appears to be no evidence of Racially Polarized Voting, so based on that rigorous testimony, COI testimony, and what I anticipate will be additional testimony when we go to our public sessions beginning in Culver City next week, that I would like to know to what extent can some of these boundaries be modified to have lower percentages in this area. And, Mr. Brown, I know he has recent information now, whereas before, on Saturday, he may not have had that information at hand. Has there been any discussion about tweaking these boundaries?

MS. BOYLE: There has. It can be done. And I would be happy to do it, I might need to do some splitting, maybe in the Englewood Westmont area, to try
to maintain the communities around the edges, but I would be more than happy to do that. I just -- on my timeline, I didn’t have time to come back around on the Assembly iteration.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: This is where I would request Mr. Brown’s further guidance in terms of coming up with percentages that are reasonable, even if they are below 50 percent.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: I’m sorry, I didn’t quite hear the question. Could you repeat it for me?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Parvenu, could you --

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Mr. Brown, hi, this is Andre Parvenu, Commissioner Parvenu. There was some discussion just now about the districts in South Los Angeles, we are looking at the one that is labeled “Compton Carson,” but this applies to the neighboring or adjacent ones to the west and to the north. It appears that the CVAC is higher than 50 percent, and I understand the intention is to make this a Section 2 district, and that applies to the one north called Culver City, Crenshaw, as well. But, because Section 2 is not required to be applied in this area, we were wondering to what extent can we lower that percentage in those areas.
by tweaking the maps as they currently exist, to have a
lower CVAP. I think this question came up on Saturday,
as well.

MR. BROWN: A couple of different answers, one is
I don’t believe there has been an intent to express that
this is a Section 2 required area, to the extent we
conclude that Section 2 does not require a majority-
minority district for the African American population in
Los Angeles, the Commission is free to formulate it
consistent with the other criteria. To the extent that
this district is already consistent with the other
criteria, the Commission is free to leave it as is, and
to the extent that, in turn, that there is over-
concentration, even at 50 percent, the Commission is free
to consider that and decide whether to modify that or
reduce it to some extent. I think it’s going to be a few
weeks before we are able to get the RPV announced in time
to make a conclusion about whether Section 2 would
require a majority-minority district. But assuming for a
moment that it would not, the Commission could leave this
district as is, or modify it, so long as the Commission
complies with the other criteria in the California
Constitution.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
Guilio.
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yes, I would be happy to see what else can be done here, what Nicole can do. I guess my only things that I’d like to see, is if there are other visualizations to accompany this, is that some of the other things that the Commission has suggested that stay intact, like honoring the coastal peninsula district and the hard boundary of Orange County, that some of those -- in any other visualization that those still remain a basis for those visualizations, so that you don’t break up those other things we’ve agreed on as a Commission at the expense of doing a different visualization. So having those kind of, the east-west boundaries, I’d say I would be interested in other visualizations, but to keep the integrity of those other boundaries.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Mr. Brown, I wanted to ask a question again on the applications of unpacking. In applying the rule of unpacking, do you we have start off with a Section 2 district? Or if we don’t have a Section 2 district, how does the application of unpacking apply to us?

MR. BROWN: My sense is that we are not saying that this district or any of these districts must be unpacked to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights
Act; we’ve not made that conclusion. I think that it is okay for the Commission to listen to concerns that a district has an over-concentration, and if the Commission chooses to do so, to take that into account when complying with the other criteria. But I’m not saying -- I think what I hear you asking is, what number must it reach, or what number must I avoid? And my answer at this point is I don’t believe that there is a risk of a packing claim based on what I’m looking at -- I should insert the word “successful,” that there can be litigation asserted, of course; at this point, I don’t see it as a substantial risk. That doesn’t mean the Commission shouldn’t have some sensitivity to these issues.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I have a question from Ms. Henderson, I believe.

MS. HENDERSON: Yes, so I just wanted to follow-up on Commissioner Di Guilio’s point about the kind of east and west borders. That puts us in a difficult situation with looking at these districts because it’s going to force us into this north-south orientation and into the downtown area. And so, you kind of anticipated our question because I was going to ask, you know, can we look at these areas to the west and to the east? Another area that has been kind of cordoned off as a COI is the
Long Beach area, and that is another area that we might look to, just based on where this population is, if we want to look at districts with lower concentrations, we’re going to need to go somewhere if we can’t go to the east and we can’t go to the west, and we can’t really go to the south, we’re limited, and then we’re going to be bumping up into the — or we might have to put the two ports in one district, which we also heard a lot of COI testimony against doing.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I would throw it back to the other Commissioners. That was my — maybe people have other suggestions, but from what I’ve heard and what I understood in our previous discussions was that there were some rather hard lines being — the peninsula district and the Orange County line, and I’m not sure what the Commissioners would like to do with Long Beach or how far a peninsula district should be on the west side, but I’ll go ahead and let other people make their comments now.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I would stick to my previous suggestion, which is to add Linwood into the Compton Carson District and I would defer to Commissioner Parvenu if you have a suggestion of what we would take out in order to get Linwood in. I think that Ms. Boyle
did a good job of following our direction and getting
Inglewood, Lenox, and Hawthorne together, which was
another COI, kept all the beach cities together, I mean,
and kept Long Beach whole, I don’t have an issue with the
other districts, that was the only comment I had. So, I
actually think that area is reasonably good. I think,
you know, we have some compactness issues with the other
districts above and can make some adjustments there.
Commissioner Parvenu, do you have a suggestion on what we
would want to lose in order to get Linwood in?

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yeah, I think that you can
move over -- have Linwood moved in because there is
testimony to the fact that Linwood and Long Beach, there
is a corridor there, a transportation corridor, and there
are some areas to -- I can’t read this very well, but
that blue area -- I believe it says West -- there is a
trade-off there, for example.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, Westmont Gramercy Place,
Manchester Square.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: There may be some trade-
offs there.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: What is the population
on those three? Because we’re looking for about 70,000.

MS. HENDERSON: Westmont is 31,853. The other
two areas that I mentioned are neighborhoods, so we’ll
have to look that up. But just to kind of skip ahead, the neighboring district is also, I think, 52 percent Black CVAP, so if we’re removing highly concentrated African American tracts from this district and placing them in the neighboring district, we’re also going to be increasing the CVAP there.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Increased, right, so that doesn’t really work.

COMMISSIONER DI GULIIO: Culver City goes up and Compton and Carson will go down, so instead of two 51, 52, it would be 60, maybe the high 50’s, high 40’s.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m looking at this a little differently because, obviously, we’ve talked about perception in looking at this one district with the Wilmington Inglewood. I’m really troubled by the compactness and so I was wondering, and I think it would still be consistent with the COI testimony that we received, but what if the L.A. Harbor -- if we moved up from the L.A. Harbor and looked at chunks including the West Carson and Carson, and maybe parts of Compton, and then moving Linwood from east and going west to Inglewood? So then you’re creating -- because we’re going to have to do something with adding population to
the Southgate Lakewood one when you end up taking out
Artesia and Cerritos, and so you’re swapping and putting
Linwood with the Compton Carson. But I know that there
is a close relationship between Compton and Carson, but
that doesn’t necessarily take away from what we’ve
actually heard, which is trying to recognize that all of
these areas are really intertwined. And because the
communities all have a good relationship, I don’t know
that we’re actually splitting anything when we’re
actually creating districts that actually are closely --
almost like sisters, and we could probably look at
putting them both in a nested Senate District because
this one all the way -- I don’t know if you put a freeway
through this little corridor here, but I know that there
might have to be some consideration of the city split,
but if it’s at Compton Carson, or if it was Carson and
Wilmington, it may not be a problem when you’re putting
the rest of Carson with Compton, because it still -- and
I certainly defer to Commissioner Parvenu in this regard,
but because all of those areas right there, Wilmington,
Carson, Compton, are so closely together, I’m thinking we
could create districts that geographically look compact
and still maintain the integrity of the neighborhoods.
So, I’m looking Linwood to Inglewood east-west is one
district, and then looking Carson to the Port as another
one, then looking at the Southgate one, when you pull Linwood out, and you’re pulling Cerritos and Artesia back into Orange County, then we’re looking at the Florence Graham and then all that purple area, Bell Gardens, that would go with Southgate, Downey, Paramount, and Bell Flower. That all looks compact.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That does look --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: No, I’m just saying, yeah, that does make a more compact region looking at this area from east to west. I’d have to see what that looks like and what the numbers are, and I know that’s more involved than what we can do, probably, in this short time. But certainly there is east-west arterials that link those communities together, as well as north-south, so I don’t see that being a problem at all.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Madam Chair, could I just ask that we confirm that the Mappers got all that down because I think that’s a good direction.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And could I actually confirm that our note-takers have that down? If I could confirm who my note-takers would be for this region? And if we need to repeat what we’ve just said,
we can pause and do that.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Slowly summarize what cities go in where, and what cities go out the other –

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Should I have some combination of Commissioner Filkins Webber and Commissioner Parvenu restate the suggested directions?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It looks like, okay, starting to the east, Artesia, Cerritos, we understand will go into Orange County. So when we look at depleting that population and then looking at the Southgate Lakewood District, based on Commissioner Dai’s recommendation to consider taking out Linwood, when you do that, I’m assuming we can work out the numbers where I think Southgate and Downey may very well merge into the Bell Gardens Cudahy portion of this district, so that when you move Linwood into Compton Carson, moving westward, the consideration is to drop Carson into Wilmington and move forward for population and compactness looking at Compton over to Inglewood Lennox, so going east to west.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So you’ve got Linwood Compton is what it might be, Linwood Compton District over to Inglewood, and then you’ve got a Carson Wilmington district to the L.A. Port.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any refinements to that, Commissioner Parvenu?

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: No. That captures what I was looking at here.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, I’ll take my final two comments on this district. Commissioner Ward and then Commissioner Aguirre.

COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just curious as to where Paramount, Bellflower, Lakewood, and Hawaiian Gardens end up.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: They probably end up with the Downey Southgate Paramount – or, I’m sorry, that clump right there, so you might be merging Downey Norwalk, and Southgate Lakewood together into a Southgate Downey district. Who knows? I’m just kind of throwing it together because I’m thinking that the numbers are going to merge those two districts together when you take out Artesia and Cerritos.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent.

Commissioner Aguirre.

COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. I would ask our Mappers to refer to the CAPAFR design of their Section 60 and 58 as being pretty close to what has been suggested by the two Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And I did not know
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COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: It would be CAPAFR in the L.A. South Bay Assembly Districts around Long Beach – 58 and 60.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, do our Mappers at this point feel they have enough direction on this district?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, let’s continue moving on in order to make good use of Mr. Brown’s limited availability.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Wait, I’m sorry, can I just – I’m sorry, I just want to make a note because there is a problem with that because Assembly District 60 does the Carson Gardenia Rolling Hills down to Rancho Palos Verde, so that breaks the peninsula district that we said, so just to put the caveat again to try and work within what you’re hearing, but to keep the peninsula and the hard county line, which this CAPAFR doesn’t take that into -- the District 60 doesn’t take that into consideration.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And that is consistent with my prior instructions because I didn’t go into the Palos Verde because I think that that district looks good based on our prior instructions.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Right. Let’s move along.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so we’re going to move up to the Culver City Crenshaw and that has –

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Page?

MS. HENDERSON: Sorry, it’s on the same page, well, part of it is on that page. Just a second.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m sorry, could you reference the name of the district?

MS. HENDERSON: Crenshaw. Yes, you can see it more on page 18, it’s in green. And this district, as currently drawn, is 28 percent Latino CVAP, 52 percent Black CVAP, and 5 percent Asian CVAP. And it includes several neighborhoods in L.A., including parts of Regent Square, parts of Cloverdale, parts of Wilmington Square, and West Adams, Adams Normandy Exposition Park, West Vernon, Crenshaw District Exposition, Baldwin Hills, Leimert Park, West Vernon, Hyde Park, View Park Windsor Hills, Vermont Knolls, Florence Firestone, and as well as Culver City. And Culver City is intact.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown, could I ask as a starting point if you have any guidance for us on this district?

MR. BROWN: It would be similar to what we just discussed. In other words, to the extent that the
district has been drawn using the non-Voting Rights Act criteria in the California Constitution, the district is fine as is. And to the extent the Commissioners are not satisfied, they’re free to do other things consistent with the California Constitutional criteria and change it.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In that regard, we haven’t received a lot of testimony on this, so it would go back consistent with Mr. Brown’s recommendation, I believe, in respecting neighborhoods, so I was wondering whether you have actually captured all of Exposition Park and, then, did you capture all of University Park in those two neighborhoods -- as I understand, those are neighborhoods and, again, I’ll defer to Commissioner Parvenu, but they are always referred to and there may be designated neighborhoods -- so I am just wondering whether or not those neighborhoods are respected because, again, we haven’t received a lot of testimony, and we might get it when we move into Culver City, so that might change a little bit. Then, I just wanted to know what the street was that is the border at the top of the Culver City Crenshaw, just so we can make sure and Commissioner Parvenu, again, I would defer to him to make
sure of what street that is, or whether that’s the 10
freeway, so that we can be assured. If it’s a freeway,
then we’re probably not breaking up any neighborhoods if
it’s the 10 freeway.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That’s right. It looks to
be.

MS. HENDERSON: The street to the northern
boundary is West Washington.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, it is? That’s
the northern boundary is Washington?

MS. HENDERSON: We’re double-checking. Yes, West
Washington Blvd.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: It more or less parallels
the 10 freeway, it’s a few blocks --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, I understand,
but then, when you go those few extra blocks to the 10
freeway, you might -- if the cut-off is Washington right
there, there may be some issue if you don’t take it up to
the 10 freeway, only because I can’t see the details --

MS. HENDERSON: It’s north of the 10 freeway.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, yeah, that’s
right, okay. You’re right. Okay, that’s fine.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any additional
direction to Q2 on this particular district?

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: To follow-up on the
question, did you actually use the official neighborhood boundaries for these? You did?

MS. BOYLE: I’m using the Neighborhood Council boundaries provided to me by Ms. MacDonald.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay, good.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent. Any further direction? Commissioner Barabba?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If that little appendage off to the west side, that’s a part of Culver City? Is that -- are there people there? In other words, those industrial areas --

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: No, that’s a commercial area. It’s stretching out to the west side. That’s an old train line.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Are there at least 123 people? Actually, under, not --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: I just had a comment about the mapping. I’m just wondering in the little text boxes that we had, is it possible at all to add like a split count metric to those in any given districts so that when we kind of look at them at a glance, we would know that? I mean, it might be impossible, I don’t know, I’m just asking.

MS. HENDERSON: You mean in the little boxes for
COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah.

MS. BOYLE: As in the number of city splits by each district? I think it would be possible to do that.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Oh, awesome.

MS. BOYLE: It could be, it would take some manual work on the park of the Mappers, but it could be done. I’ll have to discuss it with the Mappers.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Let me also ask a clarifying question to the Commission. I think there are a number of things that we could consider post first drafts, but I wanted to clarify, is this a priority to have that information available on every moving draft visualization that comes forward, kind of between now and June 10th? Or is that something we would like to strive for post-June 10th? Commissioner Raya.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: I would say we don’t have to have it now, but I also caution, some of us are already really having a difficult time reading the maps and all the details on them, so I’m a little scared by the thought of more little stuff in a little box.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: We forgot to ask the Dean while she was here if they have a bigger screen.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’ll work on it.

Commissioner Yao and then Forbes.
COMMISSIONER YAO: I think any means that they can provide the information to us, including a table with that city split, would be adequate. I don’t necessarily think that we need it on the map, itself. But I think keeping track of city split really is one of our priorities.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, we do keep track of the city splits. Adding more information, what Nicole said really quickly, was that it is a lot of manual work, which equals for us a lot of extra time to do it for every single one of the districts, but we can develop a way to get that information to you, and it might not actually be in a little text box.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Barabba.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I thought that the manner in which CAPAFR displayed the districts in their handout where they had the map, and then they had the information off to the side, that was a lot easier to deal with, I would think. You might want to check and see if that is doable.

MS. HENDERSON: Again, my question would be is this for, you know, the draft, or after, when? Because the drawing itself is very time-consuming, so -- but we are already working on the best user-friendly way to
provide more information when we’re doing the official
drafts.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Just get us maps by the
10th!

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent. So,
with that, can we move on?

MS. HENDERSON: Can I have just a minute?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: While we’re
pausing, Mr. Brown, are there any other issues that we
have raised for you of a more general nature, or that
apply to Southern California specifically that you would
like to share?

MR. BROWN: I think outside of L.A. County, I
just have really one question, and that is a choice
between having an Assembly District that is entirely
within the City of San Diego vs. having the border
district, and the question really is what happens to the
Latino population in the City of San Diego in the border
districts? Are they included in their entirety? Or did
some of them get left out of that area?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown? As soon
as I allowed you the floor, now Q2 seems like they’re
ready to --

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, actually, Mr. Brown, the
reason I’m jumping in is that we would actually like to
take advantage of the time that you’re with us on the
phone to show the areas in San Diego. So that’s what
we’re going to shift to. Let me find you the right page
for that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, continue, Mr.
Brown, as they’re pulling up the visuals.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So that was really the
principal question. I think there is some remaining
issues that we’ve already discussed, for example,
Coachella Valley and I think the Commission already
indicated a preference to keep Coachella Valley full,
we’ve already flagged the question about whether there’s
a compact concentration of Latinos if you consider part
of Coachella Valley with part of Imperial County, and I
don’t think we’ll have an answer to that for a while
because we’re doing some legal thinking about what the
compactness requirement means.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I do have one
question for Mr. Brown.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner

Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Mr. Brown, given
that you’re going to look into the legal issues of the
compactness, primarily as it relates to Imperial because
of the limited population, but yet the expansive nature of the geography, do you have a recommendation as to whether you would be recommending that we draw districts based on your legal analysis for the draft maps for next week? Or do you think we’re safe in considering, for instance, there’s a visualization that’s coming up right now where we’ve talked about last week, the entire Imperial County with the border district, do you think it’s – what your recommendation is, understanding the issues, but is it okay for us to consider including this in the draft maps if you can’t get us a compactness legal decision by next week?

MR. BROWN: My sense is that there are going to be a handful of issues that won’t be resolved before the draft maps come out and that would be fine because I think it’s going to be just a few issues, and you may want to make clear as part of the draft maps that some areas are still under – I mean, the entire thing is still under consideration, but you might want to flag some of the issues, in particular.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao.

MR. BROWN: So, for example, with the Coachella Valley, keeping it whole, I think it would be fine at this point if the Commissioners desired to keep that in the draft maps and, you know, keep a note to yourselves
and to the public that there’s going to be further analysis of that area.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Mr. Brown, this is Peter Yao speaking. On those districts where we lack analysis and information to make a clear decision, I would welcome your recommendation as compared to our recommendation in terms of which way to go in the draft map. Are you willing to take the best shot and then we’ll run with it that way? Because if you bounce it back to us, then it really would be more a flip of a coin. But coming from you, I think it would be more of an expert advice.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I’m happy to do that and, really, it would be sort of our preliminary judgment about where the further evidence might take us, and so if you can anticipate it a bit and make those decisions consistent with the draft, it may save some time later.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners Blanco and Barabba.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I just want to make sure I understand the compactness concern. Is it the length at the bottom that it’s just very long and it goes all along the border, and across the counties? Is it that? Or is it the large size over in Imperial Valley? I’m just - I’m trying to understand which part - what part of this district is the one that concerns us in terms of
compactness. Is it that big – the fact that Imperial is so big? Is it the length of the bottom part of the district? And the reason I bring it up, I think I brought this up yesterday, is I know in terms of length, we drew a coastal district yesterday that was 400 and some miles, and this is, I think, from about -- less than that. So I’m just trying to figure out what is our compactness concern here, you know, it would help me.

MR. BROWN: Yes, so with respect to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, the compactness, you consider two different areas, one is the border districts that we’ve talked about, you can speak to the dates of it, just looking at the population pattern between San Diego and moving east along the 8 and then taking all of Imperial County, it didn’t seem that that would meet the definition of compactness, just on its face.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Uh huh.

MR. BROWN: But, you know, we’ll look at that and see if we would have a different view. So, it seems that if the Commission is going to form that district, and they have sufficient community of interest testimony and evidence on that, then the Commission could make that choice based on that community of interest data. So that was one area. The other area is taking a portion of Coachella Valley going all the way east through Riverside
for the state border, and then down around both sides of
the Salton Sea. And I’ve seen maps that are shaded based
on concentrations of the Latino population where it looks
compact and I’ve seen other maps that either plot the
Census Block or the cities, and there it looks very
sparse. And so, at this point, I don’t have a firm view
one way or the other one whether that area meets the
compactness part.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I was actually referring to
the compact not in Section 2, just talk about
redistricting criteria, whether we have concerns about
compactness with that.

MR. BROWN: Well, the other compactness
requirement in the California Constitution is the last
requirement, the sort of second to the last, and subject
to consistency with the other higher criteria. I don’t
have it in front of me, but that’s what I recollect.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
Barabba.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes. Mr. Brown, we
received a correspondence today which I’m sure we can get
to you, but a gentleman from San Diego questioned
whether, in fact –

MR. BROWN: I’m sorry, I can’t hear you. Someone
was moving some papers. Could you start over?
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, there was a gentleman who sent us a note from San Diego and he questioned whether we were allowed to create that district that went the length of the southern border of the state, and we’ll make sure that you get a copy of his letter, but he identified some Judicial Decisions along those lines, as well.

