```
1
 2
 3
    BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
    In the matter of
 9
    FULL COMMISSION MEETING
10
11
12
       University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law
13
                             Classroom C
14
15
                          3200 Fifth Avenue
                         Sacramento CA 95817
16
17
18
19
                              Volume II
20
                        Friday July 1, 2011
21
                              4:14 p.m.
22
23
    Reported by:
    Brittany Flores, CSR 13460
24
25
```

1 APPEARANCES 2 COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: 3 Cynthia Dai, Chairperson 4 5 Jodie Filkins Weber, Vice Chairperson Gabino Aquirre 6 7 Angelo Ancheta 8 Vincent Barabba Maria Blanco 10 Michelle DiGuilio 11 Stanley Forbes Connie Galambos Malloy 12 13 Gilbert Ontai 14 M. Andre Parvenu Jeanne Raya 15 16 Michael Ward Peter Yao 17 18 19 STAFF PRESENT: Dan Claypool, Executive Director 20 21 Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel 22 Rob Wilcox, Communications Director 23 Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant 24 25

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED
2	
3	CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
4	Ana Henderson, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
5	Nicole Boyle, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
6	Holly Chow, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2		Page
3	Direction to Q2 for Line Drawing	
4	Southern California	5
5		
6	Business Meeting	104
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 2 Friday, July 1, 2011 3 4:14 p.m. 4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioners, if you 5 could all get seated, we will resume. 6 7 We are back from a technical break. Wе 8 are -- have just concluded some line drawing direction to our technical Q2 on LA County, and I believe we are 9 10 now going to move into Orange County, and we will pick 11 up some additional comments about San Diego at the end I'm sure. 12 13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Mr. Ward is gone 14 again. 15 COMMISSIONER DAI: Will you go retrieve 16 Commissioner Ward? Okay. We have a couple of 17 commissioners coming in now. 18 Commissioner Ward, we are on Orange County. 19 Are you ready to speak? COMMISSIONER WARD: (Thumbs up.) 20 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So actually, Ms. 22 Henderson, do you want to walk us through this first? 23 MS. HENDERSON: Okay. So here congressional 24 -- this visualization for congressional districts for 2.5 Orange County -- and just a couple notes. This was

going off of the -- the draft one maps and so you'll see the Chino Hills at the top here is still included in the district that -- the visualizations that we saw here today do not reflect, just to, you know, answer that question from the get-go.

Um, we had a direction to look at putting

Anaheim -- central Anaheim -- and Santa Ana together,

also to try to effectuate a hard line on the southern

county border with San Diego as well as the northern

county border.

We're going to need some direction about where to move some of the populations. You'll see that the populations are now off in most of these districts, so that's one of the things that we'd like to address, so we know where to go when we're drawing lines.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Mr. Ward, do you want to make some comments?

COMMISSIONER WARD: Can we move the map north just a little bit? I'm sorry. Bring south Orange County all the way in. So this visualization has the hard line --

MS. HENDERSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WARD: -- down south.

COMMISSIONER DAI: But the population is all

25 off now.

1.3

1 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: So how do we correct

that?

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER WARD: Well, we had testimony from Dana Point people to push the population to the northwest corner of Orange County due to ties between La Habra and La Habra Heights and things like that.

And then off of the review of the COI database, there was some potential thought to -- potential to move Buena Park over, which was 8,530. That was also in an effort to bring Rossmoor and Los Alamitos County back into Orange County.

Did -- were we able to consider any of those options that were sent forward?

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. We just want more direction about where to move the population, because the populations are so significant here. Maybe it would be good if we could just get started maybe with the Santa Ana/Anaheim district, so we can sign off on something or see if there are additional changes that should be made to that.

COMMISSIONER WARD: With the visualizations we have now, did we -- La Habra is still part of Orange County? It's a little hard to see back here, so I have to ask a question. Sorry.

```
MS. Henderson: This is still -- it has it
1
2
    as part of the Downey -- right here -- District, LA.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Did we see that in the LA
3
    map, though?
 4
                MS. HENDERSON: That's what I'm
 5
6
    double-checking.
7
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Do these visualizations
    bring Rossmoor and La Palma back in Orange County? I'm
8
    sorry. The COI was Rossmoor and Los Alamitos.
9
10
                MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment. Yes.
11
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Did you want to go ahead
    and start with the Anaheim?
12
13
                MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. Can we look at the
    Anaheim/Santa Ana.
14
15
                So in -- we received COI testimony about
16
    joining these two areas. We also received direction not
17
    to split the City of Orange. So this -- this
    visualization does not split Orange, and it goes through
18
    Garden Grove to link central Anaheim and Santa Ana.
19
2.0
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Barabba.
21
                COMMISSIONER BARABBA: As I recall, the
22
    conversation that we had I think with the Mayor of
23
    Orange, she said, "You could split it east of the
24
    Highway 57." Is there a reason why that's a bad idea,
2.5
    or why would she have said that?
```

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And we heard that from many, many people.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Many people, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: That there was

COMMISSIONER DAI: Natural corridor.

OUT -- or first map -- set of maps had that. And then we -- when we had that hearing, a lot of people talked about it including -- the mayor and even gave us streets -- I think it was the river -- where we could split the City of Orange and -- or maybe that was Anaheim.