MR. BROWN: Well, I think what the Commission would want to consider if it’s basing it on community of interest, is whether you have evidence of local contiguous communities of interest. You can add more than one of those together to form a district, so to the extent you have -- my view would be, subject to [Inaudible] considerations, that to the extent you have a series of local communities of interest that meet the criteria that, then, you choose to include in one district, that seems consistent with your discretion under the California Constitution.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di Guilio and then Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: It just seems like with this district, I don’t think the issue of compactness is so much an issue because, again, in the northern part we had very huge districts, it’s a reflection of population. So, then, based on the fact that, Imperial is just lack
of population, it’s going to be a large district tacked on to someone, so then you look at the COI testimony that had an argument, at least in the southern part for a district that runs along the border because your other only option is to kind of just take the Western Imperial County line and just move it in a straight line, but then I think you break all kinds of other COI testimony about, you know, I can’t really see the names, I’m assuming that’s like Julian and all those Mountain areas just north of that district, or just kind of moving into the eastern part of San Diego, which there is really no justification of COI testimony to do that. So, based on, again, looking at geographic boundaries of those mountains, your option is really just to run along the south. I mean, and there’s COI testimony to support not just the geographic boundary considerations, but the fact that there’s links to the economy, another COI.

MR. BROWN: Is that a question for me?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m sorry, I’m just kind of thinking out loud, so I guess I just felt like – it seemed like there had been some consideration as to whether this was compact or not, but I don’t think that that’s – am I correct in assuming that that’s not really an issue here because of the size of the pop --

MR. BROWN: Well, it was my view that it wasn’t a
Section 2 district, that’s all I was saying, based on the Voting Rights Act compactness requirement.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay.

MR. BROWN: There may very well be others.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, I wanted to raise the issue that actually the letter that Commissioner Barabba referenced talks about this, and I think Mr. Brown also brought it up when he was prefacing his remarks regarding going down to San Diego, which is, are we missing a Section 2 District that would be within San Diego by creating this border district? So I want to get to that question.

MR. BROWN: Is the question, are we ignoring a Section 2 district in San Diego to create the border district?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Yes, that’s the question I was trying to tee up earlier. And so, the question to the Mappers is, what happened to that San Diego community? Are they split up a little bit in order to create the border districts? Or are they included in the total?

MS. HENDERSON: So, they’re split in order to form this border district. I’m going to let Alex -
MS. WOODS: So, included in the border district is the part of the City of San Diego, south of Chula Vista and Imperial Beach, and then part of Chula Vista.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Based on that, I’m sorry, Ms. Henderson, finish.

MS. HENDERSON: I was just going to say that we have a PDF of a prior visualization that we can show you of the San Diego area district if the Commission would like to see it.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown, based on what you heard about that fragmentation, would you have a follow-up guidance to give us?

MR. BROWN: Yes, my leanings would be that, if there is a geographically compact area in the City of San Diego, that has more than 50 percent feedback for a single minority group, then we should pursue selecting RPV data in that area and probably consider drawing that district to avoid litigation risk. I don’t know what that would do for the proposed border district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In looking at the district as it is presently formed, we’re over-populated by 8,151 in the Imperial, running across the border -- wait, don’t move that away -- okay, so what I was
thinking is that there may very well be a possibility to have both, and it may very well be that maybe the highest concentration of your population may be right here in that orange section for the Imperial, but if we’re only talking about maybe even keeping it -- in fact, I don’t think the border district is because it’s not compact, it’s not a Section 2, so if you pulled back on that 8,000 in the district that we’re looking right here in front of us right now, although, Mr. Brown, I know you don’t have access to it, but if you considered going further north where the higher concentration is of Orange, there you’ve got -- you still may very well have, or might even be able to increase the numbers for compactness sake, going a little bit further north, I don’t know what those cities are above the district that you have on the screen here. But I see that there’s a likelihood, based on the coloration we have here, that you might be able to maintain that Section 2 district right here in the southwest portion of San Diego, and still be able to have pretty significant numbers and consistent district with Imperial County on the border, consistent with the COI testimony. So, is that possible? Have you looked at it to balance the two?

MS. HENDERSON: We just want to clarify, and can I just say for the public, this was already posted in the
last batches of maps from this weekend, in case anyone
wants to see what it is, it’s entitled “San Diego Option
3.” And then I just think we want clarification on your
question, Commissioner Filkins Webber, please.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: My question is, in
looking at the screen that you have up right now, you
have a district that’s cut off from the Orange population
at the top, if we’re looking at compactness, you can
probably go a little bit further north and be able to
maintain the integrity of a potential Section 2 that we
see here, while you still have an 8,000 over-population
in the Imperial County border district area. So, I’m
just trying to figure out a balance between those two
districts where we might be able to get a Section 2, and
you might be able to have a consistent district with the
COI testimony with a border district with Imperial, and
have you balance those two out. Or is it possible to
consider doing that?

MS. HENDERSON: We can -- so just to read it
back, so you’re wondering if we can have this district
and also a border district?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Correct, because
you’re over-populated in your present -- on page --
goodness, who knows what -- page 21, you’re over-
populated by 8,151. I know that’s not much, but what I’m
trying to say is maintain the integrity of a potential Section 2 in the southwest corner of San Diego.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, the thing is that this area right here, the southwest corner of San Diego, has a very high population. We can look at it more and see what will happen, but a lot of the population for that border district was coming from this area of San Diego.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me give some variance on what Commissioner Filkins Webber said --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes, could I just take pause to confirm, what page are we on in regards to our handouts?

MS. HENDERSON: For the handout, the border district, we can look at page 7 will show you the entire border district. And then, yeah, and page 8 will show you a zoom-in on the San Diego area of the border district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: There’s some confusion as to whether this area is over-populated or under-populated. Could you clarify?

MS. HENDERSON: The border district is -- we’ll double-check -- it’s under-populated by 1,077.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, that’s where
I guess I was confused because page 21 says the same, it calls the district the same, I-M-P-S-D, and is that just a different version?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Senate.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But it says “S-D,” so I figured that would be Senate District, it doesn’t say “C-D.”

MS. WOODS: Sorry --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In the box.

MS. WOODS: -- my naming conventions were - I apologize for my naming conventions, they were done very quickly, so I used a lot of the same names, especially when I was trying to nest, and unfortunately I have been using the abbreviation of “S-D,” which is also an abbreviation we have been using for Districts.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: If we look at the labels that have the date, it says 6/1/11, Region AD, Imperial, San Diego County,” so I would suggest we focus on those labels as the best marker for accuracy.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay. Disregard everything I previously said.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I had interrupted Commissioner Forbes, so let me have him finish his question.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me pose this as an
alternative to looking at -- to create the Section 2
district here in the southwestern corner of San Diego,
and going north or not, as you see fit, but then also to
see what it would take to create another Assembly
District that only keeps Imperial County whole and the
rest of it is filled out of San Diego County, as well.
That means you don’t go north, you just see what happens
in San Diego County if you use Imperial County as the
base for that second district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I think the challenge with
that is, if you keep Imperial County whole and you try to
keep them with San Diego, you’ll end up having, you know,
in order to have similar population, you’ll end up taking
all that eastern part of San Diego because it’s fairly
sparsely populated. And we had COI testimony that there
were certain communities that really did not want to be

--

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I don’t think that’s
necessarily true. I think you can move north in San
Diego proper and pick up a lot of population and not too
much area and still leave the eastern part of the county
open.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So you would actually take
Imperial County --
COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, I would take the map that we show here as the -- we’ll call it the border district?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Uh huh.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: And the southwestern corner of San Diego is cut out, and then I would move north in the urban populated areas there next to it, it would be to the east of that district.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Which -- I’m just clarifying what Commissioner Forbes is saying -- which one are you saying to move into, the N-E-S-S-D? Or the orange one on page 7. So you’re looking at the salmon color moving into salmon, into purple, or into the grayish green above.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: It would probably be the salmon because the purple would become the Section 2 district.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, I just wanted to clarify.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: You take part of that salmon district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, Commissioners, I do just want to do a time check because we have a hard stop on Mr. Brown’s time at 5:00? Is that correct, Mr. Brown?
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, so if we could get to the point where we’re providing some direction to Q2, we might be able to look at one additional district before we have to let him go. So, any additional comments at this point should be providing direction. Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think a more -- like I said, I’m still concerned, moving into that salmon area, you’re going to encroach right in that area where there was COI testimony that they didn’t want to be with Imperial. So, I would like to look at one that does move north, that keeps Coachella Valley whole with Imperial.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: My concern with that is whether your recommendation is to create a district -- an Assembly District, mind you, that crosses two county lines.

COMMISSIONER DAI: No, one county.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, so now what you’re suggesting is that we create a district that is contrary to what we had discussed in the Insight maps and that’s contrary to the COI testimony on the border district --
COMMISSIONER DAI: No, we had multiple -- we had conflicting testimony in this area, we had a lot of testimony about keeping Coachella whole and keeping the whole Imperial Valley whole, and that would be moving north. We also had testimony that was about creating a border district and matching Imperial and San Diego. I think both are reasonable options. We looked at both in our Insight maps.

MS. HENDERSON: Commissioner, so if I can just comment, we had a visualization that I think you’ve seen previously, that is on the screen now, and putting Imperial County, Cole, with Coachella Valley requires splitting Coachella Valley.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And my comment at the time when that occurred is it does split it, and what -- it’s not compact, and what testimony did we have that confirms a community of interest between Brawley and El Centro and Desert Hot Springs? And that, in looking at this district, and that’s why we pulled away from this visualization, even though we saw it, but we didn’t agree that it was consistent with the testimony, although we recognized that at least there’s a portion in the northern part of Salton Sea that said that they had some connection with Imperial --

COMMISSIONER DAI: The southern part.
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: -- with the southern. But the consistent testimony we received from those that live in Imperial from, obviously, the Brawley El Centro area, went down the transportation corridor, the 8, into San Diego. But we don’t have any COI testimony from Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, that say that they have any community of interest with Brawley and El Centro, especially when you’re talking about an Assembly District.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, and I would be concerned about keeping the Coachella Valley whole, so thank you for reminding me.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So with that, do we have alternative direction?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, again, it’s what I --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: How much population -- this is going to look like a very large district, but how much population is there to the east? In looking at page 7, I believe that the square on the eastern part of San Diego County is Brago Springs, if I’m not mistaken, but there’s nothing on page 7, but I know that there’s not much population there and we might -- if we looked at, well, actually, I don’t know. Well, what I’m trying
to do is maintain the potential for a Section 2 District down in National City in Chula Vista, and pulling back on the border district there. And when you pull back on the border district, because we’re not looking at -- I mean, we’re looking at Imperial County, we’re not looking at a Section 2 area because you don’t have geographically compact, so if you pull away from the southwest corner, that population right there could go into the creation of the Section 2 and the National City Chula Vista. So, if that happens, then where are you going to pick up the additional population such as what Commissioner Forbes had talked about before? And so, if we want to maintain the salmon area, which I can’t see what all those cities are there, but I’m assuming that’s Rancho Bernardo area, what if we went a little further north into the eastern part of San Diego where there is sparser population there, but how much further would we go up, and we might very well be getting to a larger Assembly District, but I’d rather see us split these two counties one time.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I had Commissioner Forbes and then Blanco.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me, I mean, if you look at the current border district and the purple district, that represents two districts. What we’re doing here is we’re taking part of the border district and part of the
purple district to create a Section 2 district. There should be approximately another district, another district left, between whatever is left of the purple district and Imperial; in both cases, it’s two districts, so it should work out.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I was just looking at the State Assembly District map that MALDEF gave us, and that’s what -- they’ve done something almost identical to what Commissioner Filkins Webber and Commissioner Forbes are looking at.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I didn’t know that.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, they have the Section 2 district, and then they have a Assembly District that picks up that chunk of the border that’s only in San Diego, and they go up and they pick up like all the way to Santee and Poway, and they stop a little bit short of Escondido, and they still preserve all what’s been -- what we got from CAPAFR as sort of a East Chula Vista, East National City, and that’s how they -- they have found enough population in sort of pushing that gray area up and that eastern area to have a wholly San Diego Assembly District, so that’s just one -- they don’t have their thing numbered, but they do have a visualization
that is very similar to what was just described.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: What’s the number?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Seventy-four.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: In the interest of time and hoping to get one more district out of Mr. Brown before he signs off, is it possible that we feel comfortable enough with this concept that we could direct Q2 to implement it between now and when we see them next?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, excellent.

Ms. Henderson, what district would you like to look at for our last VRA consult?

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we’d like to look at the Pomona Valley and let me find you a page number.

MR. BROWN: Which one? Could you repeat?

MS. HENDERSON: Pomona Valley.

MR. BROWN: Pomona Valley?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Pomona Valley. Do we have a page?

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, I’m looking for it right now. So, on page 10, you can see it. So it’s Pomona Valley and the Rialto Fontana, if we can do them both at once.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Sorry, could I just make a very quick comment on the last one, just to preface
what Commissioner Blanco said? I think there’s something
to be said about what MALDEF did with the district that
was kind of the proposal, but in order to do that, you
split the Coachella Valley and the Imperial one, so I
would just suggest maybe to try to look at something that
does include so much population like Poway, take some of
that out to be able to keep Coachella Valley whole, so a
hybrid of that, if you wouldn’t mind, just to begin to
reiterate the Coachella Valley.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. I trust
our note-takers will add that into the record.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so here, the Pomona Valley
includes Pomona, Montclair, Chino, Ontario, it has a
Latino CVAP of 49.16, Black CVAP of 10.17, and Asian CVAP
of 6.87 for splits.

MS. WOODS: It also includes part of Rancho
Cucamonga and it splits Rancho Cucamonga. And that’s the
only split.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Sorry, what page?

MS. HENDERSON: Page 10, it’s -- they’re small on
this, they’re on the left-hand side of the page. Pomona
Valley is that shade of gray and Rialto Fontana is the
lighter shade of gray.

MR. BROWN: What’s the label on the map? I don’t
MS. HENDERSON: Oh the - Region II AD, San Bernardino and Pomona Valley Area.

MR. BROWN: Okay. I have it.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do you have any opening thoughts about this visual, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: Yes. I think the Latino CVAP is close enough to 50 percent that -- and the district appears to be a geographically compact area, so that we should do additional RPV [Inaudible] and preliminarily consider the possibility that this could end up being a required Section 2 district. So, it would be useful to know what the splits are in that district --

MS. WOODS: So it splits the City --

MR. BROWN: -- does it split the county? Does it split the city --

MS. WOODS: It does split the county because Pomona is part of L.A. County, but we received COI testimony about Pomona being with Ontario and Chino. And it splits the city of Rancho Cucamonga, but the other cities are intact. I also should mention that we had previously had part of the unincorporated area next to Fontana as part of this area, and when that area was included, the CVAP was over 50 percent, but per Commission direction at our last meeting, that area was
moved into the Rialto Fontana district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: I’m sorry, was there a question?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, no, no, I wanted to -- I know we’re getting close on your time and I wanted to offer you the opportunity if you have any kind of over-arching framing regarding this district before I open it up to the floor for Commissioners.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I think it’s an area that we have to consider further for potential Section 2 requirements, so I think that Q2 should do further analysis of the Latino CVAP to see if a better estimate of that can be accessed, if it’s over 50 percent, and we should do RPV analysis of this area and treat it preliminarily as a potential required majority-minority district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Mr. Brown, would that be for the district that is identified as Pomona, as well as the adjacent district of Rialto Fontana?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Because the Rialto Fontana -- so, actually, we can highlight them because Commissioner Ancheta and I are kind of keeping track of
whenever you throw that out there about an RPV, so we want to make sure that we have those two areas, it’s actually those two separate districts that may require Section 2 and further RPV.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah, Mr. Brown, I’m having trouble, I guess, conceptualizing what kind of robust testimony, or can you help me make tangible the idea of what would qualify as robust community of interest testimony to support splitting -- like in any said district -- both county and city lines?

MR. BROWN: I think that you would not consider or need to consider the community of interest testimony as much if you conclude that this is a required majority-minority district under Section 2 because, if it is required, then it takes priority over the other criteria of the statute. If you get to the point where you conclude that it’s not required, then you have to be concerned about a county split. And when you’re trying to minimize the divisions of geographic boundaries and you’re going to consider community of interest testimony as weighed with that, it just seems to me that you want to have more than casual assertions about the community, you want to have some actual evidence that you all
conclude is reliable about what the community is and where it is. And I’m happy, as we get into some narrow focused areas, I’m happy to look more specifically at what the evidence is, where it matters, and express my views on that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: At this moment, does the Commission have any further questions or direction regarding this district? No. Let’s move along.

MS. HENDERSON: If we can, just before Mr. Brown has to leave us, if we can shift over to page 14 on your handouts, it’s Anaheim Fullerton and the Santa Ana Districts --

MR. BROWN: Okay, so I’m going to sign off at this point.

MS. HENDERSON: Mr. Brown, if you could just stay for a couple more minutes, please?

MR. BROWN: Sure.

MS. HENDERSON: Thank you, George, you’re the best. So, the handout that we’re looking at is the Region 3 AD North Orange County, and we would just like to get Mr. Brown’s input on this, and this was an area that was together this past weekend and then, upon Commission direction, they have been drawn separately, and the Santa Ana District now has a Latino CVAP of 45
percent, Black CVAP of 2.27, and Asian of 16.45, and the
Anaheim Fullerton has a Latino CVAP of 28.46, Black CVAP
of 3.27, and Asian CVAP of 17.43. In the interest of Mr.
Brown’s time, I’ll go through the cities and splits like
that afterwards in case you want to get his input on this
area.

MR. BROWN: I’m sorry, what’s the question?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’re opening the
floor to you just to provide your thoughts on this area
before you have to get off the phone.

MR. BROWN: Is it the Santa Ana District with the
45 percent Latino CVAP?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes, that one and the neighboring
Anaheim Fullerton.

MR. BROWN: I’m not finding it right away, but
I’ve seen it before.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It’s labeled Region
3AD North Orange County.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Ana, Ms. Henderson, could
you remind us what we instructed you to do? Because I
think this was a much higher CVAP earlier, right? The
Santa Ana, so what did we do?

MS. WOODS: The Commission instructed to keep
Anaheim and Santa Ana in separate districts.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think what we had done
is we had them both together, trying to have a high
number, and then what we said is, because there’s two
separate populations, to have an Anaheim-based district
and a Santa Ana-based district to see what it would look
like, so I’m assuming this is what happened when we gave
you those instructions.

MS. WOODS: Yes.

MR. BROWN: I think I found it. I found it now.

What we had discussed originally was that the Latino
collection in Anaheim seemed to be not contiguous and
part of the Latino population in Santa Ana, and then the
Commission directed alternatives to be drawn. So, based
on these drawings, I don’t -- it’s pretty apparent that
the area drawn in Anaheim is not a potential Section 2
area. And the area drawn around Santa Ana, I suppose, at
first brush, it doesn’t appear to be a Section 2 area, it
might be worth some further analysis by Q2 of the Latino
CVAP to see what other estimates of it might reveal, just
because we wouldn’t want to miss it if it is over 50
percent. So my preliminary view based on this data is
that these don’t appear to be required Section 2 areas
because, based on what is shown, it meets the first
Gingles precondition.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Mr. Brown, this raises a
question that we were trying to answer in your absence, which is, is there some rule of thumb in terms of what the percentage range we should consider, you know, close enough to 50 percent, a CVAP, given that we’re using unreliable data? In this case, we’re looking at a CVAP that is 45 percent. We’d assumed that if it was within a couple percentage points, we should look at it, but is plus or minus five percent something we should be looking at, too?

MR. BROWN: Yeah, I’m thinking 45 to 49 percent, maybe we should look at it. Because my understanding is that, as long as we only have a few areas we’re looking at, it’s not burdensome to look at it further.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any final questions for Mr. Brown before we let him go? Commissioner Barabba?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, we made this -- we provided this direction to Q2 because there was concern about contiguity between these two cities, and in doing so, we’ve actually reduced the CVAP. Will we be in a position to defend that decision given that we already know what the alternative is?

MR. BROWN: Well, if I understood the question, the original alternative, we -- the reaction was that it
didn’t appear to meet the first Gingles precondition. And so, if the Commission wanted to draw a district that was similar to the original alternative, they would have to do that based on the other California Constitutional criteria, and since that other alternative seemed to cut through the City of Orange, that may present a challenge.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Okay. All right, I will sign off now and I’ll check in with Kirk tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Brown, much appreciated.

MR. BROWN: Okay, bye.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What was the last thing he said?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: He’s going to check in with Kirk tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: About Orange.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: What was your question, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, what was the last comment he made about Orange? I just didn’t catch that in response to Commissioner Barabba’s question.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: He said that, to combine
Anaheim and Santa Ana, you have to cut through the City of Orange.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And that would be inconsistent with the California Constitution. So therefore, the original alternative did not meet the first Gingles criteria, so you'd have to go to the California Constitution and, in so doing, you didn't have a contiguous area because you had the Orange in there between the two cities.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes and then Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: A question on the map. Does this – the boundary between west and Santa Ana, is that the city boundary? Or is that split? Something is split there.