COMMISSIONER DAI: No. There was definitely a freeway corridor, and then there was also a sliver of Garden Grove. This takes a lot more of Garden Grove than I think people had asked for.

testimony with the Mayor of Orange -- had mentioned was that -- because I was unclear as to exactly where she was talking about splitting it and her comments. She submitted follow-up written testimony as well. The idea was to "please keep Orange whole, but if you must split it, here's a way to minimize the damage." It wasn't, "please feel free -- please split us here."

understood it was to pick up -- and this is where I thought we were trying to make this area closer connected, more contiguous and compact -- was to pick up the the green areas of Orange at what's called the Orange Crush, which is the 5, the 22 -- the green little pocket right in there -- and then you can run that up right up to 57.

1.3

2.5

So then you keep the majority of Orange whole, because most of what they talked about there is Disneyland, and there isn't a high population concentration in that little green area.

So as I recall, when she got up to testify in Fullerton, she recognized all the public testimony that was linking Anaheim and Santa Ana together, and she recognized that her city was in between there, and she had no dispute, as I recall, and I think she confirmed that that was okay.

Well, that's where the City of Orange is that links Anaheim and Santa Ana, and that's why I thought we were going to have most of the connection so that we weren't pushing into Garden Grove so much.

COMMISSIONER DAI: That was my understanding of that lot of testimony, and that helps us, as you say, on that Garden Grove site.

```
COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: I don't know
1
2
    that that helps us population-wise, because I don't
    think there's any population in there, but it would
3
    probably link Anaheim and Santa Ana more, which is more
 4
5
    consistent with the testimony we received if we like
    this iteration.
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And there was specific
    streets that were given. I'm trying to see if I can
8
    find that.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
10
11
    considered Anaheim? Is that why that little triangle
12
    east of the 57 is there? That little peak I quess or
1.3
    why would that be in there on that side?
                No. The little peak right there east of the
14
15
    57.
16
                MS. HENDERSON: That's part of Anaheim.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
17
                                              That's
18
    technically Anaheim?
                         Okay.
19
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We had a lot of
20
    testimony about west of the 57, south of the 91.
21
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, that's
22
    already there.
23
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And wasn't there a sliver
24
    in Garden Grove, too?
2.5
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah.
                                              Well --
```

```
1
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    There was a thin sliver
2
    in Garden Grove.
3
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It was east Garden
 4
    Grove.
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    There it is.
                                                  East of --
 6
    I remember that.
7
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It was southwest
    Orange and east Garden Grove are similar right there.
8
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And I think the idea of
    using that as a corridor, then you don't interrupt the
10
11
    Little Saigon that's next-door basically.
12
                COMMISSIONER WARD:
                                     Chair?
1.3
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER WARD: My concern with that is
14
15
    we'd be greatly increasing splits just to accommodate a
    COI, and I don't know if that's in the county's best
16
    interest.
17
18
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Um, any thoughts from
19
    other commissioners on whether the COI testimony was
20
    compelling in terms of -- they're all evenly ranked.
21
    So --
22
                COMMISSIOER FILKINS WEBER:
                                             Well, in terms
23
    of Little Saigon, it's very loud.
                                        That to me in the
24
    corridor, I'm less concerned about the COI testimony
2.5
    regarding Orange than I am about making sure Little
```

Saigon is protected.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, we had a lot of speakers on that.

MS. HENDERSON: So for the commissioners information, the aqua square is indicating Little Saigon.

commissioner blanco: I thought they were equal. You know, we had a lot both about Little Saigon and -- it was Little Saigon. We had Little Saigon and Bigger Little Saigon.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Bigger little, the surroundings areas.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Right. And then we had, I mean lots of testimony the second time around about this area, and a lot of people who lived all throughout the area saying it was okay to split these different cities. So it was people from regions saying -- it wasn't like we went out and did this. They were saying these are really cities that are, again, referred to up and down the state as a tale of two cities, very different. This is okay. These are -- this is like a continuous sort of community.

So from my perspective, since they're ranked the same cities and Communities of Interest, and we had a lot of Community of Interest testimony and almost none