MS. WOODS: It's not because part of the -- the west district for Westminster, it includes part of the City of Santa Ana, which is consistent with the COI testimony for the Little Saigon.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Then my next question is, just as a suggestion, there are significant Asian population in Santa Ana and significant Hispanic and Latino population west, as to whether you could take it with that border and increase the Asian population in west and increase the Hispanic population in Santa Ana,
and therefore at least we get to the 50 percent number, assuming that is something desirable. But the idea is that you would both strengthen the API community, as well as the Latino community by doing that.

MS. WOODS: I could look into it. I would also have to look at the borders for the Little Saigon Community if that is something that you wanted to continue to keep intact.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Could you just zoom in a bit on the Santa Ana district? Yeah, the direction might be to try to up the Latino CVAP, but I’m not sure where, though.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I think that’s what Mr. Brown was saying could be a problem, which shows that you may not likely have a Section 2 district here, unlike what we first saw in the initial numbers.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Question? Can I see what the VAP is, the Latino VAP? I mean, I guess my point here, depending on what the VAP is, you know, I wouldn’t strain too hard to try to increase it if Mr. Brown has already advised that we should look into this.
MS. WOODS: The Latino VAP for this district is 63.92 percent.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I think this is right on the borderline of potentially being a Section 2, so we would want to direct you to look into more reliable CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: At this point, are there any additional directions that we would like to provide Q2 on this specific district? Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Santa Ana only, or Fullerton and Anaheim, as well?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we’re looking at both of them, so either one, yes.

COMMISSIONER WARD: The Anaheim Fullerton, I know last time we looked at this, we talked about the strong city COI that combined Fullerton Brea, Yorba Linda, and Placentia, due to City agreements and fire and police contracts and things like that. I’m wondering what testimony, I guess, trumped that, or why do we have it the way it is now.

MS. WOODS: That was for the purpose of balancing population, so if we’re looking at adding Cerritos and Artesia to Orange County, that’s going to shuffle around this area. So --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I believe what we had discussed before is, if that occurred, because as I
recall from the Insight, we were going to put Artesia, Cerritos, La Palma together, which then my next suggestion was Buena Park with Anaheim, so it pushes that way, and then that is still respected potentially, Fullerton, Placentia, and Yorba Linda, and that Anaheim Hills area as one other district. But that’s kind of what I thought my recommendation was for some of the Insight suggestions. So that’s kind of how I envisioned those districts together, of course, now we have to do something with Anaheim.

MS. WOODS: Yeah, there was a lot of shuffling with Nicole and I trying to get a border between our two areas, so, you know, we did look at both of those and, if Cerritos Artesia, that’s your direction, then we’ll definitely have to work with those areas.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do our note-takers feel like they have gotten the right level of detail on this area?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: All I can say is I’m glad I had yesterday and not today. Jeanne’s finger is just going like mad up there.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: I have no idea what is at the end of my fingers.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber, do you think you need --
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Just a summary that Q2 will need to do a further analysis for CVAP for Santa Ana District to make sure whether or not we have a Section 2; then, we’re going to move Artesia Cerritos and La Palma over, which then we would have to reconsider Anaheim, Buena Park District previously, and to take a look at respecting the COI of Fullerton Placentia, Yorba Linda, and Anaheim Hills. Does that summarize it for this area?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I think Commissioner Forbes had a suggestion to explore what happens if you shave a little bit of the Santa Ana, which has excess population anyway, and you give some of that to the Westminster District, and maybe if you’re not dividing Little Saigon, you’re actually maybe picking up some Asian population that goes over to the neighboring district, so I think that was the other instruction.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And just a little more specificity on that, if I’m not mistaken, it would be in that little circle area of Santa Ana where they called it, I guess, the southwest area of Santa Ana, which had a larger COI, yes, I believe that is the area.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, excellent.
Any other clarifications that the Line Drawers need?

MS. WOODS: So, if Cerritos and Artesia are going to be included in Orange County, what district would you put it with? Or what areas?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: La Palma and Cypress.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Well, just a note, that west that you’re just talking about, that it has a 32.37 API right now; if you add the Cerritos and Artesia, I would imagine that’s going to increase the API in that west category, which is what you were trying to do between Santa Ana and West, as well, too.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, as we transition onto the next district, I did just want to do a little housekeeping here with the Commission, to let you know that our staff has sort of rolled with the punches and arranged for dinner, which should be arriving in probably between 6:00 and 6:30, they’ve ordered pizza for Commissioners and then all our consultants and staff, it will be around $10.00 a person, FYI. So, at the time that it gets here, what I’d like to do is break for about a half an hour in case folks want to go get drinks, be able to have a very quick dinner, and then we can reconvene. In the mean time, I wanted to check to see, Mappers, can we map straight through? Do you want a
brief break now, like a five-minute bio break? And I’m getting a nod from at least one of our technical consultants, so let’s just say we will go for a bio break. I’d like to start back up in five minutes, so folks can just make it snappy, knowing we have another break to come. With that, we will go to a brief recess.
Thank you.

(Recess at 5:11 p.m.)
(Reconvene at 5:20 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Good evening.
We’re reconvening this session of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are resuming our line drawing directions with our Technical Consultant, Q2. We do anticipate going until later in the evening to continue our task. We are providing direction now on Southern California Assembly Districts. So, what I will do is pass the floor and the mic back to Ms. Henderson so we can pick up where we left off.

MS. HENDERSON: Thank you. So, I’d like to move to the Westminster District. I know we had some discussion about this, but I just want to double-check if there’s anything else we need to address for this particular iteration. I think this is where we’ve had a conversation about moving Cerritos, and I think it’s already been covered, but I just want to make sure.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can we get a page number?

MS. HENDERSON: Oh, certainly, it’s the same page where we were, page 14. And it’s the kind of olive green district, it’s called “West” is what the label has on it, and this district is 18.2 percent Latino CVAP, 2.49 percent Black CVAP, and 32.37 Asian CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can you give us just an overview of the splits, what’s included, what’s not?

MS. HENDERSON: Sure thing.

MS. WOODS: So it includes part of Santa Ana, Fountain Valley, Midway City, Garden Grove, Westminster, Cypress, and Buena Park, and --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So again, this would be the district that we would be adding to?

MS. WOODS: And the splits are --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And since we’re already over in population --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I just have the finish of the overview of the district and then we’ll move into commentary.

MS. WOODS: The splits are in Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Fountain Valley. But it’s a small portion of Fountain Valley, so that could be worked out.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Di Guilio, Filkins Webber, than Yao.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so maybe you answered the question, that maybe you could take Fountain Valley out. I’m just curious, what was the percentage split of Santa Ana? What percentage is in the west side?

MS. WOODS: Sorry, that’s where my staple is.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’re pausing as we wait for --

MS. WOODS: It’s 1.21 percent.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Is in the west, so, again, another consideration might be taking the rest of that and putting it into Santa Ana proper? Would that be a population number to adjust for Cerritos?

MS. WOODS: I did that to respect the boundaries of Little Saigon.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Oh, okay.

MS. WOODS: We had discussed at the last meeting, I believe -- I have been using the -- for this, I used the streets that Commissioner Parvenu --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, thank you for that clarification. I had forgotten. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber, then Yao, then Ward.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If we’re looking
at, again, this is the ripple effect of the Artesia, Cerritos, La Palma, Cypress area, moving down to Fountain Valley, if we take out Buena Park as we considered, if we needed to respect the Anaheim, Buena Park, and then the Fullerton Placentia, Yorba Linda, when we come down the coast, because I’m looking at page 15, because all of this kind of ripples together a little bit, I was wondering if, because we keep Fountain Valley in there, or if you needed additional population, Los Alamitos and Rossmoor would probably fit better with the Cypress La Palma area if you needed to increase the population there, if you are taking Buena Park out to put it with the Anaheim District. So, then what you’re looking at is if you needed additional population down the coast district, you have Dana Point that’s not in a coastal region and, again, I don’t see that—there are too many numbers and I know you can’t put them all on the page and whether or not we would have equal population in these areas. But, again, this is a ripple effect down, and I was wondering if that might be a possibility if we’re taking Buena Park out of this Westminster District and adding Artesia, Cerritos, and then flowing down the coast.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Would that be all the way down to the coast?
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, I’m looking at the fact that Dana Point on page 15 is not with the coast, coastal district. It looks like it was put in to South Orange County District, but that was if we had to take out Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, and those areas in the upper part, to add that to the Westminster District if we take Buena Park out, because I think Buena Park has 80,000, or maybe 50,000 people.

MS. WOODS: Buena Park has 80,530 people and Cerritos has 49,041, and Artesia has 16,522 people.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Buena Park -- if we take a look at the district labeled “West,” and the district labeled “ANAFULL,” we probably can do best by combining Buena Park with Fullerton because Orange County basically see themselves as the entertainment district, and then the rest of Anaheim may make up enough population to allow that northern district to be formed with the Anaheim portion of the population going toward the west district. I don’t know exactly how the numbers work out, but I suspect that it will probably make a more sensible district in terms of combining the COI, as compared to the existing district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Ms. Henderson, do you have a question?
MS. HENDERSON: I actually have a question about the Little Saigon COI. As Alex indicated, what we’re using right now for the parameters of that are the streets that Commissioner Parvenu read out in one of the meetings. There was also testimony from the public that had a different configuration that I believe was larger than those streets. And so we’d like to know if the Commission has a preference about which definition to use.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber and then Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is the difference in those boundaries -- the COI testimony, did that include Huntington Beach? Is that where you see the conflict?

MS. WOODS: It does include a small portion of Huntington Beach.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, so based on the COI testimony, in the Streets you heard in the COI testimony, that’s where the infringement comes in is the Huntington Beach, and so whether we would be splitting a little portion of Huntington Beach to add it to Little Saigon.

MS. WOODS: And also, it moves a lot farther into Santa Ana, the -- I believe the boundary is --
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That little circle area.

MS. WOODS: Fairview?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But right now, the Fairview is -- is that at the border of the west district that you have it outlined right now?

MS. WOODS: No. That district, I used the boundaries that Commissioner Parvenu stated at the Northridge meeting, which were Magnolia, Euclid, McFadden, and Trask.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Because, then, the problem is infringing a bit more into Santa Ana could be problematic based on the necessity to have a further analysis on the CVAP, and then when you spread out, then you’re only going east, and that might not be consistent with the integrity of the area on the east side of the 55 when you go into Tustin and North Tustin, because we probably haven’t heard any COI testimony that puts Tustin with Santa Ana.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I would be inclined to expand into Santa Ana because I think, I mean, that’s their perception of what their community of interest is. And it will also address the issue that I brought up
earlier of seeing if there is a place to reach in in Santa Ana, if you increase the API population in the west district, I recognize it may have an impact on the Latino population, but I think at this point I’d like to see what that looks like.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, I don’t have a comment.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So at this point, do we have further direction to provide to Q2 on this district? I would like to move it a bit quicker of a clip. At the rate that we’ve been going, we can’t even expect to finish the Assembly Districts tonight, so I really would like to reverse that trend and see how we can push through.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Do I have any support in terms of moving Buena Park to Fullerton?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, my prior recommendation was, if you’re talking about the entertainment, as you had talked about, it would be Buena Park with Anaheim, and then respecting -- and I don’t know where you’re going to pick up the additional population, frankly, but I’ll leave that to the experts, because the other COI was Fullerton, Placentia, and Yorba Linda together, so if we’re moving that -- oh, and
include Brea?

COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah, they have City contracts, again, Fullerton provides fire.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I would just comment that Brea was also mentioned often in the Diamond Bar District, as well.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Maybe we can work that during the Senate District, and not during the Assembly district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, Commissioner Yao, could I have you just summarize --

COMMISSIONER YAO: I will withdraw my request.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. Is there an alternative direction for Q2?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I know we don’t want to get in the minutia, but here is another possibility. Because we want to respect Fullerton, Brea, Placentia, Yorba Linda, and I completely understand just my own personal experience, I’ve lived in Fullerton and Placentia and Yorba Linda, so I understand that based on the COI testimony and Commissioner Ward’s experience in that regard, and because we want to respect cities, we did make a recommendation before splitting off Anaheim Hills, but given that it is an oddly shaped city, if we
needed to pick up that additional population to have
Buena Park with Anaheim, and not splitting Anaheim, we
could go ahead and include all of Anaheim Hills for the
additional population for that area of the district.
Then, when you come -- you have your Artesia, Cerritos,
La Palma, Cypress District, if you need more people
because you took out Buena Park, I think you can add the
Los Alamitos and Rossmoor people. When you pull those
people out of what you’ve described as coastal LOC, then
there has got to be a balance in how many more you pick
up along the coast, down into Dana Point. So that’s kind
of how I see the ripple effect and then the only other
issue is pulling in that additional population into Santa
Ana based on Commissioner Forbes’ recommendation, and
then we might have to just consider probably looking at
Villa Park, the orange part of Villa Park at the top of
Orange is where you’re going to make up that additional
population between that little circle in Santa Ana that
is respective of the Little Saigon COI testimony we
received. You will probably pick up the additional
population on the north part, which is the 55 and 91
interchange, close to where you have it saying Villa Park
without crossing on the east side of the 55. That was
kind of detailed, but that’s kind of the ripple effect I
see flowing through all of these, and just based on
everything everybody said, based on my knowledge of the area, too, so …

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes, I would just express -- when we do that, when we do that visualization and we look at that Villa Park, it might be good to look at the density, I think, if we now go to a further reduction of the Latino CVAP in Santa Ana, that will be the second time we’ve reduced it and I begin to worry, knowing that we were going at a recommendation from Counsel that 45 percent is where we begin to -- where we can look at better mechanisms like, you know, surname dictionaries, etc., if we now go below the 45 by this configuration and we drop out of that margin that legal counsel has given us, then I have a concern about this.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have one -- you are absolutely right, Commissioner Blanco, absolutely right because, when you go up to that northern part into Villa Park, and you go anywhere on the east side, that would also, the same concern would be if you moved into Tustin or North Tustin, so the alternative would be to go south into Costa Mesa, and so if we do have a Section 2 concern, that might be a better area of looking at this other CVAP that we’ve requested them to look into would
be also looking at that additional analysis for the
northern part of Costa Mesa, that connects with Santa
Ana, and that may very well be more consistent than what
you’re going to find moving north into Villa Park, or
east into Tustin.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
Filkins Webber, are you the one charged with notes for
this area?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, and I’ve got
it committed to memory, so if anybody else has any right
now, and then I’ll make my notes as we move along, but if
anybody has any other suggestions, that’s kind of the
flow of that area.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Does the Commission
feel comfortable with this with the recent change of
looking farther south than to Costa Mesa because of the
population concerns, the minority population concerns?
Okay, excellent. Additional questions from Q2?

MS. HENDERSON: So, for the Little Saigon
definition --

COMMISSIONER FORBES: The Little Saigon
definition was the one that we got COI --

MS. HENDERSON: The community?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, at least this point.

MS. HENDERSON: And just looking at Costa Mesa,
there does not appear to be much Latino population there, so you’re looking for Asian population? Sorry, okay, for Latino population. But we’ll do it and I look forward to your notes, Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: We all are.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, with that, let’s move to our next district.

MS. HENDERSON: So let me just see, I feel like we’ve kind of covered a bunch of districts at once here, so to just kind of clean the board, have we talked about -- are the directions we have here covering the Coastal OC here? Okay. All right, and then we have the Tustin District that I think we touched on some, but you may need some further discussion.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: This is page 15? Or is there one that shows the northern border better? Okay, sounds like 14 – a combination of 14 and 15.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I have a question. What is the pink area on both 14 and 15? I know that is hills, but I mean, there is population there, there is Cooks Corner and all of that, the 241 – Toll Road goes through that area. Where does that go?

MS. WOODS: That pink area is actually included, because of the way that I created these visualizations, the sort of dark areas with outlines are on top of the
pink, so it’s included in the same area, so I apologize, I should have sort of hidden those areas.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is that technically incorporated?

MS. WOODS: I can’t tell from -- hold on, let me -- it’s unincorporated. So this area includes the City of Irvine, the City of Tustin, North Tustin, Villa Park, Lake Forest, and it splits Orange.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: How much -- I’m sorry, I was not looking up -- I wondered how much of Orange was split.

MS. WOODS: It includes 39 percent.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If you can blow up with the color map the Latino CVAP that you have on the screen on that little part of Orange that is east of the 55, because if we consider -- well, we can’t with Costa -- because you’re 5,000 off in population for this area, which means we may have to consider splitting something else to get more people.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao.

COMMISSIONER YAO: If you look at the bottom of page 15, you can see that the SOC is 10,000 over, so I suspect that’s probably where you’re going to pick up
that 5,000 population.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The coastal
district is off.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: What is the dividing line for
Orange on this map? The northern --

MS. WOODS: So there’s not one street that
divides, but if there is a way to divide Orange that you
would prefer, that would be helpful.

Again, this is the shape of the City of Orange.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any direction from
the Commission?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Just my familiarity
with the area, the area of Orange east of the 55 and near
Villa Park is closer -- I mean, literally, you drive from
one neighborhood to the next and you wouldn’t know you’re
in Villa Park or Orange in that area to the east, but I
see that little orange part there, which I’m assuming is
in that other district, in the Santa Ana district already
right now? Is that right?

MS. WOODS: No, it’s not.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh. Well, that
would be helpful. That might be helpful with what we’re
looking at, the close numbers we have already. So if we
consider splitting Orange, I would probably recommend
that little orange part go into the Santa Ana
district that we were talking about earlier.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
Guilio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m just kind of looking
at a bigger, larger scale of the three districts that are
listed as Tustin, Coastal OC, and then the one further
south, SOC? And the Tustin one is in need of about
6,000, the Coastal OC is in need of about nine, and then
you have over 10,000, so it looks like in that district
area, you could shuffle some population. I would just be
curious to know from those people who live in that area
if you have some suggestions on how to shuffle population
down there because I think the problem with being over-
populated in that SOC District, that’s Dana Point, San
Clemente, if we respect that line between San Diego and
Orange, the northern part of Camp Pendleton, that means
we can’t go south and you’ve got the other issue of, I
think, geographic boundaries up there. So, I’m just
trying to wonder how you can move some of that population
up into the Coastal and the Orange because that’s kind of
a bottom baseline. I don’t know if that’s --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Is there some broad
direction we can provide Q2 regarding how to reorganize
the population across these three adjacent Assembly
Districts? And then have them actually do that work later?

COMMISSIONER YAO: I suspect the inland cities like Rancho Santa Margarita, Mission Viejo, that probably can go into the Lake Forest Orange area.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: If we were to suggest a dividing line, I mean, it seems like the 5 --

COMMISSIONER YAO: The 5 would be a reasonable --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Or somewhere right around the 5, depending on where the natural — it seems like there may be some natural city splits, which we can follow around the 5.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Right, when you get into Dana Point, Laguna Beach, those are the beach cities, San Clemente, those are the beach areas.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We did receive, as I recall, a woman in Santa Ana that provided color maps and she was from San Clemente. I don’t have my notes in front of me and I left those maps in my suitcase by accident. I’d like for us to maybe look at what she had drawn because the point was that I thought, when we looked at it from the Insight, when we did the Insight Maps, we of course respected the San Diego County line, we went north, and when we added up all this population, I thought we had come to the conclusion that we weren’t
as far over as we are, but I thought that we did not
include Dana Point, and that Dana Point would be part of
the Coastal, and the Coastal is already under by 8,000.
And if we’re taking out Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, and
maybe considering adding Dana Point, then you’d probably
have this South Orange County District from Rancho Santa
Margarita, Laguna Woods, and San Clemente whole, and more
cities whole.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: What is the population of
Dana Point? I don’t think that’s --

MS. WOODS: It’s 33,000.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So what is Los
Alamitos?

MS. WOODS: It’s 11,449.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And Rossmoor? Is
that a neighborhood or a city? I don’t remember.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: How would the
Commission feel about some broad direction in terms of
trying to shift population and to look at this
potentially I-5 Corridor, but prioritizing if we were
able to keep the cities intact, but sort of shifting the
population on the western side of the border, towards
this Coastal OC district and the population on the east
side sharing some of it with this orange district to the
north? Commissioner Ward.
COMMISSIONER WARD: On the page 15 visualization, I mean, if we – we’re down in the corner and have to split another city, about 8,000 or so, the northern part of Dana Point could move into the SOC district, maybe 10,000, that should allow the rest of Dana Point to join the Coastal OC configuration.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, I think we have some general direction. Any additional refinements? Okay, excellent, let’s move on.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m sorry, can somebody just summarize, we’re just saying that they’re going to shift the population of Southern Orange County in comparison to the Coastal OC.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we have extra population in the SOC district that we are going to suggest they move a portion towards the coastal, using this roughly the I-5 Corridor as a demarcation between coastal and inland, although there will be exceptions. So, pushing that on the western side, more towards the coastal OC, and then what we see on the eastern side, pushing some of that extra population up into Tustin. Okay, let’s move on.