saying, "don't split me," in that session. That's how I 1 2 would come out on that. COMMISSIONER DAI: Any other 3 commissioners --4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: In that regard, I'm a little concerned with the area of -- that we heard 6 7 a lot of testimony about, which is just north of that 8 triangle -- or I mean, the agua square north of the 22, which -- the Little Saigon and looking at my notes also 9 10 had provided quite a bit of testimony for that area 11 north of the 22 and their connection with Garden Grove. 12 I'm afraid that our prior iteration did not 13 include Little Saigon in a costal district, which is 14 what we're doing right now. Um, but that's just something to throw out there. 15 16 And, again, they also wanted the western 17 portion of Santa Ana, which is the blue area, which is 18 far more Asian than it is Latino. 19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We got a lot of 20 testimony, I thought, at the hearing from the folks in -- because it was mutual. 21 22 COMMISSIONER DAI: It was mutual. 23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: The people were 24 saying -- the people in Westminster were saying, "We 25 really don't belong in Santa Ana," and, you know, it was

```
sort of this thing that happened again in other parts,
1
2
    you know, like in the San Diego, Imperial Valley
    situation. And I have in my notes testimony saying, "We
3
    actually are -- could go down to the coast and be with
 4
5
    this area that goes, you know, out and then down."
                And I have -- and I'll look at my notes
 6
7
    right now, but they did talk specifically about the
    coastal area.
8
                                    They actually did.
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                                         They
10
    said the population was changing a little bit.
11
                Commissioner Ward has his hand up and then
    Commissioner Barabba.
12
1.3
                COMMISSIONER Barabba: I recall also
    testimony from people that said that it would be natural
14
    for, you know, Little Saigon be a part of their
15
    district.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So we say west of the 57
18
    and put more of Garden Grove back in the other district
19
    and population.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And population balance
21
    accordingly.
22
                MS. HENDERSON:
                                 Okay.
                COMMISSIONER WARD: You mean go into Orange?
23
24
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, just that part that
2.5
    they gave permission for, the west of the 57, that will
```

```
make it a little less --
1
2
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Can we find out how many
    city splits we have with WEST G, and the follow-up
3
    question to that is, is LHBYL, the district around it,
 4
    does that put Buena Park and Tustin in the same
5
    district?
 6
7
                MS. HENDERSON: So to answer your first
    question about the city splits, this is splitting -- the
8
    WEST G is splitting Garden Grove and Anaheim presently
9
    in this iteration.
10
11
                Can you repeat --
12
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So we'll add a split in
    Orange, so just one additional split.
13
                COMMISSIONER WARD: And just for the record,
14
15
    why would we move the lines and split another city?
16
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Because we're protecting
17
    two COIs by splitting that.
18
                COMMISSIONER WARD: That aren't protected
19
    now?
20
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Not according to the
    testimony. The testimony was very much the corridor
21
22
    between Anaheim -- central Anaheim and Santa Ana I
23
    believe was that corridor west of the 57, kind of around
    the Disneyland resort area.
24
2.5
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY:
                                                It was
```

```
essentially Santa Ana and the flatlands and Anaheim.
1
2
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And then the Little
3
    Saigon area included most of Garden Grove, and right now
 4
    we're cutting into that so -- the greater Little Saigon
    area.
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Just a clarification
7
    on Commissioner Dai's language. Do you want to say,
    "One local Community of Interest" or we could use the
8
    two Community of Interests. In order to do the split,
9
10
    it has to be a local Community of Interest. We have to
11
    make that call, and then you can justify them being
    choices between. Just a clarification.
12
1.3
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, and I think based
    on Mr. Brown's re-reading of this that this is local.
14
15
    Close enough.
                COMMISSIONER WARD:
                                     Chair?
16
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    Yes.
18
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Just so I'm clear, so
19
    we're -- the direction we're giving is to move the
20
    connection between Santa Ana and Anaheim eastbound
21
    splitting Orange.
22
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Uh-huh.
23
                COMMISSIONER WARD: To accommodate the COI
24
    for greater Saigon; is that correct?
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that's -- part of
```

```
1
    it is also to be more aligned with the testimony we
2
    heard about the connection between central Anaheim and
    Santa Ana. Is that consistent?
3
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Can I check with the
 4
5
    line drawers?
6
                Are we presently not incorporating the
7
    boundaries of greater Saigon -- or what are the
    boundaries that we have now?
8
                MS. HENDERSON: The aqua box is actually the
10
    Little Saigon.
11
                COMMISSIONER DAI: The official designated
12
    area.
1.3
                MS. HENDERSON: The official designated
14
    area.
15
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Most of the testimony
16
    actually was Westminster, Garden Grove, and Fountain
    Valley.
17
18
                MS. HENDERSON: Fountain Valley, yeah.
19
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So they actually named
20
    all three cities at the greater area.
21
                MS. HENDERSON: And the Westminster, most of
    the Garden Grove portion, and the Fountain Valley are in
22
23
    this purple district right now, the OCCST.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So right now you can see
24
    it's splitting the aqua area.
2.5
```

```
1
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Splitting --
2
                MS. HENDERSON: A question for the
3
    commission, if we're going with the larger Little Saigon
    boundaries, is that okay to split into Santa Ana then?
 4
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Um --
 5
                COMMISSIONER WARD: That's a city boundary
 6
7
    you drew it along now, right?
                MS. HENDERSON: Yes, that's right.
8
                COMMISSIONER WARD: So we have to split into
9
10
    that.
11
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And did you include
    western Santa Ana?
12
                MS. HENDERSON: Uh-huh.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER WARD: So we're going to make
14
15
    two city splits?
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Uh-huh.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But you're
18
    already over-populated in the costal district by 95,000
19
    people, and we're going to run into a problem on the
    south. But if --
20
21
                And remember when we're doing these
22
    deviations there's going to be a lot of splits just so
23
    you know.
24
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: This is just
2.5
    the beginning of woes.
```

```
COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, yeah for
1
2
    certain.
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I feel
3
    comfortable with the split. I think the Community of
4
    Interest testimony we received was clear, consistent,
5
    compelling.
 6
7
                COMISSIONER DIIGUILIO: From multiple sides
    of the aisle.
8
                COMMISSIONER DAI: With lots of
9
    documentation.
10
11
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Chair, I must apologize.
12
    I was late today and did miss the Brown briefing.
13
    there -- you said there was some clarification or
    something given that helped define the connection
14
15
    between Anaheim and Santa Ana with the necessity for
16
    drawing it this way.
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Not today. It's just the
18
    same as Mr. Brown had given to us before his re-reading
19
    of that area.
20
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Okay. And the COI
    particularly that we're protecting with this district is
21
    defined as --
22
23
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Someone else like to --
24
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We had a long
    conversation -- when did we do this visualization?
2.5
```

think it was in -- was it -- which meeting was it?

Stockton? And what we did was we -- I'm not sure if you were there -- I think you were, Commissioner Ward.

1.3

2.5

We had a very long conversations about the testimony we had heard about the folks from Santa Ana being very connected to Anaheim and, in fact, what had looked like a -- something that was disconnected was, in fact, much more compact. And Mr. Brown had indicated that upon second review, he thought so. And that the testimony that what was in the middle was the resort industry and that, in fact, people from Anaheim that worked in that industry and folks in Santa Ana worked in that industry and that this was -- he made some interesting observations that he had looked at the scatter map for this area and that he realized that what essentially what may look like to the naked eye like something --

COMMISSIONER DAI: As separate.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: -- that is separate, when you really see the way the population is spread in this whole area that he had come to understand it as a compact area.

And then we reviewed a lot of the testimony from the Fullerton -- most of the testimony occurred at our Fullerton hearing that we used at our Stockton

meeting to draw this, and I think there was pretty much consensus at the last time that we discussed this that this was, in fact, a COI.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: That also happened here, right? That was when -- I think, Commissioner Ward, you did actually ask Mr. Brown when he said that was acceptable, and you had asked him, "Well, I had talked to somebody about something else," and Mr. Brown said -- well, as I understand it, he gave us permission when you indirectly asked him that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. And also

Commissioner Ancheta distributed the population

concentration by census track information that helped

form the basis of Mr. Brown's decision.

Commissioner Galambos Malloy and then Commissioner Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Some of the COI that I found most compelling was regarding educational issues in the unique socio-demographics of this area, that these areas that we're joining here have a very high percentage of English learners. The majority of the students are on free and reduced lunch. There is a high proportion of homelessness among children. We're talking about four different school districts that are in these two areas that we're joining

and I think we heard similar things from a number of different speakers, but, again, this is largely from the Fullerton meeting that we had.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

underscore of Commissioner Galambos Malloy's summary of some of the characteristics of the Community of Interest. Just as a reminder, we're not dealing with a compensatory and compliance issue at this level, and, of course, let's look at the multiple bases, and I think at the assembly level, among other reasons besides the Community of Interest testimony, there is a predicate that looks like it's an issue of compliance but at the assembly level only.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. Right. So -- Commissioner Ward.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Right. I just want to make it clear to my follow commissioners, I'm not attacking the idea. This is a real important area of Orange County. This particular district drives a lot of what happens throughout the rest of the county if we choose to draw it. And there's certainly is written testimony as well that talks about a difference between the areas, and what I think is most important to respond

to is the California Association of Orange County
Cities, which is a nonpartisan group that use the same
criteria we did -- strictly provided maps in which they
as well felt that the city relationships, the municipal
needs, looked different -- did not combine those areas.

2.5

So I just want to make sure that because of the impact that this has on the county that we provide a very thorough rationale for why we're choosing to do it.

I'm not trying to frustrate the idea here.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I ask a clarification for my fellow commissioners. If I remember correctly, it came to our attention during a meeting that one of the key cities in this equation is actually not a member of that consortium of cities.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I believe it was Santa Ana, and Santa Ana has some of the pronounced issues regarding the socio-demographics that I just referred to, and so I think while the other testimony was compelling, we do have to balance and not assume that the consortium of cities actually represents everybody within all of the cities within Orange County area and all of the communities within the Orange County area.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah. I'm reviewing my

```
1
    notes here, and a lot of the testimony only mentions
2
    east Garden Grove, and some of it mentions west of the
    57. So there's probably some choices there. I just
3
    want Q2 to note that you're probably going to do some
 4
    population balancing.
5
                So I think that there was some testimony
 6
7
    that just said, "connect through east Garden Grove" and
    some that also mentioned west of the 57.
8
                MS. HENDERSON: Also actually, if I could
10
    ask a question. Is "west of the 57," would that also
11
    extend up into the Anaheim area as well? Would that be
12
    the dividing line that we use?
1.3
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    I think we were just
    talking about the connection between the cities.
14
15
                MS. HENDERSON: Okav.
16
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Did somebody else
17
    understand it differently?
18
                I think we were just taking the corridor
19
    there through Disneyland.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER WARD: Chair, did -- were we
21
    able to determine on the LHBYL district, since it's
22
    impacted by the drawing of this district, does connect
23
    Buena Park to Tustin and --
24
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, if we
2.5
    want to move on, is there anything else that we want to
```

```
1
    talk about on WEST G? And then we can move on to
2
    another district.
                COMMISSIONER WARD: I'll just note that my
 3
    review of the COI and 30 years plus of living there, I
4
5
    think that there is alternatives ways to draw the center
    of north Orange County that --
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              The center
    of --
8
9
                COMMISSIONER WARD: -- that put other COIs
10
    to include Anaheim into Orange, Fullerton, and --
11
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, is there
12
    a visualization that you would like to discuss?
13
                COMMISSIONER WARD: I sent -- I sent
14
    direction -- I don't know if they have an alternative
    version based off of the COI review that was forwarded
15
16
    or not, but I do commend Q2, because I think they did a
17
    great job of following what the COI summaries showed in
18
    minimizing city splits and trying to accommodate this
19
    COI. I think it is a great visualization --
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, is there
20
21
    any --
22
                COMMISSIONER WARD: I'm just saying that as
23
    a commissioner being a subject-matter expert on this
24
    area, I just don't agree with the COI testimony that
    that needs to drive --
2.5
```