MS. HENDERSON: I’d like to just get some input from Bonnie, who has been watching us remotely. She is a San Clemente resident, says Camp Pendleton divides us
from San Diego and to use I-5 as a divider. And she --
there was a COI handout and she mentioned parks and the
Capistrano USF, so I don’t know if -- just to throw it
into the mix.

COMMISSIONER YAO: If they are agreeable to be
split, that probably is a good way to split San Clemente.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That seems
consistent with our direction.

MS. HENDERSON: All right, we’d like to move up
to the Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Chino Hills, Yorba
Linda, Brea, La Habra, and that you can find on page 14
kind of in the top right-hand part.

MS. WOODS: And so this includes Walnut, Diamond
Bar, Rowland Heights, La Habra Heights, La Habra, Brea,
and Yorba Linda, the Anaheim Hills, and Chino Hills, and
so you’ve just given direction to put Fullerton Placentia
with La Habra, Brea, Yorba Linda, and potentially put the
Anaheim Hills with Anaheim. So, if there are any other
comments on this area?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward?

COMMISSIONER WARD: Did we take the -- I might
have missed it, did we take the Fullerton, Brea, Yorba
Linda, Placentia, Anaheim Hills option off the table?

MS. WOODS: This was a previous visualization, so
the current Commission direction is to include Fullerton,
Placentia, La Habra, Brea, Yorba Linda together, with the possibility of maybe putting the Anaheim Hills to Anaheim for population reasons.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any further direction for Q2?

COMMISSIONER YAO: The City of Industry, since it really doesn’t make any difference in terms of the population, if we can keep them whole, that would be a good thing to do. They are in the process of trying to put together a stadium and a lot of commercial ventures.

MS. HENDERSON: So I was just going to highlight the City of Industry, it’s another uniquely shaped city, and the reason that it’s divided this way is because of the COI testimony received about Walnut and Diamond Bar, and there was also COI testimony about actually taking that portion of the City of Industry to maintain the Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights COI.

COMMISSIONER YAO: The residents really don’t speak for the businesses and the City of Industry is all business, so that’s the only reason I mentioned that from a city perspective, they probably would like to stay whole, so that they can get further representation.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think where we do have COI testimony, that is, more of what we have to rely on at this point, but it may be an area in which we do
get feedback from the businesses in that area once we have something to respond to.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I don’t believe we have anybody speaking for City of Industry, we have other cities -- residents from other cities -- have spoken of City of Industry, so I think there is a difference there.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We have no local COI?

COMMISSIONER YAO: We have no local COI from the City of Industry.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di Gualio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Just -- not to [Inaudible] too much, but I do think this is a very important point because there have been places throughout the state where we have had people speak on behalf of other communities because they’re close to them, so there is a distinction to be made that we could get additional information from some of those areas that haven’t been spoken for, for themselves because our COI testimony does have limits to it, so it’s important that the public realize that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think this is also a case where we could rely on the experience and knowledge of a
Commissioner familiar with the area and I think Commissioner Yao, because of his experience with the regional governments in that area probably could pretty well substantiate any information.

COMMISSIONER YAO: So, if it doesn’t make any difference in terms of the population, I don’t know why we shouldn’t try to follow the city line and drawn the district that way.

MS. HENDERSON: The reason here is that, then, we would have to move Walnut into a different district because it would make this a non-contiguous district.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, well, if that’s the case, then that would be a good reason to divide it up.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Direction from the Commission? Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think, since we got so much testimony about this particular COI, I would prefer to leave that one as is and see if anyone from the City of Industry complains.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are we in agreement?

COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent. Let’s move on.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m sorry, I have
one question because, if we consider taking out Yorba Linda and Anaheim Hills, then where does the additional population come from? That’s the - everybody is silent.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Was that a rhetorical question?

COMMISSIONER WARD: Is Chino an option? I don’t know what the population is there, I don’t have the numbers.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Don’t we have some COI testimony about Chino?

COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, I think from the CAPAFRS, they want to keep Chino Hills.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Is that part of the Pomona Valley District, though?

COMMISSIONER YAO: No. It’s the Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, La Habra.

COMMISSIONER DAI: No, I mean Chino is part of -

COMMISSIONER YAO: Chino Hills, they want to keep that together.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Chino is part of the Pomona Valley Section 2 District?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, so it’s off limits. Other suggestions?

COMMISSIONER YAO: Is it okay to just leave the Diamond Bar, PPHCH [ph.] alone? Because we’re just so --
it makes a perfect district the way it is right now. And
deal with Orange County issues --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, it looks like
a perfect district, but this is what you have to think of
geographically, is that -- and there are ways to get
through, which the name escapes me right at the moment,
but there are mountains right there where you see all the
blue that separates Chino Hills from Yorba Linda. I’m
just -- we never really heard from that area of Yorba
Linda or Anaheim to put it with Chino Hills or the
Diamond Bar District. Now, granted, there are
transportation corridors that can go through there and
there’s major thoroughfare, the 71, which comes right
into the 91, so you do pull a lot of people from the
south and go right onto the 91 coming into Orange County,
but I’m just a little concerned that we just didn’t have
much in the way of testimony, other than Fullerton,
Placentia, and Yorba Linda, and Brea, that were together,
and the other respect for the northern part with Walnut
and Chino Hills.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I just have a quick
question for Commissioner Filkins Webber just because I’m
not that familiar, but it seems like there’s a little
mountain or a mountain range there. I know we’ve heard
in other testimony sometimes there are people like, let’s
say, the Santa Monica Mountains, or Griffith Park, that
they see those geographic areas as the center, or the San
Gabriel Mountains, so do the communities of this area see
those mountains as like their unifying source? Or is
that not — is it just a mountain that separates them?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, it’s a mountain
that separates them because there’s very few ways of
getting through there, in fact, if I’m not mistaken,
there’s the 60 freeway, which we’ve heard a lot of
information about, which is at the top, the Chino Valley
people come over off the 71 and go over to the 60 because
there isn’t any way around there, I mean, there are a few
streets --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I didn’t know if they
used it for recreational purposes, or if there is like
things that people in that community would utilize the
mountain in the same way.

COMMISSIONER WARD: There’s Chino Hills State
Park runs through there from Brea to Chino Hills, and
there’s one, the Carbon Canyon is like the only, yeah,
main thoroughfare. I mean, actually, the county line on
this is pretty good. It is a good distinguisher.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah. The Diamond Bar refers
to the county line adjacent to them as the four squares,
and that basically is where four counties come together,
and the 60 freeway is very congested because of the fact that you basically have that traffic going around the hills to get from one part of Orange County and Los Angeles County into the Chino Hills and San Bernardino County. So I don’t think getting around is really an issue, even with the hills there.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Well, I go back to Chino and Chino Hills if that’s, like I said, an option to shade in that way.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we’ve heard from the COI and from the Commissioners that that’s actually not an option. Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I just want to point out, I think we’re really – and I’m sure the Mappers have figured this out already, that we’re completely boxed in here because of Section 2 districts on the top right. We have the Pomona Valley District, which is a potential Section 2, we have the Rose Mead Monterey Park one up to the north, as well. We have a Foothills district, you know, so we can only come down, unless we start reaching over to pick up part of the Whittier, Pico Rivera District, I don’t see how we’re going to accommodate all these things.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So was that a direction to Q2?
COMMISSIONER DAI: Unless another Commissioner can come up with a better idea. I think we’re hemmed in. I mean, I think we are stuck coming down from Walnut, Diamond Bar, and Chino Hills. I don’t see another way to spill over unless we go into the Whittier Pico Rivera District, and you know, my Southern California Commissioners, do we have any thoughts on whether that makes sense to combine? And that’s another -- it’s a very high percentage, so I think you could move over a little bit.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Between two Section 2.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I think we’re kind of stuck here.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So it sounds like Commissioner Dai’s suggestion is the best one we have on the table and we have spent quite a bit of time on this area, so I would suggest that we ask Q2 if they have any further clarifications and continuing forward. Ms. Henderson, then Ms. Blanco.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, I was going to add some COI testimony in the San Gabriel hearing there was testimony about Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Chino Hills, Brea, Yorba Linda, and down to Fullerton, as a COI.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco.
COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I was just going to point out that I think we need to be more precise about the use of the phrase “Section 2” according to our Counsel’s instruction. And these aren’t necessarily Section 2 Districts in the traditional use of the phrase. I do think you run into COI issues when you start -- when you put parts of Whittier, put Pico Rivera in with Rowland Heights and La Habra Heights, but I don’t think it’s a Section 2 issue that you have 60 percent CVAP and it would be an issue of is there a community of interest, but between that part of that district that is to the side, that could go with Roland Heights, La Habra, but it’s not necessarily a Section 2 issue.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, so it sounds like we’re going with -- under duress, Commissioner Dai’s suggestion and, with that, I’d like to take stock -- are there anymore questions from Q2 on this particular district?

MS. WOODS: Did someone take notes on Commissioner Dai’s suggested --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, because that’s what I was going to ask.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So just to clarify my comment was the Section 2 district was the Rose Mead-Monterey
Park District, which is up there on the north. We have strong COI testimony about Pomona Valley. We have strong COI testimony about Rowland Heights, Walnut, Diamond Bar, and Chino Hills, with additional some of them looped in Brea and Fullerton, as well. My question to the Southern California Commissioners is exactly the question Commissioner Blanco asked, which is does it make sense for the Diamond Bar area to migrate west at all because, if it doesn’t, then I think we’re stuck going south in this configuration, which means that we probably can’t do the Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda combination. I mean, we can do some shifting around, I think, to accommodate Artesia and Cerritos, and we’ve given a lot of suggestions on that, but I think we’re going to be stuck on the top here in the north county with combining it with the Diamond Bar area because at least we have some COI testimony there that links those areas together.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber, do you have the basic parameters of the direction?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No. Well, because it sounds like all your suggestion is that we just have to keep what we have on this visualization. And if that’s the case, then the direction is no change, but then we’re still going to run into a problem with the
changes that we had previously recommended once we pulled
Artesia and Cerritos in there, and pulled everything to
the west. So, maybe because you’re going to have to add
additional – when you add Buena Park into Anaheim, and
I’ll defer to Commissioner Ward, as well, when the
Fullerton Placentia area -- and we’ve heard it a little
bit, and I think we’ve gotten some public comment on the
Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda area -- I think Brea
might be a little iffy because the testimony we received
with the Chino Hills people and Walnut people did include
Brea, but there is this strong community with Fullerton,
Placentia, Yorba Linda, and I didn’t hear that that COI
testimony that talked about Chino Hills included Yorba
Linda, so that’s where -- if there was just maybe some
way that we could work on the population push because we
are crunched in here, because otherwise you’ve got
Anaheim that is going to be a little island based on our
prior suggestions, so we’ve got to move something here,
even though we can be respectful of this district a
little bit, we’ve left Anaheim, you know, under-
populated.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: One thing, and I don’t know
if this works because I know that there were questions, I
mean, we could go into a modified version of our original iteration, which was that Santa Ana went up a little bit, and that way, you know, you could push the Fullerton, Placentia, you know, sort of try and capture those cities at the top that we’ve been talking about maybe more properly together, rather than trying to see this whole section in green here as one COI, and then, if we went up from Santa Ana, we also may solve the issue of the CVAP down there, I don’t know. It’s a though.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Then are we giving them direction to consider splitting Anaheim?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That’s the issue, I don’t know that we have. I mean, this is where we get into these situations. I mean, we’re already splitting Santa Ana to the west, so --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’re not going to like -- no matter what we do, we’re not going to like it, but it is a draft and we need to do something, so I guess I’m essentially asking what is the lesser of evils on the Commission? Commissioner Ward and then Yao.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Well, I think that’s the question I asked Mr. Brown earlier, was kind of in regards to this because, again, we’re splitting the county line here which also has a geographic boundary, that is very distinguishing for this area we’re talking
about, and I mean, we’re identifying a COI as the reason why we’re boxed in, but there’s -- I guess that’s what I’m unclear is how do we figure out what COI is, I guess, the most important, the California League of Cities Orange County sent some maps out and they’re a nonpartisan group of City Managers, and they offer two pages of rationale that explains the city connections, contractual connections, between Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda, and Brea. So, I mean, that’s important when they share fire services, education, things like that -- I think that has to be considered, especially when you add the county and geographic boundaries into that district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So what would be your proposal, Commissioner Ward, as the local -- you know, we tend to defer to the locals, so …

COMMISSIONER WARD: Well, the problem is that, like I said, I mean, I realize what we’re saying is that we’re boxed in on all sides, but I would -- like I said, then, we have to evaluate the lesser of the evils and, like I said, Chino, Chino Hills boundary, or the Whittier La Habra, I mean, I went to school in Whittier and La Habra, I lived in La Habra, and, I mean, I’d like to see what the COI testimony is there that we’re using for that.
COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, it seems to me that we’ve crossed a county line for a COI with La Palma, you know, that area; then, we’ve split Santa Ana based on COI. It seems to me, you know, we could either pull back on everything, or we can continue to go in some ways in this area with a lot of COI and worry less about what are official jurisdictions and go -- so, if in fact it’s true that Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda, you know, and I must confess, I didn’t look closely at the League of Women Voters --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: California Cities.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Was it the League of Cities?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But then do we worry about splitting Anaheim since we’ve already crossed a county line, and split a couple of other cities in order to -- if this area begins to look like we’re really dealing with a lot of different COIs, I think a sort of high level Meta-view of this is how do we -- do we put aside some of the official things and give preference here to some COI? Because, if not, it looks like in some areas we’re respecting COI, and in others we’re insisting on geographical considerations, all within one very integrated area.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I agree, this concept of consistency and I think, as we’ve gotten legal counsel, it seems like we do have some flexibility in how we move through this exercise so long as we are applying whatever Meta-criteria we’re using consistently across the entire area and, in fact, you know, across the whole state, so I am interested if we have already seen so many breaks, what are the COIs that we continue to respect and identify? Given the options on the table, I am curious about the idea of moving into the Whittier district. I am hard pressed to find a better option. I do think the COI testimony regarding the Pomona Valley is pretty solid, so that’s the only direction I’m really seeing.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I think it all started when we looked at Cerritos and Artesia and tried to improve that situation and we basically have gone into Orange County, and now the Orange County is even pushing San Bernardino County and the south is pushing against the oceans. I think we probably just have to acknowledge the fact that there’s only so much we can do, and I think the Mappers have done really a very good job with this first cut and I think we probably should just stay with it for this first round.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right.
COMMISSIONER YAO: I think anything else that we do at this point in time, it’s not obvious that we can do anything else.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: The other thing to keep in mind is that we will hear from Whittier, coming up. So I would agree, best to just sit tight for the moment.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, it seems like we are in agreement as a commission that we will move forward with this, as it’s been provided. Are there any questions Q2 would have in that regard?

MS. HENDERSON: Just a second.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: May we maybe warn you that, after we clarify if there are any outstanding questions for this sub-region, that I would suggest that we actually take a break for dinner.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I just have one summary just for my notes, that we’re going to just leave the Diamond Bar area for now the way that it is. But what were your thoughts about the Anaheim Hills based on the Buena Park to Anaheim? Because that technically is included right now. What I’m picturing is that we haven’t solved the problem with Anaheim just yet by adding – but maybe we have if you add Buena Park, and Buena Park, Fullerton, Placentia, and Anaheim is one --
COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think our suggestion was, as Commissioner Yao said, we started over here and now we’ve just sort of moved everything around and jumbled it up, and maybe just not do any of that, don’t even start with the Cerritos Artesia thing, and then none of the rest of it goes off the rails either.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh, because we’ve created a ripple that’s turned into a tsunami.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I have a question, though. We did use the assumption about taking Artesia and Cerritos out, otherwise this is going to mess up L.A., too. So, I mean, I think the Artesia Cerritos one is probably doable, I just think the Diamond Bar one is not because I think the Artesia Cerritos one, we can move things around within Orange County because we know that there’s an older population issue anyway. But I don’t think we can do both.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah. So, are we comfortable with saying we leave the Artesia -- attempt to leave Artesia and Cerritos, but we leave this current district that we’re looking at alone? Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAO: It is for the better part of the entire page 14, really, is what I have concluded.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Just for the consideration,
and I guess for the record, that the only comment I have on that, again, being in OC, is just that with the strong COI testimony that would keep Fullerton, Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, and La Habra together, that strong COI testimony is also bolstered by the objective criteria of the Commission with the geographic and the county lines, by keeping this district, we’re ignoring all of that, or we’re giving COI testimony precedence over all of that in this district, so just for the record.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di Giulio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Just to address Commissioner Ward’s concern, I’m just curious in the proposed Senate, were these two -- were these nested for a Senate or Congressional to honor -- again, we’re not going to be able to give everybody everything, but could we give Fullerton, Brea, Yorba Linda something in the Senate or Congressional to be together? Do you recall?

COMMISSIONER WARD: I’ll reserve comment until it pops up, I guess. I don’t know off-hand, I haven’t looked. But we can consider something.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I don’t think the original COI request that you have to be satisfied with the Assembly numbers.

MS. HENDERSON: What was the question?
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m just curious, you know, I think Commissioner Ward had some legitimate concern here that there’s been some testimony that says Fullerton, Brea, Yorba Linda, and if we can’t give it to them in the Assembly --

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, we did have that in the Senate.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So, in the Senate they are together in the Senate, okay.

MS. HENDERSON: In this iteration.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so, again, it’s kind of like spreading the pain, maybe there’s still some consideration to have it in the Assembly, maybe we can run it to see if it works, but at least we know that they’re in the Senate.

MS. HENDERSON: One way that it might work is if we can look at that central Anaheim, Santa Ana, where we had the COI testimony. That may free up the northern part of Orange County in order to have those COIs that Commissioner Ward has been talking about respected, as well. Would the Commission allow us to take a look at that?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I would like you to take a look at that because I think that’s an option. If there’s an option available for the Assembly, we should
consider it, but at least knowing that it’s there for
Senate makes me feel a little bit better.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay,
Commissioners, I think we are drawing this discussion to
a close -- at long last, good work. I think we all smell
the pizza here in the room, so our productivity is likely
to decline. Let’s say, gosh, would the Commission be
amenable to a short dinner break and come back at 6:35?
At 6:35, we will reconvene with line drawing instructions
to Q2.

(Recess at 6:18 p.m.)
(Reconvene at 6:40 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Good evening and
welcome back to this session of the California Citizens
Redistricting Commission. We are here with a quorum in
Sacramento. We took a very brief dinner break and are
back providing line drawing direction to our Technical
Consultants, Q2, in the Southern California portion of
the state.

I want to just give Commissioners a little bit of
a preview on where we are at. With the pace we’ve been
going, we’re not making the headway that we had hoped,
and I anticipate that the maps you’re going to see as we
move into Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, there
are going to be many aspects of the maps which you feel like you want to dissect, and rightly so, I think there are some real challenges in this area around population and how much flexibility we have to move various directions. So, in order to increase the pace of our line drawing, my suggestion is that vs. dissecting each district city by city, part of city by part of city, that we’re able to, again, spend a very limited amount of time -- I’m going to go back to trying about five minutes and just seeing if we can land on some general agreement around which directions we would feel comfortable telling Q2 to move to pick up or lose population and, you know, if there are any absolute boundaries which we don’t feel comfortable with them touching that we can note that so that we can keep moving and have something worth looking at when we come back again on Tuesday. So, that is my suggestion on how we move forward and, with that, I would pass it over to Ms. Henderson.

MS. HENDERSON: Thank you, so we’re going to start with the -- that’s probably the wrong page -- we’re going to be starting with the Far Eastern part of this large district which is Mono County, Indio County, San Bernardino, and part of Kern.

MS. WOODS: So, from Commission direction, Mono and Inyo County, it’s on page 11. Mono and Inyo County
were to be included with San Bernardino County and this section of Kern County was an area of population that did not - that is part of Jamie’s region, that did not fit in with any Assembly Districts within her region. And Mono and Inyo Counties do not have high populations, so in order to achieve the ideal population, we move down into splitting this Apple Valley or going into Victorville and -- sorry, I’m trying to zoom in -- Apple Valley area. It also includes Big Bear City and Lake Arrowhead. Hesperia is split and I think that’s the major city split area and the rest of that city is in the Antelope Valley configuration.

COMMISISONER DI GUILIO: I’m sorry, could you just make the bottom part a little bigger so I can read the words? And then could you go to the northern part just a little bit, as well, too?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: My question is, do you know they are short population in the Kern County district to the west? I’m looking for a place to put 9,000 people. If you don’t have it quick, don’t worry about it.

MS. HENLEY: Are you just asking about the population in this corner?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes, the white to white
space, what’s the over short population on that, whatever
district that happens to be? And, again, don’t spend a
lot of time on it.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, I’m not sure if we have
that in this plan.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I’m just looking for a
place to put 9,000 people.

MS. HENDERSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I’m not exactly sure
if it’s the best district or not, but I just want to just
touch base with you, Ridgecrest is in Kern, correct?

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. Ridgecrest is up in the
northern part. It’s right on – right over here.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, just wanted to
touch base with that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are there questions
or direction regarding this visualization? It’s a good
district. All right, let’s move on. It’s been a while
since you’ve heard that today.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, next we’ll be moving to
page 10, the “SB CUCA” for San Bernardino, Rancho
Cucamonga. On the screen, it’s a light blue color.

MS. WOODS: So this area includes Crestline, part
of Rancho Cucamonga, part of the City of San Bernardino,
Highland, Redlands, and Loma Linda.
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only question I have is why you included – we did not see Rancho Cucamonga, we saw where it was split before, but I assumed it was going to go along the Foothill District with Upland and Claremont, but maybe because Claremont was the other one, now I don’t know where Upland really is in the picture, but why did you put Rancho Cucamonga because you have a really significant geographical divide from Rancho Cucamonga all the way to Highland? And, in fact, the only way you could get there when you’re looking at this map right here is getting out on the 15, going all the way up through Cajon Pass and then cutting over. I mean, you could cut over on the 210, but what were your thoughts there? Just gaining population?

MS. WOODS: Yes. As you’ll see if I pull up Riverside, this area to the east has been placed with part of Riverside because Riverside didn’t have enough population to make four Assembly Districts, so part of the population had to be joined with another area, which is this area, Mentone and Yucaipa, and then over to Marengo Valley, Yucca Valley, Joshua Tree. And so, in order to achieve ideal population, yeah, I went over the mountains to get Rancho Cucamonga. I know that’s -- if you have another solution, I would be happy to hear it.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Again, within the
frame that there will be lots of micro-level detail that we’re not so pleased with, what kind of macro directions can you give to Q2?

MS. HENDERSON: And we’re just looking at the city splits, too.

MS. WOODS: Uh huh. So, it includes 67 percent of Rancho Cucamonga and 79 percent of the City of San Bernardino.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Feedback on this visualization?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes. Is there any opportunity to— you mentioned that there are two significant parts of two cities to make one whole and, so, can you move one entirely into another district, rather than have two basically half splits to two third splits?

MS. WOODS: That’s possible, but we would have to move into another area and reconfigure.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I assume the other half of the other portion of Rancho Cucamonga is at the Foothills District that we finished discussing earlier?

MS. WOODS: No, it’s not.

COMMISSIONER YAO: It’s not?

MS. HENDERSON: It’s in the Pomona Valley
MS. WOODS: It’s actually split three times, so it’s partially in the Foothill District, partially in the Pomona Valley District, and partially in this district.

MS. HENDERSON: The reason I asked Alex to pull out and let you see kind of more of the districts together is you’ll see kind of what is driving this here and this purple area district going into even San Bernardino and across into Riverside, and then you have the potential Section 2 districts to the south of the San Bernardino Cucamonga districts, and it makes the decision -- we get to points in this redistricting when you start to end up with very limited choices and that’s why, you know, if there are suggestions we would be happy to hear them.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, I’ll take the next three comments and then try to wrap. Of course, we defer to the locals.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Is there any way that we cannot split the city three ways? In other words, putting a single city into three districts?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Can we give them direction to look into?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh, please do.

And as we give you direction, if there are alternatives
that we’re considering, or directing you to, of course, we want you to weigh in if these are things that you’ve already tried and run up against roadblocks.

MS. WOODS: If the Commission wants to identify another place to get population other than Rancho Cucamonga that would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, I’d like you to -- I can’t see all the cities in the purple, if you could lighten that up a little bit, I’d like to see what the border is right there at San Bernardino at the top northwest corner. Is that Calimesa? Or do you have --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mentone. Is

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That’s where I would figure you would pick up additional population if you consider keeping Rancho Cucamonga whole, or at least in a Foothill district, and I can’t read the numbers to see what population difference we’re talking about if we remove Rancho Cucamonga and put in Mentone.

MS. WOODS: Mentone is about 8,000 people.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And how much was left in that other portion of Rancho Cucamonga?

MS. WOODS: I think it was about 67 percent.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So, I’m sorry, what
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, so it sounded like our direction was to focus on this, the northwest corner of the purple district, whose name escapes me, but looking at Mentone, if we have to have more population than that, would you suggest Yucaipa, Commissioner Filkins Webber? Yucaipa is about 51,000.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The problem is, just as Alex had suggested, the further east that we go there, the less contiguous we get with the remaining portion, which is 29 Palms, and then I don’t know what that population is to the east in the purple.

MS. WOODS: It’s about - this area ends up being about 50,000 or 60,000, the Morongo Valley, Yucca Valley, Joshua Tree, 29 Palms.

MS. HENDERSON: So I’m asking us to pull back a little bit more to give you guys even more context of what’s going on. So, we’ll see that the county of Riverside is divided with the Coachella Valley to the east, and then the purple district here, which we’re calling Morongo Banning, and then the SB CUCA that we’re looking at now.

MS. WOODS: So, basically, it’s driven from the need to join part of the population of the County of Riverside somewhere, and so there is this border here
which is the Coachella Valley, which the Commission had

directed to keep whole, and so the remaining portion,

there was a district that, if I zoom in, includes the

Harappa Valley, and then another one based around the

City of Moreno Valley, and another district down here in

the Murrieta Temecula area, and there is a additional

population. So, if there is a way that this can be

reshuffled....

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could I see the border

between the Murrieta and the Morongo Banning one,

basically the bottom of the purple? Because it seems

like you’ve got 6,000 needed in the Morongo and you’ve

got 9,000 --- I’m sorry, about 7,000 over and next to

9,000 under, so I’m just curious to get people’s opinion

from that area if we want to shift population between

those two districts, if it can happen and, if so, where

you would suggest as overall arching directions? So you

would have to take from the purple and put it to the

yellow.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Which cities will

we take out of the purple?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Is that Murrieta in the bottom

there?

MS. WOODS: It’s Menifee, which has a population

of 77,000.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And how much population do we need to move? Remind me. Seven?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m sorry, this is kind of what I was looking at again, if that population in Rancho Cucamonga is significant at 100,000, we could consider removing them and then the replacement could very well be to respect the county line, and keep 29 Palms in that entire purple area, including Yucaipa and Mentone --

COMMISSIONER DAI: And go across.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And go across. And that geographically is still okay because you see where Big Bear is, I mean, the population match is almost -- well, it’s not that high, but anyway, it’s contiguous geographically probably, I’m not sure, I’ll leave that to other experts. But it respects the county line and you might be able to trade that population, it respects Rancho Cucamonga with less splits than what we saw before, keeps it in the Foothill District, and like I said, it respects the county and geographically it’s okay that Big Bear and Running Springs because that’s all in the mountainous region that goes with that other district, so if you go further east as a general direction, take a look at the population numbers, when you take that population out of the purple district, then
it would be okay to go further south to pick up population because that area, French Valley, is closer with Menifee and that’s contiguous -- consistent, I’m sorry -- with the COI testimony we received from the San Jacinto Valley, all that yellow at the top yellow area that you see right there, that’s where I would think you would get the additional population running down all the way probably to the eastern portion of the 15 Freeway, taking it down even -- however further down you need to go, just for general direction purposes to the county line. Just, that would be my recommendation, just general instruction.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, are you the one also taking notes?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah!

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I know! Let’s pause and allow you to capture all that. Are there any other questions or refinements on the part of other Commissioners? Okay, I think we just -- would Q2 have any additional questions based on that guidance?

MS. WOODS: So would this blue district which now includes Rancho Cucamonga, we would remove Rancho Cucamonga and go east, would we include the Big Bear area? Or would we just go along Mentone, Yucaipa, Oakland, over to Morongo Valley, Yucca Valley?
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I know it looks funny and I would defer to other people as if this looks like an acceptable district. The reason why I thought it would be is because, technically, that’s the bottom of the Foothills, and the rest of it is the mountains right there. I mean, there is a potential geographic divide there, but it is consistent with the county line, as well, or at least the county boundary between Riverside and San Bernardino.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I would agree, being familiar with this area, if we were to look at the topography, this actually is a fairly logical way to cut it. We do have, even within the purple district when you look at the kind of Banning, Beaumont, going down towards Hemet, I mean, there is a series of canyons and valleys and mountains, but they are more easily traversed than when you go up into the yellow district that is immediately to the north.

MS. WOODS: So, if we do do that, then there is going to be additional population in Riverside County, so I would ask the Commission what sort of -- where would we go to join Riverside County?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m sorry, what area are you talking about we have increased population?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, which part of
Riverside?

MS. WOODS: If we respect this county line, the rest of this area is missing about roughly 60 --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I had said to go south just down the San Jacinto Valley that you’re talking -- down to French Valley?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, keep going in that direction.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And carrying that down and stay on the east side of the 15. Because I can’t tell if that includes Hemet and -- oh, it does.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, I think at this point I would like to move us along. I think we have some broad direction unless there is any immediate clarification, let’s go to the next district.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Commissioner Galambos Malloy, could we as kind of a commission maybe to agree to some of this, again, there are some commissioners that may have some levels of detail, but I know we’re doing notes, but can we agree again that some of the Mappers can contact commissioners to -- is everyone okay with that? So I think that might give them an opportunity to work out some of these things offline if we’re all okay with that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, if I haven’t
made that clear, let me repeat, that’s the expectation is that Commissioners are expected to be on call for any individual clarifications about our notes, our agreed upon direction that we’ve given Q2, but to clarify using their local knowledge.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And in that regard, I would like to give Alex some credit, I did talk about 29 Palms, but I just see here that it probably is not going to work out, so just for – because Alex, “You told me to do this and now you’re changing it!” But that’s true, it’s probably not going to work.

MS. HENDERSON: So just so I can make sure that I’m clear, and I apologize, so is Rancho Cucamonga, then, staying in this district or not? So then we’ll also need to figure out what to do with about 100,000 people over on that side of the district, as well.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only general direction I would give, possibly, is based on some of the comments that we made earlier, take a look at going west on that Foothill district, which is still consistent with keeping that Foothill into probably Upland and Claremont, because I think we were pulling back when we were talking about the La Crescenta and La Canada area and we gave you general directions on the Foothill, so I’m thinking Rancho Cucamonga, that portion of it, because we still
want to maintain the Section 2 district in the Pomona Valley, which Rancho Cucamonga is a part of right now, so the general direction in that idea with those 100,000 would be to go back west across the Foothill. That would be my recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, let’s move on.

MS. WOODS: Do the Commissioners want to look at the zooms of the Riverside District or the Moreno Valley District?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes.

MS. WOODS: So the district entitled “RIV JUR” is part of the City of Riverside, Eastvale, the Jurupa Valley, Norco, Corona, and El Cerrito. And then, the Moreno Valley District is part of the City of Riverside, High grove, Moreno Valley, March Air Reserve Base, and Paris.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And in this one, you split the City of Riverside, correct?

MS. WOODS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And the reason that we considered looking at it this way is because we want -- I guess, from my idea, I liked this configuration, it’s consistent with some of the maps that we have seen and, as we have left Auburn -- and I said Norco didn’t
have a home -- but you see here that we’ve taken out that
15 corridor consideration of that district that we really
didn’t like. But the hard part in this area is that both
Moreno Valley and Riverside have significant population
that can’t be joined, and I think we saw that in the
Insight, and so in this case, Riverside has obviously a
longer standing history vs. Moreno Valley, and in Moreno
Valley, we received consistent testimony that they didn’t
want to be split, so respecting that COI testimony, this
looks pretty good and consistent with my understanding of
being in the area overall.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, so let’s
move along.

MS. WOODS: And then, this is a zoom of the Muir-
Tem District, it includes Reed Valley, Temescal Valley,
Lake Elsinore, Lakeland Village, Wildomar, Murrieta,
French Valley, all the way down to Temecula and the
Riverside-San Diego border.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Looks good to me.

Commissioner Filkins Webber, do you have any --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Sorry, what’s in
the box? Are you under or over in population?

MS. WOODS: Under 9,000.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Do we have any compactness
concerns about this, just looking at it?
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, the purple is going to move down into French Valley and likely some areas of Temecula, but then my concern is that we’re pushing back north, back into Corona.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Or do we pick up? Well, to the east we’re boxed in by the Coachella Valley. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I was just going to ask that. We want to know what the finger is.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Oh, the finger on the northwest side?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Is that part of Temescal Valley? What is that?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That is actually El Cerrito -- it’s actually Lake Matthews area, which is like a foothill area off of Corona -- oh, you mean that finger right there?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, that finger right there.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, that’s the mountains, actually.

MS. WOODS: So trying to do that finger up here? Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Question. Do you have a
layer that includes populations for reservations and
tribal lands? And the reason -- we haven’t had COI
testimony on this, but I know that in Southern Riverside
and Northern San Diego, there’s a collection of various
reservations, which you could justify going into San
Diego County to pick up some population if you treat that
as a community, but that’s presuming a lot of things, but
there is a set of reservations that are closely located
together, but they straddle the two counties.

MS. WOODS: I’m adding that layer right now. So
it’s the yellow dot areas.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Could you go further
south? Those checkerboards show the -- that’s Palm
Springs with that funny checkerboard pattern. Yeah, so I
guess it’s the ones that sort of go into San Diego and I
don’t what the populations are.

MS. HENDERSON: There’s the Morongo area up in
this purple district. The population on that is 913.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m sorry, can you
repeat that one more time?

MS. HENDERSON: Right under where it says San
Bernardino in that purple district, oh, now you can see
it better, that Morongo area, what it says is that the
population is 913. I think that this area over here
actually has more substantial population.
COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And how about the ones in Northern San Diego?

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, so this one over here that’s on the Coachella Valley, Agua Caliente, is 24,781. And do you want to see the Northern San Diego County? Did you have a question about that?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I clarify what information we’re seeing right now? Is this dedicated Native American land and the number of Native American Residents that live in that area? Or is it total population and there may be other people living in that area who are not Native Americans?

MS. HENDERSON: It is all population, the kind of brown lines are showing tribal land.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I don’t have a particular suggestion, I just know that there are various tribal lands there that, if you were picking up 9,000 people, and I don’t know if we were given the shifts, maybe this isn’t an issue, but if you wanted to cross the county lines, I could see a justification, but, again, I’m presuming certain common interests which I don’t know if they actually are, in fact, common interests. But it’s a way of sort of justifying straddling the counties.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, to define common interest, you’d have to know whether they’re federally recognized or not federally recognized because there are big differences among the two.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, where we had started before this layer was we were up in the yellow district, and we were looking for ways to add in some additional population. Is that correct?

MS. HENDERSON: Well, we had two things going on. Because of the change in this purple district that we’re going to be looking at, we were going to have to address other population implications within Riverside County, decide where to bring that district down into, and then that’s also going to affect this Muir-Tem district, is going to affect its population, as well.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So what would you like from us right now?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I’ll confess that I’m a little lost and don’t know, we started up north and now I’m not sure what pushed what and what we’re trying to accomplish.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, can you reground us in where we started out, I think, with the purple district, the spillover effects down into the
Murrieta Temecula area, and what question you would like the Commission to address?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could you maybe just frame it for simplicity, may I suggest, that it’s framed simply where you need us to look in terms of losing or gaining populations? So, you know, if we need pluses in purple and minuses in yellows, and we can look at it that way.

MS. WOODS: So if we’re losing Rancho Cucamonga, then this rest of San Bernardino is going east for population, which means that the purple area needs more population and then the rest of Riverside County needs additional population. Yeah, so it could be about, depending on how much of the San Bernardino County that district takes, it’s roughly 50,000 to 100,000 people. We’ll be needing 100,000.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So if seems like we are bumping up against the Coachella Valley here, given that San Bernardino and Riverside are the areas where we need to add population. I have one question in that regard, regarding the COI testimony that we’ve received about the Coachella Valley, and again, knowing that these areas towards the Southwest of Coachella Valley don’t actually have a lot of population in them, it’s my understanding, so I don’t know if it will get us very
far, but within the Coachella Valley, is there any flexibility if we were to look at the kind of Murrieta Temecula area and going farther east, and maybe maintaining -- well, my concept here is maybe maintaining the Coachella -- Metro Coachella Valley, I don’t know if they consider themselves a Metro, but, really, the more urbanized areas of Coachella Valley integrated. And I am not so sure of the traffic patterns, you know, where do people in the southwest portion of Coachella Valley -- where do they identify with? Do they hop over to Temecula? Do they always go up to the desert cities? I don’t know Commissioner Filkins Webber, do you have any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, those are areas I think you’re referring to as Warner Springs, and some of those areas, that’s like Route 79 which goes into Temecula, and then that’s the back way which goes actually over to Borrego Springs, and over to Ocotillo Wells and Imperial County. And so there is a big mountain range that separate that from the Coachella Valley and on the south side of Borrego Springs, so the primary routes are like the 79 into Temecula, and further south into San Diego, actually, right there, because there is big geographic divides. But essentially, you can travel on the 79 through Temecula and go over to
Borrego Springs. There is another back way that you
could go into Palm Springs, but I think it’s just a
split, basically whichever way you’re closer to, you go
into Temecula or, if you’re on the other side of the
mountain, then you go into Palm Springs.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So maybe we could
dip into that west side of that -- what is that, the 79?
I’m looking at maybe crossing the county.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, if you look
at “COCH” [ph.] on page 13, it’s awfully close. I mean,
we’re at 622 people there, with only a .13 population
deviation, that’s why my recommendations weren’t
necessarily to push into that district because it was so
so close.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
Guilio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could I – if you could
zoom out again so I could see a little perspective? I’m
just going to throw this out and maybe it’s not
population-based, but if we did the Coachella Valley,
there was some testimony about wrapping up and linking
Coachella Valley with 29 Palms? I thought we heard that,
so that would cut off the top park of the purple and
then, if you take the other part, and you start combining
the purple and the bottom yellow along the 15 corridor,
which I think there is a lot of community of interest there, as well as maybe what Commissioner Filkins Webber just said about Western Riverside County. I don’t know if there’s any basis for that to work with that population, does that --

MS. WOODS: There is too much population in that area in San Bernardino County, because most of the population in the Coachella Valley in this district is concentrated in the Coachella Valley and that area north of it is about 60,000 people.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And what is the population of Coachella Valley?

MS. WOODS: It’s 622 people -- well --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Is there any way if you shave off --

MS. WOODS: The population in this area, it’s so small --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I just wanted to throw it out there.

MS. WOODS: Yeah, no, it’s --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I didn’t know how populated that San Bernardino part of that was.

MS. WOODS: Yeah, it’s something I looked into, but it just doesn’t work with the numbers if you want to keep the Coachella Valley whole.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So I’d like the next two comments to be suggestions on how to move forward with the problems of how do we, based on wanting to take Rancho Cucamonga out, what direction do we give Q2? What direction do we want them to go in order to pick up population in, a) the San Bernardino, and b) the Riverside, the Riverside, kind of Temecula area district.

MS. HENDERSON: Can I address Commissioner Ancheta’s point about Native Americans? I got a little email from Bonnie, which has now disappeared, but she says the only testimony she could find about Native Americans was from the Mayor Pro Temp of -- I will tell you what it is when it pops up again -- but it was talking about keeping the Coachella Valley with the Imperial Valley.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Aguirre.

COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, I’m following up, Madam Chair, on your suggestion to push east into the Coachella Valley itself. We have testimony, of course, that there are individuals that want to keep Coachella whole, but we also received testimony from individuals not only within Coachella, the City, and Indio itself, but from the Southern Imperial Valley that they, themselves, as to the county of interest, given that even
there are two realities for the Coachella Valley --
the eastern side which is the Palm Springs, very upscale
kind of area that’s got lots of golf courses, and then
you have on the west side, you have the town of Coachella
and the town of Indio that are primarily agricultural
related, highly Hispanic, and so if there – I’m not sure
whether there is an interest in delving into the east of
Coachella Valley to pick up some population and maybe
working the other population into a relationship with
Imperial County.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: A second
suggestion? Commissioner Forbes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: This is not so much a
suggestion as it is an observation, it seems to me that
the attempt to combine Rancho Cucamonga is really
twisting this whole area. And I think that the effort to
twist in order to save Rancho Cucamonga is not worth the
candle at this point.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Granted, I would
agree with that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. So let’s
retrace our steps backwards, meaning that we put Rancho
Cucamonga back where it was when we started this
conversation.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: We gave it a good shot,
though.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, we did. And so, then, the understanding if we are to look at the Rancho Cucamonga, look at that district, we’re going to leave it as is, or we have some direction on shifts? And then I really want one person to summarize and then we’re going to move on because I think we spent about a half an hour on this one district. Okay, if I don’t hear any direction, we’re going to move on. Let’s move on.

MS. WOODS: So I’ll start with this “N Coast SD.”

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What page?

MS. HENDERSON: Just to clarify, so we touched on several districts up there in the Riverside County Area and I just wanted to confirm that – are we revisiting those or, by saying that we’re going to leave Rancho Cucamonga the way it is currently that we’re okay with all those districts?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, I believe so.

MS. HENDERSON: So all the Riverside districts that we looked at just now? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, San Bernardino, Riverside.

MS. WOODS: So this is on page 8 and it starts at the border with Orange County. It includes the cities of Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, and Encinitas, and I don’t
believe it splits any of those cities.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Now, is this an Assembly District?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Because the --

MS. WOODS: Sorry, I used the abbreviations, "SC" for San Diego.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I like it. All right, let’s move on. It was page 8, but we’re moving on.

MS. WOODS: The next district is Rancho BMM, so let me pull up the neighborhood layer. So, this is something that we talked about in the wrap-up, it includes --

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m sorry, can I ask for you to actually shade in a different color that district?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And then, on our sheet on page 8, it’s -- what color is it?