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Is there another visualization that Q2 has done of this area?

2.5

MS. HENDERSON: We were not requested to do another visualization that I'm aware of. The only one that I've seen, we did have a request to look at a water district that was there. We can pull that out for you to see if you'd like to --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, this is the time to discuss other -- or provide instruction if there's other visualization that the commission desires for this area.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ward, you can describe it if you'd like. This is the time.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Next week, we're going to take a look at these visualizations if there's going to be some other changes, so if you have other recommendations for Q2 to take a look at, feel free. We're not locked into anything, we haven't voted.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah. No, I'm just -the water district map that was testified to was
provided and forwarded as an option to accommodate the
COI, and I think that they have actually done a -probably better job at minimizing splits than the water
map did in accommodating COI. So that's great.

The Association of Orange County Cities is

```
the one that offered --
1
2
                MS. HENDERSON: So the blue -- it's blue on
    yours too -- in the middle is the water district.
3
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: The blue that says,
 4
    "Santa Ana" just that portion or the whole --
5
                MS. HENDERSON: The whole thing.
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Does that include the
    whole City of Orange?
8
                MS. HENDERSON: It splits the Orange.
9
10
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: At the 55?
11
                MS. HENDERSON: I believe it's further to
    the east, but let's take a look.
12
1.3
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, the Mayor of Orange
    said, "Don't use the 55." She said, "That's too far
14
    over."
15
16
                MS. HENDERSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I think I
17
    thought you were referring to 57.
18
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: 57 is the blue
19
    line that's really light.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And she said, "Absolutely
    do not use that."
21
22
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: So maybe Commissioner
23
    Ward could maybe explain how this is more reflective
24
    of -- if I'm understanding you, you did not accept the
2.5
    COI testimony as being reflective of what's best for
```

central Orange County. So could you describe how this water district boundary better reflects that?

2.5

COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah. Thank you. I was probably unclear.

The water district map was forwarded by public input testimony to us with a number of endorsements that draw a district to -- in response to the COI that was received in Fullerton to combine Anaheim and Santa Ana. So that map was forwarded in an effort to accommodate that COI and make that district possible. So that was an option provided by the public.

In review of what Q2 was able to conceptualize as a visualization, they, in my opinion at least, did a much better job of not only accommodating Santa Ana/Anaheim COI testimony but also minimizing city splits with what they did. So I actually think what Q2 did is more responsive to our criteria.

What I was suggesting is that there's also a lot of -- or at least testimony has been provided that Anaheim and Santa Ana have relationships with other cities that do not bind them, that do no connect them. And so obviously, we have an issue of which COI is, you know, the commission's will to accommodate.

I just wanted to spell out -- make sure the record is clear, because as you can see, what we decided

to do with this district has huge ramifications for the rest of Orange County, and since we're starting there and this seems to be the linchpin, I just wanted to make sure we're very clear on if we chose -- if the commission's will is to draw this district, why they're doing it so that we can justify what we do from here.

1.3

2.5

But the Orange County Association of
California Cities, although they don't have every single
city in Orange County, they're 80-plus percent our
cities. And, again, they use our criteria only and
their knowledge of municipal relationships to come up
with their maps, and like I said, obviously, the
commission needs to balance out with COI testimony and
commend our effort to do that --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: We've spent a half hour just on this one district, and we have about another three districts to discuss for Orange County.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner DiGuilio.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm just trying to move the process along forward. It looks like we have this district. We have some options to discuss in regards to it, and it sounds like if we want to have Q2 look at some other options, that might be something we can do for the next iteration -- I mean, for Sunday, because I do think there will be a lot of consequences

```
1
    that will happen. And I think once we get a picture of
2
    that I think -- it's my understanding that this -- this
    not only respects the COIs related to this area but it
3
    better respects the COIs that ripple out past that.
 4
    It's not just about the COIs here. It's all those other
5
    ones.
 6
7
                So, again, this is a good starting point.
    If Commissioner Ward would like to have another
8
    visualization, maybe we could do that, and then we could
9
10
    take them in their totality, because what I'm concerned
    about is the other visualizations will break a lot of
11
    other COIs.
12
1.3
                But I would like to see those options, and
14
    we can make that final decision. And just because -- I
    mean, again, my county submitted a perfect map that
15
16
    worked for them. Again, it's the center of the
17
    universe, right? It had all the towns.
18
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So, again, looking at our
19
    timeframe, we have three other districts to discuss.
20
    Can we look at the costal district? We're generally okay
    with this for now?
21
22
                I don't remember, but I think we -- in the
23
    80s, we might actually separate Anaheim and Santa Ana.
24
    No?
         We put them to together? Okay.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              One other
```