MS. WOODS: It’s yellow. So this includes Rancho Bernardo, Mira Mesa, Scripps Ranch, Tierra Santa Miramar, Carmel Valley, San Pasqual. It does not include Poway. And it includes a small portion of Fairbanks Ranch, so that is split.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can you walk me through -- remind me what San Pasqual is about, kind of the finger off to the northeast?

MS. WOODS: It’s part of the City of San Diego and it’s sort of the northern part of the City of San Diego --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Of which Poway is not -- it’s a separate city.

MS. WOODS: Poway is a separate city.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: What I’m concerned about, actually, is more the district of those areas around it because Rancho Bernardo and San Pasqual go up there, you have the loop around it, I guess I’m just curious to hear what we base that on. But this whole district is this right here, right? That — what is it called? “NESD?” North East San Diego?

MS. WOODS: NESD. So that’s a visualization from the wrap-up if we sort of put together a northeast district, and I came on the other side of San Marcos and Escondido, which were included in that visualization.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But my point is that San Marcos, Escondido, and correct me if I’m wrong, but it wraps all the way down the bottom part of that, and that includes Poway and if you keep going, I’m assuming some of those bottom ones, the bottom parts of that district,
is that like Julian and--up there in the very bottom
part of that district? Alpine--

MS. WOODS: It includes Alpine, Descanso, Pine Valley, Mount Laguna, Ramona, San Diego County and States.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I guess I just have a little problem with the way that one lays out. I think those communities down there are very different than the ones up in the very top. I’m just wondering, on the general concept, if we could incorporate those southern ones into maybe some part of the south district.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And that’s, I think if we go back to our earlier discussion, we were going to push all the--we were going to push my notes, say, a little bit around Poway, probably stopping at Poway, but we would push all the way north to about Poway.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, and if that happens, there’s going to be a district that includes San Marcos, Escondido, that’s going to be very short--NESD will be very short, so we’ll have to grab population somewhere else. Am I correct in that?

MS. WOODS: If you exclude the lower areas, you’ll have to pick up population elsewhere and, you know, this blue shaded district is something that we had a lot of community of interest testimony about.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I’d be interested in hearing a little more from Commissioner Ontai on this area because I recognize that the shape of -- the way that these two districts come together, the shape seems odd, and yet if we’re following the city boundary of San Diego to try and keep those communities together and, as I’m looking at what would be the NESD district on our map, you know, many of these communities are essentially bedroom communities, or commuter communities, I believe, of San Diego. And so, just trying to think like if we actually did chop that district off in the middle, where would we be grabbing population from and what would the other people in that district have in common? So, I don’t know, Commissioner Ontai, as the local --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, well, I’m looking at -- Poway is actually a bedroom community, that’s correct. And drawing the lines up further to include Poway, and it’s hard for me to read, but I think the - so the yellow areas that are shown to the right, Lakeside, Santee, El Cajon, those are generally communities that have a lot in common, so I would keep those together. As you go into -- you can also go out to Alpine and Descanso, I think they’re fairly similar in population. Poway, on the other hand, is really part of the City of San Diego, I
would -- in terms of density and lifestyle, it’s very
similar to the gray area. I don’t know what that does to
the numbers, but …

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
Guilio, then Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I just had a question. The
legend that’s at the northwest part of that NESD, what is
underneath that? What’s the purple underneath that
community? Because I think Commissioner Ontai is right,
I think that northern part that is actually Escondido, La
Mesa, all have something in common. I’m just wondering,
what’s the three —

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: What area is this you’re
looking at?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: San Marcos.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: San Marcos, again, and
south of that, what is the yellow – Yellow, Rancho
Bernard?

MS. BLANCO: Rancho Santa Fe.

MS. WOODS: Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Rancho Santa Fe and
Fairbanks Ranch are fairly affluent communities.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Very affluent, yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Very upscale communities.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Do they identify more
with the coast or --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, I would put them with the coast side, yeah.

MS. WOODS: We got COI testimony about that area being linked to Del Mar and Solano Beach.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, that’s about right.

COMMISSIONER DAI: And not being with the communities right below it.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I guess the ultimate question, again, is if we do what Commissioner Blanco had mentioned, we’re bringing that southern boundary up to include the lower portions of the purple, you’re still losing population, so you have to pick it up. That means you’re either going to go into the coastal, or you have to take from the grayish blue color, correct? And then we have some conflicts with COI.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Where are you looking at?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So, if you follow the logic of the very bottom light color yellow, which is in that – the suggestion we’d done earlier was to say to move that line up, correct? And that would take in all the Alpine and those communities. They’re not very big, but you’re going to lose population there in the purple, the larger, right, in the larger part of the purple. So now you’re looking to pick up population and where would
you do that? Because you were saying the line was going
to go all the way up to Poway, which would eliminate --

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, we had talked about
it going north, I think we just had kind of - I don’t
think we thought about how far.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I don’t want to make
this conversation go out too long, I just think we need
to give them some direction that if the purple needs to
pick up population, we have to decide where, and I’m
hearing there was COI testimony about the grayish blue
color not breaking that up, like taking that finger away,
and then there’s testimony that says, “Don’t go into the
coastal area communities.” So what do you have left?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can you show the cities
below Alpine and Descanso?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And Commissioner Dai is
next in the stack. Feel free to chime in, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I was just going to say
that, actually, the community of interest testimony
included Poway, and we, for whatever reason had excluded
it, but all of the COI testimony included Poway in that
grayish blue area.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, that’s true.

COMMISSIONER DAI: And that would make it look a
lot more compact, as well.
VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, and that’s about right.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think we had differing – that was one area where we had so many differences of opinion about how to do those north county that I do think if we wanted to put Poway in with Escondido and San Marcos, we would be okay.

COMMISSIONER DAI: It’s an option.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: I would agree with that.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But, to address Commissioner Dai, if you put Poway with the grayish blue, you’re way over-populated and now you’re getting even less populated for purposes --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: That’s true. You could go either way, though.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I was just trying to give our Mappers another option here.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: But the yellow area on the bottom, I think, if we can move it up to pick up some numbers in the Alpine, Descanso, Pine Valley, if we needed some population there, I think that would be -- that would be okay.

MS. HENDERSON: Commissioners, so I just wanted to point out that this is currently what we see on the bottom part here is the border district, what we’re asked
to put together, and that will probably be different.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right. But that’s what we’re saying is that we asked to push up and I – are we under-populated in the purple? Because, if we are, I can’t see the numbers. Or are we over in the purple?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, yeah, exactly.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay, I agree with Commissioner Ontai that I think there is a lot of similarity with Alpine, Descanso, they could actually go -- that’s all eight and that’s all the mountains, it’s all those orchards and --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Agreed. So who is taking notes for this area?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I am.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Is that helpful?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So it’s going to go all the way down to stopping at Alpine, okay.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, unless you have further clarifications, let’s move on.

Remember, you can always call us.

MS. WOODS: Yeah, thanks.

MS. WOODS: So I’m going to show this district on the coast, so this starts at Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch, goes west to Solano Beach and Del Mar, and goes
down through Torrey Pines, La Jolla, and into and all the way down to Coronado and includes part of the central City of San Diego.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: And I would agree with that. It’s not going into Imperial Beach, right? Just --

MS. WOODS: No, Imperial Beach is --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: -- because Imperial Beach really should be part of what is shown now as the gray area.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.

MS. WOODS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s move along.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So we’re keeping that -- what are we calling that?

MS. WOODS: That’s -- I put “Sierra NOSD Coronado, San Diego.”

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It stays the same, okay.

MS. WOODS: So this area that’s currently surrounding what is now our border district includes National City, Bonita, parts of East Chula Vista, Bay Terraces, Paradise Hills, and then also includes the Shell Town, Logan Heights.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Can you show where Highway 8 is?
MS. WOODS: It’s right here.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I have a question here.

Isn’t this the area where Mr. Brown suggested that we are probably going to be required to draw a Section 2?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So all the ones on the bottom are going to change, are they not?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, that’s correct.

MS. WOODS: And the area I have surrounding that is Santee, El Cajon, Bostonia, Winter Gardens, Lakeside, Harbison Canyon, Crest, and it goes into part of the City of San Diego.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: I would agree with that.

Yeah, I would agree with that.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, we’re in agreement.

MS. WOODS: Okay. So that’s it for San Diego. Does someone have wonderful notes?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don’t know about “wonderful.”

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think Commissioner Blanco has been the lead on San Diego in the notes.

MS. WOODS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I was curious before we transition, it didn’t occur to me really earlier, but before we transition out of the Assembly, I remember we did East San Fernando Valley, but I don’t recall we ever did the West San Fernando, we never talked about --

MS. HENDERSON: Yes, we need to go back to pick up some Los Angeles areas. So Nicole is going to --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: -- the missing parts in the western part.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. Can I get a rough estimate of how far we are into the Assembly Districts?

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we have about three or four left.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Actually, Ana, could you go back to that last section? That last district we were looking at?

MS. HENDERSON: Sure.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: And zero in on the left-hand side or the western side, that little finger there, could you blow that up? A little bit more if you can do it. The highway that is running along the west side, that is 805, right?
MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yep, I would agree with that.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we’re going to start on page 18. So, we’ll start with the west side, Santa Monica, just to kind of give you a preview, we’re also going to do the Hancock Park and the East L.A. So let’s look at the west side of Santa Monica first.

MS. WOODS: So this is what I’m calling the West Side Los Angeles District. It consists of Santa Monica right now, right here, Marina Del Rey, Venice, Marina Peninsula, Mar Vista, parts of Palms, parts of Rancho Park, part of Century City, Westwood, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, Bel Air, Beverly Crest, it looks like part of the Hollywood Hills and Hollywood, or part of Hollywood.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Questions? Before I take questions, did you split any cities? And, if so, could you just run through those for us?

MS. WOODS: I believe only Los Angeles is split intentionally here.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

Commissioners Forbes and then Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER FORBES A small point. I think for making the map more attractive that the VA Hospital would be included with this. I don’t imagine it’s a huge
amount of population there, or am I wrong?

MS. WOODS: There’s actually 11,000 people in one
Census tract there. I was puzzling over that yesterday.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, could you actually
zoom in, just use as the center the VA Hospital area, and
just zoom -- the issue I’m having is that a lot of West
L.A., Brentwood, this is all the VA Hospital near UCLA,
that’s very similar, and more similar to the adjacent
areas in, say, West Hollywood would be to the west side.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, if you can
find Santa Monica Blvd., or what’s -- off of 10 -- it’s
further north.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And are you following the
neighborhood boundaries?

MS. WOODS: I’m attempting to follow the
Neighborhood Council boundaries.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So what is that
neighborhood that is in yellow?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: That’s the hospital.

MS. HENDERSON: That’s the hospital right there
on top. Brentwood.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And, again, we don’t have
much testimony, I’m relying on personal knowledge here.
I think Commissioner Forbes also had some personal knowledge from a few years ago.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I went to high school there.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I mean, part of this is also how you’re looking at what looks to be the Topanga Malibu Santa Monica Mountains District, I think you’re trying to draw there to the northwest, and it just seems like those parts that we were just highlighting fit more closely to a west side district than the adjacent district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di Guilio.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m going to take a couple steps back because we started this whole conversation in this area where we were trying to give our Mappers some line drawing directions to do Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, which left that hole swath unaccounted for, and -- yeah, there we go -- and so if we’re trying to do what Commissioner Ancheta said, where maybe you do include that western Burbank plus Hollywood Hills and so you bump that down, and then you could move over and grab the Brentwood area, yeah, over there into -- does that kind of work a little bit, Nicole, with what we were talking about earlier, or not?
MS. WOODS: It does --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Then what does it leave us?

MS. WOODS: -- except that I’m going to need additional population for what is now the green area. If I take out that Brentwood area and put it into the purple, that will leave me under-populated in the green, and I’m abutting here the San Fernando District, and Santa Clarita Valley, and then up into Ventura County, and I’d have to discuss population exchanges with Jamie there.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I was hoping we’d talk about that area, the Malibu area and the Santa Clarita. I mean, I think there are some shifts that might go on, as well, too. I know we’ve done a lot in trying to keep -- we’ve had a lot of testimony with Santa Clarita, and I think just initially looking at this, that Santa Clarita Valley has been kept together in at least the Assembly and the Senate, and I’m not sure if Congressional, but I’m thinking at some point the idea of sharing the pain has to be brought into effect with Santa Clarita, as well, too. That’s just -- in terms of how we’re going to shift some of those populations. Based on some of those, do we need to answer any more questions for you in terms of -- there may be some -- I think there
may be some justification also looking at Santa Monica
being tied into Malibu and Calabasas and Topanga and over
our hills, possibly. I mean, I think we had a lot of
testimony about that.

MS. WOODS: Santa Monica, I think, has about
80,000 people, so that would cause a shifting up here of
the population.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, I’m sorry, I
didn’t know if you needed population in green, or if you
were trying to take away from it, but --

MS. WOODS: We could trade, but I don’t think it
would be an even exchange. I would have to split Santa
Monica if we were just trading population here.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I wouldn’t move Santa
Monica on the west side, I think it’s in the right place.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, that’s fine.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I agree. I think
Santa Monica needs to remain in the west side.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But now, if we did the
Glendale Pasadena Burbank and that took -- what’s the
little --

MS. WOODS: Sherman Oaks.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: -- thank you, Sherman

Oaks --

MS. WOODS: Toluca Lake.
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: -- and brought that
down, this is the way we started the conversation, what
does that do, then, for you in terms of what we need to
consider?

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Brought down where?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Brought it down into
Hollywood.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, remember, that was one
of the things, and the San Fernando Valley was just
stressed if they were represented by people on –

MS. WOODS: Remembers, that’s some sort of hard
line there for –

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, I’m sorry, so you
wanted to go up -- I’m sorry, I didn’t realize. So if
you take that out of the Glendale, Pasadena, then you
would move it up into West San Fernando. Is that
correct?

MS. WOODS: Yeah, so we could take this area and
move it into the green, and then we’d have to move back
up into here.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I don’t think that works.

MS. WOODS: If we’re just trading population
between these two.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I hear some concern
on the part of the Commissioners.
COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I think you have a clean break there with the Mulholland break there to the south of that yellow, and you have a clean break with the 405, I would the way that looks right there.

MS. WOODS: If I’m going to attempt to, I’d remove this from the Glendale Burbank, though, I am going to have to put this somewhere. And I don’t see it going up here because of the demographics of these districts.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so if we’re saying you can’t go up north and the 405 is the boundary, and Mulholland Drive is the boundary, then that means you can’t do the Glendale Burbank Pasadena, then, and that’s where we started this whole day off with, so….

MS. WOODS: The only way that I could see doing it is through a narrow bridge or taking a piece of Hollywood here and connecting it to the Hancock Park District, which is the downtown area, Korea Town. I worked really hard to keep this area intact as much as possible.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I don’t think that’s an option, actually. I wonder, I mean, without going and revisiting in so much detail the Glendale Burbank Pasadena decision, but I’m wondering if there’s a way that we can keep the majority of the cities together. We’re going to have to make – I don’t see a way that
we’re going to be able to not make a split there on the west side of that district.

MS. WOODS: Which district? The Burbank, Glendale?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, the Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena District.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Did we talk about Burbank earlier today, now it’s been so long ago, about taking the west side of Burbank?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Because there was business interests or something of that nature?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Because the movie industry -- entertainment industry, there’s a lot of kind of small studios, post-production facilities, you know, props, shops, etc., that start in Burbank and then kind of trickle westward from there.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Warner Bros., Universal.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m sorry, can I just go -- is the part I’m talking about -- zoom in a little closer so I can read it -- okay, so on our maps, so there was a lot of testimony that said Sherman Oaks wants to be with Burbank and Glendale? Because that’s where they’re with.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, it’s in the
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: No, it’s not in the Valley.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Sherman Oaks?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, it is.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: You went to that restaurant the other day –

MS. WOODS: There was a little bit of testimony about this corner going with Burbank.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m sorry, on our map, though, correct me if I’m wrong, on our maps Sherman Oaks is with Burbank and Glendale. Right? It’s on 17.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Why isn’t it with the Valley?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Why isn’t it with the Valley? Right?

MS. HENDERSON: Are you asking why is it with Burbank?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, because right now, just so we’re clear, Sherman Oaks is with Burbank and Glendale, and originally when we had the conversation about doing Burbank, Glendale, Pasadena, we shaved off Sherman Oaks.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, that’s right.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So I’m saying, now,
doesn’t that belong with West San Fernando Valley?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so, I want to be clear about that.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That frees up possibly Pasadena to the east.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But if we bump it into West San Fernando Valley, I’m assuming there’s implications to that. But if our direction is that Sherman Oaks needs to be with West San Fernando Valley, then we need to consider -- and that would allow for the Burbank, Pasadena, and Glendale, but now we have to consider the implications of it going into West San Fernando Valley.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But I would agree that anybody who is from L.A. knows Sherman Oaks belongs in the San Fernando.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: You’re right.

MS. HENDERSON: So if we’re taking the Sherman Oaks area here and pushing it up into the West San Fernando Valley, you’ll see that this current has a deviation under by 45 people. That in turn is going to need to push up somewhere; it may be up into the Santa Clarita Valley district that we have drawn right now.

The San Fernando Valley East is a potential Section 2
district, so you’re trying to explain why we wouldn’t just go into that district because we might affect the CVAP for Latinos in that district.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Barabba.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think the price of bringing Pasadena into Burbank Glendale is a very high price to pay for the rest of the valley. And I understand the preference that they have, but that’s going -- that messes everything else up.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: It’s true, and you don’t have to do that, but the point is, if you want Sherman Oaks in the San Fernando Valley --

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Which it should be.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: -- which it should be, that’s fine, so then there’s two issues, one is the population in that Sherman Oaks area has to be made up in the Burbank Glendale area, however you need to do, but in addition, you also have to lose population in the West San Fernando Valley because you just added a lot, so there’s -- it isn’t so much whether we want to keep Glendale, Burbank, Pasadena, but what I hear from everyone is that Sherman Oaks has to go with the San Fernando Valley, so now you have to deal with the repercussions of that.
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The district that they have drawn, the Glendale, Burbank, and I guess that’s Sherman Oaks, I think everybody would say that was in the San Fernando Valley.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m sorry, can you repeat the last part?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Well, if you look at that purple area they’ve got that includes Sherman Oaks, I think most everyone would agree that’s part of the San Fernando Valley because that’s Mulholland Drive up there, I would imagine, on the south part of it.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, you’re saying that because it’s also below the East San Fernando Valley that, in a way, this is all a valley district.

COMMISSIONER DAI: It’s a third San Fernando Valley district. I actually think, yeah, there was reasonable testimony tying those areas, so you know, we can unite Glendale, Burbank, and Pasadena in the Senate District.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: They are united in the Congressional, too.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would suggest the district they have drawn is probably appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any additional questions, Q2?
MS. HENDERSON  So what is your final word on this one?

COMMISSIONER DAI: It sounded like there were no changes, right?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We think that the district you’ve drawn is appropriate.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. And so, just to make sure that I’m clear, so the discussion that we had earlier today about Pasadena --

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, overruled.

MS. HENDERSON: Overruled, okay.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’re coming to many of the same conclusions that you have, but we’ve gone through our own process to get there. Commissioner Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I think the only afterthought I have about this is that I think we’ve seen testimony from VICA about keeping that corridor at Ventura Blvd.-101 Freeway together, but it looks like it’s unavoidable, that there has to be a split somewhere and I just think the 405 probably is the appropriate breaking place.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, we’ll make a note of that and if we can do something with that, we’ll take a look at it. If Ventura County changes, there may be some
changes that are available here.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Were you going to look
at that very last one, the Thousand Oaks, Santa Monica
Mountain? I just was curious how far west that went on
the coast that includes Oxnard, Port Hueneme.

MS. HENDERSON: Port Hueneme.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Or just the mountains.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And what is the
best map to look at?

MS. HENDERSON: Sorry, I apologize, that’s the
next one up.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So that’s that leftover
where we had a conversation with Jamie that the coastal
western boundary is that Port Hueneme and part of Oxnard?

MS. HENDERSON: This green district that you’re
referring to? No, that is --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: No, that’s not, so it
stops at the mountains. It stops before you get to Port
Hueneme.

MS. HENDERSON: It stops at Casa Conejo.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m saying on the coast.

MS. HENDERSON: On the coast?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Because Casa Conejo is
in the mountains.

MS. HENDERSON: It’s the first Census tract.
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So I guess the point is this, before you have the population of Port Hueneme.

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so it’s basically Malibu is the first coastal community, right?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes. Do we want to go through this district in more detail?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: No. I don’t see any concerns. I think we should keep moving.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. We’ll do San Fernando Valley East, which is on a different page, just a moment. It is on page 17. And on the page, it’s green and it’s up in kind of your right-hand corner. And this is a potential Section 2 district, I think it’s one of the ones that Mr. Brown referred to as perhaps needing some further inquiry, if I’m not mistaken. The Latino CVAP is 52.41 percent, the Black CVAP is 5.02 percent, and the Asian CVAP is 8.26 percent. And this includes the City of San Fernando, as well as several neighborhoods in the San Fernando Valley, the L.A. portion, including Sylmar, Mission Hills, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills, Sunland, Tonga, La Tuna Canyon, Sun Valley, Arleta, part of North Hollywood, and part of Granada Hills.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Barabba.
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I recall that pretty much captures, I think, what most of the COI discussion was and I think it’s pretty solid. And as I remember how it was and how I think it is now, I think it captured it quite well.

MS. WOODS: From the iteration you saw last Thursday, I added the Sunland, Tujunga, La Tuna Canyon, and Shadow Hills, per your direction, and pulled in the western boundary further east.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right. Do we have more Assembly Districts?

MS. HENDERSON: Give me just a second.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

MS. HENDERSON: Oh, San Fernando Valley West, which is right next to it. This includes L.A. neighborhoods North Hills, Panorama City, Van Nuys, Valley Glenn, Resita, Winnetka, Canoga Park, and Balboa Park -- Lake Balboa, excuse us.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Which highway is that up there?

MS. HENDERSON: This one?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Is that the 505?

MS. HENDERSON: That’s the 405.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Parvenu.
COMMISSIONER PARVENU: What street is that above the green that’s going east and west? It sort of cuts off and then it dips down and picks up again?

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: That’s Roscoe, wasn’t it?

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Is that Roscoe, you said?

MS. HENDERSON: I think it was. We’ll double-check. So Toppan, and then Oxnard, and then up a block --

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Oxnard.

MS. HENDERSON: To Victory, and it looks like there’s a park, Balboa Lake.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It looks like we are pretty pleased with this map.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Moving on, we have on page 18, we’ll take a closer look at the Hancock Park District. I know we touched on this a little bit, but I just wanted to make sure that we get as much comment as possible. This is -

MS. WOODS: It’s based around the downtown COI in Los Angeles, and that includes several different smaller communities, and then it extends out to the west side to include up to Cheviot Hills, which is a Los Angeles County neighborhood. It includes on the north Thai Town, Little Armenia, East Hollywood, Filipino Town, Wilshire,
Korea Town, Harvard Heights, Victoria Park, Country Club
Park, Melrose, Park La Brea, Miracle Mile, Mid City,
parts of South Carthay, Crestview, Beverly Wood,
Cadillac-Corning, Rainier Village, and it borders Culver
City -- or, I’m sorry, there’s a Census tract between
Culver City and the district.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So as we had
discussed during the time we had talked about the Insight
maps, did you respect those, I guess, neighborhood
boundaries designated by the city?

MS. WOODS: I did my best. Some of them are
split around the edges, and I’ll take a closer look at
aligning them more closely. But for population reasons,
there probably will be some splits around the edges. And
I have several different boundaries, actually. I’m
noticing that there are several different boundaries. In
addition to the Neighborhood Council boundaries, everyone
has a slightly different accounting of where they are, so
I’m using the ones that were provided to me by Ms.
McDonald, but I’m questioning exactly how firm some of
those boundaries are.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And this is the
district where the southern part was Washington Blvd.,
correct?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Could we get -- perhaps Commissioner Parvenu could provide his description of those neighborhoods?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, I lived in Park La Brea myself.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: She said she was having trouble with the neighborhood descriptions.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: To confirm that she has the latest version --

MS. HENDERSON: So, the green lines that are on the map right now are showing the neighborhood boundaries that we’ve been using for this.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Can you zoom in a little bit more?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: If we have very specific detail, this may be something we can handle offline?

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. All right, I think that I want to touch on the East L.A. District because I don’t think we addressed it directly yet. And this is another area of high Latino concentration, there is a Latino CVAP of 53 percent, Black CVAP of 3 percent, and Asian CVAP of 14 percent. That’s the same page, page 18. It’s the green district kind of at the top of the map. So this includes also several L.A. neighborhoods, Eagle Rock,
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It’s diverse.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: So this includes the Griffith Park [Inaudible], right?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do you have any concerns or direction? No, it looks good.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Okay, I think that’s it for - wait, wait, yeah, because we discussed the downtown and Boyle Heights together, but I don’t know, that’s when Mr. Brown was able to join us, so I don’t know if we received specific direction about these districts about the downtown district.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think this is one of the districts you have to use to shuffle the population a little bit, so maybe folks who have some thoughts about -- I mean, besides keeping the downtown area together, I think you should have some freedom there to move things around that we asked you to shuffle those different populations to make more compact.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Anymore specifics?

COMMISSIONER DAI: L.A. Commissioners, do you
have any more deeper thoughts?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: What do you need to do with it, I guess, based on the numbers that you have there?

MS. HENDERSON: We just wanted to see if there was further input about some of these areas because I think we discussed them in kind of the aggregate with some of these other districts in the area of Latino concentration in this part of L.A., and we’re trying to see if there was any specific concerns or direction about this district or the neighboring ones.

COMMISSIONER DAI: This is where we were going to move to the Southgate Downey combination instead and move Linwood, remember? So do we want to give them some parameters there as they kind of shuffle those around?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, Commissioner Dai, this is also an area that we had had the issue with Artesia, Cerritos, La Palma, and now we’re starting to look at, and what I’ve given more thought to at our break, our dinner break, Commissioner Ward and Commissioner Dai had mentioned this about La Habra Heights, and Whittier. And if we wanted to potentially fix up this problem a little bit, we could just make this - it might actually work out where, if La Habra and La Habra Heights or Whittier went with Diamond Bar, then
that blue district kind of goes a little further with the
Downey and the Southgate, and it probably will work out
with our earlier instructions. So the downtown district
is probably okay, it’ll work its way over from the
Diamond Bar area into that Southgate direction that we
gave earlier, so I think it’s actually going to be able
to flow. And we might be able to work out that Orange
County District just kind of in a big circle. I don’t
know if you as the experts see those types of waves?

MS. HENDERSON: We’ll see.

COMMISSIONER DAI: It will be a counter clockwise
shift.

MS. HENDERSON: All right, thank you.

Congressional.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’d like to
congratulate ourselves that we have made it through the
Assembly Districts this afternoon. This was actually
quite a feat. We have a commitment from our very patient
and gracious Court Reporter that he is willing to stay
until 9:00, so I think we have about 50 minutes to work
with.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, all right, we’re going to
shift back down and pick back up with Alex. And give me
just a minute. Okay, let me grab these maps so I can
give you the right page numbers. Okay, we’re going to
start in San Bernardino County and I’m looking for the
right piece of paper to give you the page number, but in
the mean time, I’m going to let Alex describe the
district to you.

MS. WOODS: So, again, the Commission direction
was to move Mono County and Inyo County with San
Bernardino, so we’ll start up here, Mono, Enyo, and then
San Bernardino. Unlike the Assembly configuration, all
of this, Apple Valley, Victorville area is included in
this district, as well as Crestline, Lake Arrowhead,
Running Springs, Big Bear City, Mentone, Yucaipa,
Oakland, and it does go east to include Morongo Valley,
Yucca Valley, Joshua Tree, 29 Palms.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I like it.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, it seems
like we are in agreement, we like it.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So much nicer when the units
of analysis work.

MS. WOODS: Next, we’re going to go to the City
of San Bernardino, which is page 23. This includes part
of the City of Fontana, Rialto, the City of San
Bernardino, Bloomington, Colton, Loma Linda, and
Highland. Hold on while I look for my sliver part.

COMMISSIONER DAI: It looks like that preserves
most of the Ebony Triangle, too.
MS. WOODS: So the splits are, it includes 85 percent of Fontana and 27 percent of Redlands, so Redlands is split into the larger county of San Bernardino District and the other part of it is in the City of San Bernardino District.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is the unincorporated part of Fontana included in this district?

MS. WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER DAI: But arguably, it probably has a lot in common with the district it’s in, so...

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In comparison to Fontana, itself? It really doesn’t with Chino Hills, but it --

COMMISSIONER DAI: No, but with Chino and Pomona.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I have you run through what the numbers are that we’re looking at in our little white boxes?

MS. WOODS: Yes, so there’s a deviation of 25 people, the Latino CVAP is 44 percent, the Black VAP is 14.81 percent, the Black CVAP, and then the Asian CVAP is 5.06 percent.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I was just wondering if, and I don’t know the population difference, and I don’t know what effect it would have, but if we wanted to preserve that whole community, and I think it’s
only been easier to take it out because it’s unincorporated, but I think it’s a close knit community there, and we did have some testimony, and obviously we’re looking at a grander scale for Congressional Districts, but what if we considered including that incorporated [sic] area of Fontana with that district, SB, and then considered taking out the rest of Redlands and putting that with the other one? I mean, if there’s got to be a balance someplace, otherwise you get zero percent, you couldn’t ask for more than that.

MS. WOODS: So, if we had all of Fontana in there and left out Redlands, that would go to the larger San Bernardino District, which would mean that some population from the larger San Bernardino District would have to go somewhere, so I think that would mean that we would maybe have -- you could take that from going north over the mountains to the Hesperia, Apple Valley, Victorville area, or to Lake Arrowhead, Big Bear, or wherever you think would be best.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What are we trying to do?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We’re trying to replay it -- basically retain the unincorporated area of Fontana, that little southwestern portion of the Ebony Triangle.

COMMISSIONER DAI: That’s also, as I recall, a
high Latino CVAP area, and it might boost that number.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, we’re really on the border there almost at 45 percent.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, so that might be worth exploring, but we need to provide a suggestion for our Mappers on how to shift the population. So, Jodie is saying put Fontana, the unincorporated part of Fontana, back in, push Redlands out, but then the big district is over-populated, is that right? Or becomes under-populated?

MS. WOODS: It becomes over-populated, but I could look into maybe joining some of those areas as Commissioner Filkins Webber had suggested for Assembly, maybe the Yucaipa Area below with Calimesa.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe we actually have COI testimony linking Calimesa and Yucaipa if I remember correctly. So, yes, I’d say let’s go that direction. If there are no further comments, let’s move to the next map.

MS. WOODS: So this is the District labeled “ONT.” It includes Ontario, Chino, part of Chino Hills, Pomona, and it keeps Rancho Cucamonga intact.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I just had a very quick logistical question on our paper, on page 23, that section is a mixture of orange and pink, is there a
reason for that?

MS. WOODS: That has to do with my map styling and the orange areas are cities or Census places that have --

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, so that’s all considered one, and the boundary is - but you can’t quite see the eastern boundary, but on our map the eastern boundary of that is the salmon color, the long salmon color, correct?

COMMISSIONER DAI: We’re looking at ONT, right?

MS. WOODS: Yeah, we’re looking at the one in --

COMMISSIONER DAI: Blue.

MS. WOODS: -- the green. I’m sorry about the coloring on these maps, it does make it hard to tell.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: On our maps on page 23, I’m just looking at the eastern boundary of that RVMV, that’s what we’re looking at, correct?

COMMISSIONER DAI: No, we’re looking at ONT, O-N-T.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Oh, I’m sorry, I thought she was highlighting the purple down there, I’m sorry, I apologize about that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I had a question about ONT, which is could we swap Chino Hills and Upland? Would that be a better swap?
MS. WOODS: Sure, I can definitely look into that. Would you include San Antonio Heights, as well?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I mean, the population looks pretty close. And that way, Chino Hills, I don’t know how much that split -- how much of Chino Hills is actually in there, but maybe you can avoid splitting Chino Hills, then.

MS. WOODS: So it’s 58 percent of Chino Hills is included in that district. So we would probably have to split Upland, as well.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Clarification from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I just remind everyone, this is the Congressional, so we’re down to one person, so there’s going to be a lot of splits.

COMMISSIONER DAI: My guess is that, I mean, one argument for keeping it this way is that it brings Chino and Chino Hills together, but not quite all of it, so that’s something we didn’t do in the previous one. An argument for swapping them is then we have Upland and Rancho Cucamonga in this district, I don’t know how people feel about that exchange.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, if we’re taking out the unincorporated Fontana -- refresh my recollection, was that about 7,000 people in that
unincorporated Fontana?

MS. WOODS: I can’t quite recollect.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So how much do you think is leftover in -

MS. WOODS: But that’s also -- this configuration also splits the City of Fontana, it’s not just the unincorporated area.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And then how much is left of the population of Chino Hills if you’ve only taken a portion of it?

MS. WOODS: So the population of Chino Hills that is included in this configuration is about 43,000.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, I see. Oh, so the number that is in there is the total population of the city?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOSS MALLOY: Remember, I think it would be helpful if we don’t get into the same fine grain of detail that we have for the Assembly maps because we’re talking about really no deviation, essentially, and so -

COMMISSIONER DAI: Lots of splits.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOSS MALLOY: So if we could know and be comfortable with the fact that there will be lots of splits and provide Q2 with which cities do we want you
to explore dipping into for population, or which cities
do we want you to explore swapping, but knowing that most
of them are going to be split.

Ms. Henderson: Yes, and also, if I may, we
really need to try and get through all the Congressionals	onight. We need to do the L.A. ones, as well.

Chairperson Galambos Malloy: I’ll take two more
comments. Commissioner Ward.

Commissioner Ward: I was just going to say, I
think the Chino Hills split works from the standpoint of
the portion, the dividing line separates southeast Chino
Hills and puts it with Yorba Linda, and they share Chino
Hills State Park, which is a big fire problem in the
county -- it works.

Chairperson Galambos Malloy: Okay, all right.
Any further direction? Okay, let’s move on.

Commissioner Blanco: Oh, I’m sorry.

Chairperson Galambos Malloy: Commissioner
Blanco.

Commissioner Blanco: In that “SB,” what is that?

Chairperson Galambos Malloy: San Bernardino.

Commissioner Blanco: Are we supposed to do the
same thing here when we get to 40 – you know, that CVAP
number that we had talked to our counsel about?

Chairperson Galambos Malloy: Yeah, I believe so.
So, is that Commissioner Filkins Webber that is tracking -- I’m trying to remember, what is our tracking system? Can we make a note of it in our notes?

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That’s one to flag.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, make a flag.
COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, it’s in my [Inaudible] list.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Good.
COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta is on top of it.
COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I have everything now.
MS. WOODS: So this next district is RVMV, which is Eastvale Jarupa Valley, the City of Riverside, the City of Marino Valley, and March Air Reserve Base. The deviation is about 6,000.

COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Because this is so nuanced based on the areas around this, Alex, where can we consider taking from, then we can maybe give you some ideas of the communities that need to be taken. I’m assuming just south and east? Is that really our options?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That is what I would agree with as far as Corona.
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And we just have to slice off that 6,500 people and we just have to choose
where it’s going to come from.

COMMISSIONER DAI: There’s some unincorporated
area there, too. I don’t know how many people are there.

MS. WOODS: This also includes Norco.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, again, general
direction we’d want to go with this district to pick up
some population?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Southeast.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Southeast.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I’m sorry, east?

We said we’re going into Beaumont --

COMMISSIONER DAI: Southwest, right?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Southwest.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Southwest into

Corona.

MS. WOODS: So this next district, if everyone is
ready to move on, is Coachella Valley District, it starts
at the eastern border of Riverside County and moves west,
it includes the entirety of the Coachella Valley, it
includes Beaumont Banning, Cherry Valley, San Jacinto,
Hemet, Valley Vista, Anza, and Lake Riverside. The
deviation is 418 people over-populated. The Latino CVAP
is 27 percent, the Black CVAP is 3.9 percent, and the
Asian CVAP is 2.57 percent.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It looks like we
are in good shape. Let’s move on.

MS. WOODS: This next area starts at Corona in the northwest, includes Corona, El Cerrito, El Sobrante, Temescal Valley, Warm Springs Lakeland Village, Wildomar, Murrieta, French Valley, Menifee, Lakeview, Romoland, Green Acres, Paris, and Mead Valley. It also includes Aguanda.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Do you have a page number?

MS. WOODS: It’s page 24. And this splits the City of Temecula.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And puts it where?

MS. WOODS: It puts it with San Diego County.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So Commissioner Blanco has a page 25 where it’s very clear, but I don’t seem to have a page 25.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I don’t have a page 25.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, Commissioner Blanco’s page 25 is a great representation of the area, so if you would have 25.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So can you talk a little bit -- I noticed that we have had a few of these districts where we’re looking at pretty significant deviations, if you could talk about some of the issues
you’re running into.

MS. WOODS: Well, for the purposes of preparing for this meeting, I was just trying to get them zero percent and so this is 0.8 percent. It’s about 5,000 people overpopulated, which because this city of Temecula is already split up, I could look into adding more to the part of Temecula that is included with the San Diego District.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, also, just as a side note, the one just north of it is the one that’s under-populated by 6,500, and that’s over-populated by 55, so you’ve got almost a swap right there and then you could maybe make up the difference in Temecula.

MS. WOODS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, are we generally in agreement with this district? Yes.

MS. WOODS: So we’re moving to Orange County, the first district is LHYL, which is on page 27, thank you, it includes La Habra, Brea, Fullerton, Yorba Linda, Anaheim, Villa Park, and part of Orange, and the split I’ll get to you in a second.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So in the Congressional, we have Fullerton, Brea, Yorba Linda altogether?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, it looks
like we’re generally –

MS. WOODS: And so it’s 58 percent of the City of Anaheim, and that’s the only split.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s move on.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Can I just ask you, is 91 the split on the east side for that? No, it’s not, okay. Thank you.

MS. WOODS: The next district is WestGG, which includes Fountain Valley, part of Garden Grove, part of Santa Ana, Westminster, Cypress, Buena Park, and part of Anaheim, and part of Huntington Beach. So it’s 41 percent of Anaheim, 2 percent of Huntington Beach, and 16 percent of the City of Santa Ana. So the portion of Santa Ana is that circle that we’ve discussed before, and the Huntington Beach was part of the larger boundaries of the Little Saigon COI that was the testimony given at the Santa Ana hearing for the street boundaries.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any questions regarding this district?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m just wondering if maybe a slight little change, but I don’t know – Los Alamitos is in the Socal -- SA Coast, and then Cypress is WESTGG. I’m just wondering, if you bring that purple down to incorporate Los Alamitos, which I think is kind
of a sister city to Cypress, and then push up into Fountain Valley on the bottom of that purple, kind of do a little, I’m just wondering if there might be a little more similarities there, unless you have to do a big split, just something to consider.

MS. WOODS: My other question is, I know we’ve had a lot of discussion about Cerritos and Artesia, is that something that you would want to look at for this Congressional District, as well?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: They’re together in the Assembly.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: My perspective would be, again, not everyone will get their ideal configuration at each layer. I think if our district here is working, which it appears to be, let’s let well enough alone unless we hear about it. All right, so let’s move on to the next map.

MS. WOODS: So the next one is the SACOAST which is Santa Ana and the Coastal District that includes Seal Beach, Sunset Beach, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, and Newport Beach, and the City of Santa Ana. Again, Huntington Beach is split and it’s 97 percent in this district because the other portion is in the WESTDG and it’s 83 percent of the City of Santa Ana.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m seeing nods
from the Commissioners. Are there any concerns?

Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: What is the - in the district south, the Coastal District South, SOC, is that Newport Beach that is divided there?

MS. WOODS: I believe all the City of Newport Beach is included in this district, so it’s not split between those two districts.

COMMISSIONER WARD: SOC is over by 5,000 and we need 4,000 for SACOAST, is that right?

MS. WOODS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER WARD: So should we direct to go in that direction?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I would agree.

MS. WOODS: Is there a dividing line in Newport Beach, or a specific area?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I would just move up until you get to the population because the closer near PCA, you know, just running it evenly up through the City, I’d probably have to just look at what streets are, but I’ll leave that detail up to you and just give you that I would make the recommendation that we just move until you get the population. I’m sorry, it’s the Newport - between the SOUTHOC district that has 5,000 over vs. the SACOAST, balancing -- I mean, moving it
down, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we’re in agreement on that direction, so let’s move forward.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: But just along those things, moving Newport Beach –

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Wait, we’re off the record now. Shell Districts? Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m just looking, maybe we’re going to go next to SOC, the one below that, too, if we’re saying bring down SACOAST because there is that little blue dot, see there’s that little blue leg that goes into the coast, so we could cut that off maybe by picking up population, right? The SOC, but I anticipate we would have some problems with – can we get enough to get Laguna Nigel, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Dana Point? Because that’s the one that’s left, because that’s included with the San Diego, that Southern Orange County is included with San Diego. That’s on page 28.

So, I’m just saying, in trying to capture SACOAST to go down south, I’d suggest, if we can, to go all the way through that blue section and get the top of the green, which is Laguna Nigel, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, and Dana Point.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I agree. If we can take it all the way to the county line, that would
be ideal.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: You may have to maneuver some numbers around in that SOC and the SACOAST to make it work, but I would suggest that.