question that I just had about this area. If we do look at this visualization that's being considered by Commissioner Ward, we're not splitting the City of Orange all that much going to the 55; is that correct, Ms. Henderson? MS. HENDERSON: The 57? COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: No, to the 55. The water district map included almost all of Orange all the way to 55 as Commissioner Ward's potential other visualization. COMMISSIONER DAI: Is that what you're advocating, because I thought you said Q2 did a better job? COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah. That's all I was saying is that what was forwarded was two ideas was, "Please try to give us a visualization with this COI, and give us a visualization with the other that kept them separate." That's all. I wasn't trying to make it the center of the universe. I just wanted to see a second visualization and see, like I think Commissioner

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decision.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. Well, then we still might be asking for it, and the reason I say that is the costal district is over-populated by

DiGuilio said, what the ramifications are to make a good

```
95,000, which means we're going to push down and when we
1
2
    push down against the hard border at San Diego in Orange
    County, it's going to push the south. In other words,
3
    we could probably push Dana Point into the south and see
 4
    if we can get into this district. That's my idea.
5
                                   Do we need to take 95,000
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
 6
7
    out?
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Correct and the
8
    point is, is that -- I think --
9
10
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Aren't we pushing up
11
    then?
12
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: No. We need to
13
    take 95,000 out. When we do that, then the population
14
    comes back up north, and then we might be back at this
    issue on how we balance orange -- or north Orange
15
16
    County. When you start to go around in a circle is my
17
    point.
18
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: Commissioner Dai?
19
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
20
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: I've been thinking
    about this ever since we had a discussion about south
21
22
    Los Angeles. We've got 95,000 extra people in west Los
23
    Angeles, and we have to move to the southeast to move
24
    them one way or the other. So I think it's -- and I
2.5
    look at the plus 95,000 here. I'd really like to get Q2
```

```
1
    to get me sort of a gross idea of how that -- moving
2
    that 95,000 is going to affect this 95,000 because
    there's no point in talking about a costal district if
3
    we have to -- all of a sudden, we have to fit 95,000
 4
    people into or take it out of it.
5
 6
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                     Right.
7
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              So do we want
    to move to that costal district where we had that
8
    95,000-person problem?
9
10
                Commissioner Ward, is that where you want to
11
    go next?
12
                COMMISSIONER WARD:
                                      Sure.
13
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS Weber: Because one
14
    idea in looking at it is Cyprus in comparison to some of
15
    the COI that we got with Dana Point, but is Dana Point
    in the costal district, O.C. costal, right now?
16
17
                MS. HENDERSON:
                                  Yes.
                                        So -- no. Sorry.
18
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              No, it's not,
    and is it whole in the south O.C. district?
19
20
                MS. HENDERSON:
                                 Yes.
21
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Wonderful.
22
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: So what's the
23
    potential impact of the 95,000 west Los Angeles
24
    population on this district as you come down the coast
2.5
    toward Long Beach?
```

```
MS. HENDERSON: So if I understand your
1
2
    question correctly, we have a 98,000 person bubble up in
    the west L.A. area.
3
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: Correct.
                MS. HENDERSON: And we had discussed earlier
 5
    coming down the coast around --
6
7
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: Correct.
8
                MS. HENDERSON: -- the port and taking in
    population and you're asking if this might be affected?
9
10
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: Exactly. How might it
11
    be affected. Because there's no point in -- if
12
    it doesn't -- this may be part of the solution to the
    bubble and where we draw the line here.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But how can
14
    that be if we have a hard line at the Long Beach --
15
16
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: We might not have a
    hard line.
17
18
                COMMISSIONER DAI: We did have some
19
    testimony that links Seal Beach and Long beach together.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Very little.
    know the relation there.
21
22
                MS. BOYLE. The bubble in LA is 98,000, but
23
    there's 267,000 people in Long Beach who are currently
24
    in that Palos Verdes Estates district. So we we will be
2.5
    able to pull out of Long Beach by 100,000, but there'll
```

1 still be 167,000 people in Long Beach in LA --2 COMMISSIONER WARD: Right. MS. BOYLE: -- that need to go into a 3 district and it's looking like right now they would have 4 to be included with Lakewood, Cerritos, and --5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Los Alamitos, 6 7 Rossmoor, and Seal Beach. 8 MS. BOYLE: Right. COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Did we have some 9 10 testimony -- again, this goes back to the smaller 11 communities where these smaller communities, who link themselves with -- whether it be costal or inland --12 1.3 there's an idea, again, to link them more together so it's a power of smaller communities versus -- little 14 ones getting -- that periphery into large ones. 15 16 was just part of the discussion here. 17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No. I agree, but we 18 have 150,000 people that look like they may be moved 19 into Orange County to get the west LA bubble taken care 2.0 of. That's going to affect what we do in this district 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well -- and I think that 22 the testimony that Commissioner Ward pointed out is that 23 most of the flexibility was on the northern border with 24 Orange County in terms of being across the border. 2.5 COMMISSIONER YAO: This is a hard line.