MS. WOODS: So that is a significant population going down to the border between Orange County and San Diego, it’s ballpark almost 200,000 people, so I mean, we could shift if you want to have -- if you absolutely do not want to split the county line, we could look at shifting population up to L.A. if you would prefer.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could you shift that as a coastal district? Because I do think in that SACOAST on page 27, Santa Ana is not the coastal district in that. And Santa Ana has 324,000, so I’m wondering if a good part of that could be shifted into –

MS. WOODS: So would you include Santa Ana with the neighboring WESTDG district and then move part of that district into L.A.? Or where would you put Santa Ana?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, I know, there’s the problem.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: The problem is we have 200,000 extra people in the South County.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So what we’re saying is that, for the Congressional, those people in the South
County of Orange are going to have to go with San Diego.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, I think you do have three choices, you could do Santa Ana and move that inland and tie that with the green, and then have the salmon pick up the green, and come down and have a coastal district that continues on down to San Clemente, and then have an inland district that swings up out of San Diego County, but I think those are your two choices.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Can I just ask maybe Q2 for the sake of time to run some of those – maybe, have you run that option to see if we could do a coastal, and then do Santa Ana inland and kind of rearrange it as necessary?

MS. WOODS: I can look into it. Would you want me to look at putting Santa Ana with the Irvine Tustin area first? Or would you think the WESTDG area?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: WESTDG area.

MS. WOODS: Okay. I’ll look into that and see what it does, and then maybe work offline with some Commissioners about those different iterations.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That sounds good. Let’s move to the next map. Can I get a check on roughly how many more cities we’ve got?

MS. WOODS: I think I have about four and San Diego.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, so we’re going to start cruising through these.

MS. WOODS: The next district is the COASTALSD district, which includes those portions of -- it’s page 22 -- which includes those portions of this Orange County that we have previously been discussing, Laguna Nigel, San Joan Capistrano, San Clemente, Dana Point, but we’re going to look into pushing those north, but it also includes Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch, and Del Mar.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What page is that?

MS. WOODS: Twenty-two.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any red flags in this area? I would say let’s keep moving.

MS. WOODS: So if we move that population out of there from Orange County, where would you look to add - would you look to the east to San Marcos Escondido? Or south along the coast?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would suggest south, potentially -- well, south and southeast. What is south of Fairbanks Ranch? That’s San Diego, I’m assuming?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think that what we’ve created in that city is a coastal district and, so,
if we went too far east through San Marcos, we would be - I think that’s a very different type of community when we get farther east.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I would suggest maybe continuing south only because that district, the yellow one up there, is a coastal and very far inland, so maybe you continue the coastal theme and keep the other one as more of an inland theme?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, I would agree.

MS. WOODS: Okay. And so would you move this -- you know, this is a similar configuration to what we were looking at for the assembly. Would you move to pick up the population that has moved from the coastal into the green district, where would you add for population in this yellow district?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What about Poway?

MS. WOODS: Poway.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: You can add Poway, add Poway.

MS. WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Oh, yes, Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just a process question that we were sort of commenting about over here, is that
maybe when we reconvene on Tuesday, we start with the
ones we did last today, and start with those just to make
sure that we haven’t short-shifted because of the late
hour, we just flip it?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Sure, yeah. That’s
a great idea. Let me clarify what you said, you mean
starting with the geographic areas that we did last, not
necessarily that we start with Congressional and then end
up with Assembly? We can refine that later, let’s keep
moving.

MS. WOODS: This blue district is labeled CHNC.
I need to pull up the label for it. So, this includes
the eastern portion of Chula Vista, each of the 805
Freeway, Bonita, Paradise Hills, Bay Terraces, La Presa,
Spring Valley, El Cajon, part of, and then part of the
City of San Diego. It includes about 52 percent of the
City of Chula Vista and 23 percent of the City of San
Diego.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can you just zoom in? It’s
kind of hard to see what cities are in there.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And so at this
point, because of the other decisions we’ve made, would
we need to be picking up population as we move east?

MS. WOODS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh, so I’m
interested in adding -- I don’t know how much population
we’ve got there, but that southeast purple area.

MS. WOODS: So, Rancho, San Diego, Crest, Harbison Canyon, Alpine? The Santee?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m having a lot of trouble reading what’s on here.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: So am I.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: There’s also one area that looks like it’s a geographic tract that might be significant.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think I’m talking about Jamul.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: What about -- could I look just north of the 8 on the top part of that green -- I mean, purple, a little bit higher? Higher north. I mean, you’ve got to make it -- I need to go north of the -- okay, see -- go east a little bit -- there’s one community, Descanso, that’s captured down below if you’re looking for populations, flip Descanso into purple. You’re trying to pick up population, right? Because right now that’s the only community on our map that is on the southern part, everything else -- it goes Alpine and it skips to Descanso, and then it goes back down into Pine Valley on the other side. To me, that seems like just -- it’s a small amount of people, but for the
integrity of that community, you shouldn’t have one
district, another district, another district, that’s
along the 5, those three districts.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And we just put them with
Alpine in the Assembly.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, with
that, can we keep moving?

MS. WOODS: So this is the border district, which
includes Imperial Beach, the west part of Chula Vista,
all of National City, and then into the Logan Heights,
Barrio District, in the City of San Diego and some of the
other neighborhoods in San Diego, and then goes along the
border. We just -- I just received direction to move
Descanso into the purple area, along the border, and that
includes all of Imperial County, and the Latino CVAP for
that area is 50.11 percent, the Black CVAP is 10.76
percent, the Asian CVAP is 8.91 percent, and it has a
development of about 8,151.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can you show the boundaries
again as it goes into San Diego? I just can’t see them
real well from the paper map.

MS. WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So it’s that green?

MS. WOODS: It’s a green area.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.
MS. WOODS: So it includes Sherman Heights, again, you know, there is the issue with the bridge and Barrio Logan, it includes City Heights, Oak Park, Encanto, Valencia Park, Mountain View, South Crest, Shell Town, up to Tralta West, Colina Del Sol, Fox Canyon, Cherokee Point.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Could you blow up that yellow section just where it says Logan Heights? I would include that section just below that line above Logan Heights.

MS. WOODS: So this section right here?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah.

MS. WOODS: I’ll try to select by blocks, but I’ve been trying to keep the 5 freeway, and then the bridge out of this district.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, that’s fine.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: At this point, we are so close on our upper time limit, so I will only be entertaining directions.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I would just suggest for shaving 8,000 people that it’s more in the metropolitan area of San Diego vs. the lesser populated area of Imperial. How about that?

MS. WOODS: Thank you, Commissioner Di Guilio.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And at the top maybe of
that piece, you know, of the finger is where maybe you
might want to shed.

MS. WOODS: Okay. And then the last district is,
again, sort of a northeast county of San Diego district.
We received direction to move Poway into this yellow
district. It includes Jamul, Crest, Lakeside, Santee,
Ramona, Julian, Escondido, San Marcos, Valley Center,
Bonsall, Rainbow Fallbrook, and then goes up into
Temecula and that’s where we split Temecula -- or I split
Temecula.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Yeah, I would agree with
that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Looks great.

MS. WOODS: Thank you. Thank you so much for
your patience.

MS. HENDERSON: We need to do a quick computer
swap which will take us about 10 seconds.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Now we’re going to do L.A. in
10 minutes?

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we’re back up in L.A. and
we have a few districts to look at.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well,
Commissioners, it’s been a long day. While we’re pausing
for the computer swap, I’ll go ahead and read our
This morning, the Public Information Advisory Committee presented plans for the public release of draft maps. The Commission agreed to hold a news conference in Sacramento on June 10th. Commissioners also tasked the PI Committee with a series of website updates to be implemented prior to the draft map release.

The Legal Advisory Committee updated the Commission on progress to retain an expert to perform Racially Polarized Voting studies and requested staff to develop a policy for the Commission’s consideration around staff, consultant, and Commissioners speaking and publication post-August 15th. Staff provided Commissioners with a draft compilation of all previously adopted CRC motions that will continue to be updated.

The Finance and Administration Advisory Committee received a current financial report on the Commission’s activities and directed staff to implement an enhanced security protocol for the second and third round of input hearings. The Commission voted to accept the results of a recent inquiry by staff, the results of which found that there was no basis for any allegations investigated within the report. Commissioners directed Commissioner Dai to lead revisions for CRC’s Code of Conduct Manual and present to the Commission during the upcoming
business meeting. The Commission consulted with their Voting Rights Legal Counsel via telephone on Section 2 and Section 5 considerations. The Commission also provided extensive direction to Technical Line Drawers for Congressional, Assembly, and State Senate Districts in Southern California, and this summary was courtesy of our Communications Director Rob Wilcox.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we’re going to start with Long Beach.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Could we have a page number, please?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes, you can see it on page 29. And there’s more copy on page 32. It’s a blue district on the bottom right-hand. Okay, so this includes the Port of Long Beach, Hawaiian Gardens, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Bellflower, Paramount.

MS. WOODS: No, there are no splits.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Let’s keep going.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, moving to our north, we’ll look at the Whittier. So Whittier includes Whittier, La Mirada, West Whittier Los Nietos, Downey, Cerritos, Artesia, La Palma, Linwood, and Southgate. Southgate is split.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And you need another 14,000 people there, don’t you?
MS. HENDERSON: Yes. Yes, this is the population problem we were talking about earlier.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners.

Commissioner Dai.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I was just noticing that La Palma was pulled in?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Do we have a great objection to that given the previous discussion? Not at this point?

MS. HENDERSON: That was based on prior direction, also.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do we have any specific direction for Q2?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Do we have some within the park?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, was it to take La Palma back out -- at this point, because we respected it at the Assembly level and, in the Senate level, we probably do, as well. Because I can see it’s getting tight. All the other districts look so close, so that would be my recommendation, and then we could see what happens in Orange County.

COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: If we take that out, we’re already down 14,000, and if we take it out, we’re
down almost 30,000.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I was going to say add
some of Buena Park, part of Buena Park, I think, would
fit. Would it not?

MS. HENDERSON: So we can split Buena Park.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner

Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Because this is a 54
percent Latino CVAP, this would be attentive to that
percentage as you pick up the 14,000.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Let’s move on.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. To stay on the same page
that we have here, let’s go to Carson, Hawthorne-Carson
-- I’m sorry, Hawthorne-Compton district. And this is
neighboring, this includes Inglewood, Lenox, Westmont,
West Athens, Willow Brook, is that Del Air? No, sorry,
Hawthorne, Gardena, West Rancho Dominguez, Compton, East
Rancho Dominguez, Carson, Wilmington, down into the L.A.
Port. The demographics of this district are 36.12
percent LCVAP and 44.73 Black CVAP, 8.67 Asian CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, looks
good.

MS. HENDERSON: All right, moving to your left,
we have the Palos Verdes East Beach Cities District, this
includes Marina Del Rey, Marina Peninsula, Westchester,
El Segundo, Hermosa Beach, Elandra Park, Torrance, West Carson, Palos Verdes Estates, Lomita, Rolling Hills.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, I think a couple things are going on here. We may have to enunciate, slow down just a little bit so the Court Reporter is able to get everything down, and then I think we have a question from Commissioner Raya.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Let’s see, am I reading this correctly? You’re a little bit under, right? In this one?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: What is that little tiny patch of Hawthorne? The little yellow tiny -- I’m assuming that’s part of Hawthorne?

MS. WOODS: That is part of Hawthorne and it’s contiguous with Hawthorne, so I left it in.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any direction for Q2? All right, let’s move along.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so staying on this same page, let’s move up to West L.A.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, could I suggest for the second time, you don’t probably need to read the cities. How about that?

MS. HENDERSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Unless there’s a
particular question?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh huh.

MS. HENDERSON: I’ll just note the demographics.

Thirty-seven LCVAP, 52 BCVAP, and 3 ACVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s move along.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, the Santa Monica Mountain District, it’s not on this page, it extends over to Malibu.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Does that include Griffith Park? Does it go that far over? Can’t tell?

MS. HENDERSON: No. That is in the East L.A. District.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s move on.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Now, switching over to page 33, we’re going to look at the San Gabriel Valley and Valley Diamond Bar District, it’s the yellow district. Okay, so the stats for this one are 26 percent LCVAP, 2.35 BCVAP, and 43.49 Asian CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s move along.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, we’ll look at the East L.A.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just one comment. So, in this one, Sherman Oaks doesn’t stay with the Valley? No?
COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: We aren’t talking about
that -- sorry!

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so East L.A. County is
immediately to the north of the Diamond Bar District that
we were just looking at. The stats for that one are
50.77 Latino CVAP, 3.94 Black CVAP, and 14.85 Asian CVAP.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Good.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let’s
move along.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, and then moving to the
west, we have East L.A., not to be confused with East
L.A. County --

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, okay.

MS. HENDERSON: And you can actually see that the
best probably on page 31. It’s more zoomed in on page
33. Yeah, this district includes Griffith Park. The
stats for this are 58.29 Latino CVAP, 3.38 Black CVAP,
and 12.67 Asian CVAP.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Could I just ask, I had
a question kind of going back a little bit to the San
Gabriel Valley, the yellow that curves --

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I guess for people that
are there, does that make sense? You kind of start way
up near the mountains and you go back down and around everyone? Is that --

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I’m guessing that this is satisfying testimony about reaching across through all the potential Asian areas.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Oh, to do the Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights thing?

COMMISSIONER RAYA: All of that, yeah, from the east side, and then the rest of it is coming up, you know, the yellow part where I live, same thing.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just in keeping with counsel’s advice, though, I think we should talk about that in terms of communities of interest and not just a desire to pull together different Asian communities --

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Exactly. And there’s a very strong economic community, a relationship that goes all the way across the San Gabriel Valley and across into that Hacienda Heights area, strong educational connections, very strong social connections.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I can see that for the southern part, I’m just curious -- that’s a corridor, transportation?

COMMISSIONER RAYA: The 60 Freeway goes all through that Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond
Bar, and then it connects also to the other part, the 10 and 60.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: One last question because I know we need to move on. I just didn’t know how it -- it was more connected to the bottom part where I heard like taking the bottom part of the purple, which is the City of Industry, West Covina, and then incorporating that with Diamond Bar, Walnut, and then having more of a San Gabriel-based? I’m just trying to see if I can even out those two districts in terms of the way it looks? Or would that just not be --

COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think you are talking about very different social and economic connections.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, thank you. I just wanted clarification.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, I would concur in that, as well, because I don’t recall there being any testimony connecting Diamond Bar to the San Gabriel Valley. We really need to find this robust COI testimony, I think, to support a district like this.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So you’re disagreeing with Commissioner Raya?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, no. She went
down to Rowland Heights, or, sorry, she went down to Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, I’m going a bit further east on Diamond Bar, and that’s all, because I don’t recall the testimony from Rowland Heights or Hacienda. But Diamond Bar might be a little bit of a push, that’s all.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, do we have any changes that we would want to direct with this district? Or do we feel comfortable with it for a draft? Okay, it seems like we feel comfortable as a draft. Let’s move on.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, so the East L.A. District to the west of the San Gabriel-Diamond Bar District --

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Page.

MS. HENDERSON: It’s also on page 33. This is the one that includes Griffith Park, that was asked about earlier. It has a Latino CVAP of 58.29 percent, a Black CVAP of 3.38, and an Asian CVAP of 12.67.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right?

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Good.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, shifting to the south, to the Downtown District, the stats for this one are 51.44 percent Latino CVAP, 10.45 Black CVAP, 17.88 Asian CVAP.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, I think we can move on.
MS. HENDERSON: Okay. If you want to take a look at page 30, we’ll look at the San Gabriel Mountain Foothill District. It’s the large green one.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The three cities together, that’s good.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Most of them, right? Most of Pasadena, it looks like.

MS. HENDERSON: Yes. Pasadena is split in this iteration.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Just because I can’t see the detail on the far southeast part of that, that’s all -- are those all the communities above like the 210, is that what we said?

MS. HENDERSON: Uh huh, yes.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay, this looks like there’s a lot of purple encroachment on there to, you know, it’s not quite -- the yellow finger that goes up, and then a little purple above there, I’m just wondering if there’s any options to --

MS. HENDERSON: Arcadia, that’s similar to the Assembly District configurations.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I’m just wondering if we could clean it up a little bit because it doesn’t even look like it’s contiguous.

COMMISSIONER DAI: That cuts a city, then.
MS. HENDERSON: Do you want it split, like immediately right across there?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Could we have a little clarity on what “clean-up” would mean?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I guess I just feel like there’s a break -- it’s like you go to Alta Dena, Sierra Madre, then you go into another district, then you cross over into Monrovia, and then you cross into another one, and then back into the original. You’re entering and exiting that district a number of times. Maybe that’s just what it has to be, but, to me, that just seems like there are some issues there for contiguity.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think we need to be consistent about whether we want to keep cities whole or not, though.

MS. HENDERSON: So, in this case, actually, that’s the entire city of Arcadia. That’s the Arcadia borders.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: It’s not about whether keeping cities whole or not, I’m just wondering if there’s another option, other than entering -- if you’re doing the San Gabriel Mountain Foothill, you see what I’m saying? You’re entering and exiting in order to keep the cities whole, and if that’s what all the cities want, then maybe that’s what we -
COMMISSIONER BARABBA: The dark green area above
the light green area is the same district?

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yes, it is --

MS. HENDERSON: Yes, it is.

COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: -- but the yellow that
separates those, the green, then there’s a purple that
separates the green.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, that’s the City of Arcadia
and then the City of Azusa is the one that’s in the
bluish, purplish.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: You could make an argument
that that area of Arcadia north of the 210 is a much
higher income level than south of the 210 Freeway. I
mean, parts of Arcadia way south are quite a bit
different, so you know, it’s not entirely out of the
realm of logic to take some of Arcadia into that Foothill
District.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, we’ve had direction before
about splitting these communities at the 210. Is that
what you have in mind?

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: But, Commissioner
Filkins Webber, why don’t you give us some direction?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That is what I
recall. When we talked about it, we’ve talked about this
in the Assembly, so I would just ask that you follow the
directions because we’ve already talked about taking off this top portion of Arcadia and making it consistent so it’s contiguous and it sounds as if that’s consistent with the Commission members that are familiar with that area.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I’m just going to channel Commissioner Yao, who complains every time we split a small city, so I’m just putting that down for the record since he’s not here.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But I think we’d recognize it on the Congressional level, we might have to do that a little bit more, and I think he agreed with this part, as I recall, but ….

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, I’m just looking at this district and this iteration goes all the way to Upland is what we’re showing on the screen.

Okay, moving west to the East San Fernando Valley. And it is flagged that, in this iteration, the Latino CVAP is 49.6 percent, the Black CVAP is 5.71 percent, and the Asian CVAP is 9.76 percent. So if we’re to take Mr. Brown’s direction from earlier, this might be an area where we should look at the CVAP a little bit more closely.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ancheta, are you still the note-taker for this area?
COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Actually, I never was officially, but I continue to take notes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

MS. HENDERSON: Moving on to the adjacent district to the west, the West San Fernando Valley/Eastern Ventura County District, you can see this on page 30, as well as on page 31. I think the portion that you can’t see, that you see on the screen, it’s just that it goes a little bit farther to the west than what you see on the page along the coast along Route 1.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, I’m seeing nods from the Commissioners.

MS. HENDERSON: Okay, and then we’ll move north to our Antelope Valley-Santa Clarita District. Big yellow one. And you can see this very well on page 30.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So on this one, you chose to keep the Santa Clarita Valley Area whole?

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’m seeing nods from the Commissioners. Let’s move on.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Are you sure it’s not just nodding off? [Laughter]

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I’ve seen some smiles, too, at some of these districts.

MS. HENDERSON: I think we’ve got them all.
CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Good work, Commissioners. Okay, so I’m going to do a very brief reminder of what to expect over the coming week, so clearly we’re about to adjourn this meeting. At this point, our Consultants, Q2 and Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, will be spending quite a bit of time implementing the direction that we have given them for these maps and consulting on VRA issues. When we come back into session, Tuesday morning at 9:00, we will have a long day. We plan to go until the close of business, we’re hoping to end at 10:00 p.m. We will be joined by Mr. Kolkey of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, and that will be our final significant push as a Commission to provide line drawing direction on the 8th, then Q2 goes back again as implementing our maps. That Wednesday, the 8th, we will not be in session, we would like to invite Commissioners, however, who are able to, to stay in the Sacramento area. We imagine after a late night, the night before, you may want to sleep in. Also, we would have some coaching on communications and media work with our Communications Director, Rob Wilcox, and we’ve also had a significant amount of work tasked to various Commissioners during this Business Meeting that will need to be queued up for that meeting on the 9th, and so, for example, creating our framework, our agendas for the next two rounds of input
hearings, I think a lot of work to be done on our Policy Manual and Code of Conduct, etc. etc., so the idea is that we should be on call, expect phone calls from our Consultants, Q2, as they attempt to clarify the line drawing direction we have provided. And then, on the morning of the 9th, we will reconvene as a Commission, and at some point in the day, we will be getting -- again, a detailed agenda will be forthcoming, but we’ll be getting a preview from Q2 regarding the information that we will be set to receive later that evening. We will also be doing our Business Meeting, and then, moving into the 10th, we actually have our release, our Communications Director is working with the Public Information Committee on scheduling a Press Conference in the area, and at that point, we will go forth and be publicizing our release and encouraging the public to weigh-in and comment on the work that we’ve done to inform the next round of maps. So, with that, I will conclude my tenure as your Chair and hand the reign over to Commissioner Ontai. [Applause]

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: And we all need to go home and get a good night rest.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Job well done.

VICE CHAIRMAN ONTAI: Thank you, Q2.

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We are now adjourned. We will reconvene on June 7th.
(Adjourned at 9:21 p.m.)