COMMISSIONER DAI: And the crossing over I think started at Cerritos -- was where people were more okay.

1.3

2.5

thing -- and some of the public testimony when looking at this O.C. district -- even though I'm not at the top part of it -- Alicia Viejo recently put in some testimony, if anybody has taken a look at it, that they do not want to be in a costal district with Newport Beach and Costa Mesa. And we heard from the Dana Point representatives that if there was going to be some necessity to take out some population on that costal district that Laguna Woods could go as well.

So, again, this affects how much over-populated we are in the south O.C. district, but maybe the ripple effect up north will push out some Orange County people that would still preserve this testimony for south O.C. So we can probably consider that 47,000 Alicia Viejo is pulling them out of the costal and putting them in south O.C.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I look at the surplus population of the south O.C. and I added it to the 150,000 coming out of Long Beach, and I see 250,00. I mean, moving 30,000 isn't going do it. There's going to be some major structural change take place in Orange

1 County. 2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, then it might have to be a bit north. So that's where we're 3 going to rotate up again. See what happens in the 4 north. 5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I just think we need 6 7 to keep that -- that's a big number. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Do we have 8 other options, Commissioner Forbes? I think this is 9 10 your area. 11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, no. 12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So if you have 13 greater suggestions where we're looking for --COMMISSIONER DAI: We're looking for 14 15 potential solutions. So the -- is that green district 16 all one, because I think that was Commissioner Ward's 17 original question. Do we have --18 MS. HENDERSON: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER DAI: His question was Buena 20 Park and Tustin being in the same district. 21 So there was some testimony about splitting 22 Irvine. I don't know if it was from Irvine, though. 23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: They want to 24 keep it whole, but it's 212,000 people. It's the same 2.5 issue we had with Riverside at three hundred and three.

When you're talking about very large cities -- the testimony that we saw recently was that they didn't want it to be split, but it's a very large city for south O.C.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Let me ask a clarifying question. I know that the surrounding districts don't change. So our assumption of Chino Hills is --

MS. HENDERSON: What this is showing is the draft one iteration, um, Tustin, Chino Hills, and a visualization has been moved in with Diamond Bar.

COMMISSIONER DAI: And then does it take any of the La Brea, because originally I think it was. So that's my question, because I'm wondering if we're looking at it accurately, because I don't think there's enough people right now, because that's where I think the population push can come from, from LA.

MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment. Nicole is working on something with the computer over here. So I need to -- just a moment, so I can see what that map looks like.

If I can switch us back to what we were just discussing with Commissioner Forbes, that's the calculation that Nicole was running.

MS. BOYLE: So if I move the border over in

```
the Palos Verdes district, so back west, so that I have
1
2
    an 98,000 -- or approximately 90,000 hole in the Palos
    Verdes Estates district to move the bubble in west LA
3
    down to -- that puts the border of the Long Beach
 4
    district almost down the center and it leaves it with
5
    a -- that includes the eastern part of Long Beach,
 6
7
    Lakewood, Cerritos, Rossmoor, and -- is that Los
    Alamitos -- and that district as a remainder needs
8
    358,000 people.
9
10
                COMMISSIONER DAI: That's half a district.
11
                MS. BOYLE: It's going to need 348,000
12
    people in the end. My little visualization isn't exact
1.3
    here.
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                     Thoughts?
14
15
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, one
16
    thought might be, if I -- refresh my memory
17
    commission -- I thought that Cyprus might have wanted to
18
    be with Artesia, and we might get them closer across
19
    than LA County border there.
20
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Part of the Buena Park
21
    was okay with being with Cerritos and Artesia.
22
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So that district cannot
23
    move any further north to pick up any population?
24
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: No.
2.5
                MS. HENDERSON: Which one?
```

1 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The long Beach. 2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Into that LA 3 district. COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's the question. 4 There's no opportunity going north anymore, right? 5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: That's the one 6 7 that goes right into downtown? 8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: 9 So this might 10 be an option, you know, this is the way that the area 11 works right now, which is to take Seal Beach and put 12 Seal Beach and Long Beach together. We didn't hear a 1.3 lot of testimony about keeping this a hard line at this 14 county. They do have relationships. A lot of people in Seal Beach think that they're LA county. That's true 15 but -- and we've been respecting that border for a 16 while. 17 18 COMMISSIONER DAI: It may not be possible. 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: It may not be 20 possible. So if anything, we might want to make this a 21 little more compact, and if we did that, it might be 22 much to my personal dismay but for -- and I don't mean a 23 bias there -- but recognizing Los Alamitos and the testimony they have provided and Rossmoor and I 24 2.5 recognize that if we can keep a pull at least in this

congressional district, we might consider putting Long Beach with Cypress, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, and Seal Beach.

1.3

2.5

Maybe we can direct Q2 to see that as an option if we were going to keep that as maybe a compact district, and then we free up some population on the coast, which frees up some population for Orange County in general. Maybe we want to see that as an option.

COMMISSIONER YAO: The testimony from Long
Beach since the first draft is -- ends up keeping the
city whole. We now divide them up into three
congressional districts, and now we're going to mix them
with the Orange County district?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Split in two.

and there was a significant amount of COI testimony to the contrary that actually Long Beach is a tale of two cities and that it does make sense to split the city, and our split really reflects the Community of Interest testimony received. The only exception that we may have made would be in not including Signal Hill in the western half of Long Beach, which is a refinement.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I think if it's just a two-way split, I think Long Beach can accept that, because we have received a lot of testimony in terms of

the western part and the northern part being coupled with the Community of Interest a little further west of them but --COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: remember that some of the written testimony we received from the smaller cities near the Orange County border have had concerns about being sort of the Lone Ranger in with the huge, long beachy district, which now with our configuration into half then that creates space for having maybe more of a cadre, if you will, of northern beach, northern Orange County cities that would have a significant power block also within the district. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: True, because you might even get equal population, equal LA county with equal O.C. in this combined district. At this congressional level, I don't know how beneficial that is. COMMISSIONER FORBES: It might be a rationalization but -- oh, well. But how do we get to the 350,000 people out of Orange County? We've got Seal Beach, you've got Los Alamitos, you've go Cypress, and -- you know --COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, the question still was whether or --

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER DAI: Buena Park.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Buena park --
2
    excuse me. La Brea, Yorba Linda, Chino Hills, and
    Diamond Bar is really the district that we had asked for
3
    before, but those are questions before we got to this.
 4
                MS. HENDERSON: Right. So we just did a
6
    quick calculation with a portion of Long Beach, Lake
7
    Woods, Cerritos, Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress, Los
    Alamitos, Hawaiian Gardens, and all of Ceramistas is
8
    looking for about 230,000 people. So that's 230,000,
9
    220,000 under that combination of areas but that may
10
11
    help address the 98,000 bubble in west LA by --
12
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: No. Right, I
13
    understand.
                MS. HENDERSON: -- as Commissioner Forbes
14
15
    mentioned.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So did we establish what
16
17
    the top of that -- the northern county district actually
18
    looks like?
19
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Just pull it
20
    down.
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Because it's not
22
    consistent with --
23
                MS. HENDERSON: Yes. This is off of the
24
    draft one map so --
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Because La Habra I think
```

```
1
    was not in the LA map.
2
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: It's not now.
                MS. HENDERSON: That's correct.
 3
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: I just wonder whether
 4
5
    we're going to have to have our considerate district
6
    that Orange County goes all the way to the Orange County
7
    line there on the north. I mean, so you have a fairly
    lengthy, relatively thin district that comes down the
8
    Orange County line -- the Orange County side that comes
10
    down to, you know, La Brea, Fullerton, Buena Park,
11
    Cypress, Los Alamitos -- to get to 350,000 people. And
    then it looks into the east of the -- east side of Long
12
    Beach.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So the actual district
14
15
    just -- I hate to be a broken record on this -- the
    actual district from the north takes in the Diamond Bar
16
17
    district, takes in La Habra Heights -- La Habra, La
18
    Brea. What does it actually take in?
19
                MS. HENDERSON: Yes, it takes La Habra
20
    Heights, Roland Heights, La Habra, La Brea.
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And Yorba Linda?
22
                MS. HENDERSON: Diamond Bar, Chino Hills,
23
    Yorba Linda, Placentia.
24
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. So that's the --
2.5
                MS. HENDERSON: Part of Orange.
```

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: The problem is we're not 2 looking at an accurate representation here. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And that's the 3 hard part because then it almost looks like --4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think I'm looking at the numbers. I'm not looking at the colors so much as 6 7 the numbers. The numbers get to be 350 without touching the Anaheim/Santa Ana district or the coast. 8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. been on this area for 45 minutes and we haven't even 10 11 seen south O.C. yet, and we really wanted to get to some 12 before our business meeting at 6:00, and we wanted to 1.3 eat. COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me make a 14 15 suggestion. Let me make a suggestion that we direct Q2 to develop a district that consists of half -- the 16 17 eastern half of Long beach and 350,000 people out of 18 Orange County. I mean, unless you got some other place to find them. 19 20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Ms. Henderson, do you have a suggestion of what kind of direction will be most 21 22 helpful to give you a little latitude to deal with this 23 population bubble that we're talking about? 24 MS. HENDERSON: Commissioner Forbes 2.5 suggestion.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okav. Do we want to look
2
    at the south O.C. district?
3
                MS. HENDERSON: What we did there was follow
    direction to establish a hard line at the O.C./San Diego
4
    border. So bringing San Clemente, Dana Point back into
5
    Orange County.
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And Irvine is?
                MS. HENDERSON: I'm sorry?
8
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Is Irvine split
9
10
    at all?
11
                MS. HENDERSON: No.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: No.
12
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And Irvine is in the
13
    coastal district? May I ask whether it's reasonable to
14
15
    do a hard line at the south O.C./San Diego County given
    that we started from this area.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Is it
18
    reasonable?
19
                COMMISSIONER DAI: No. I mean, in terms of
20
    the numbers, does it work out?
21
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, that's my
22
    concern.
23
                MS. HENDERSON: Establishing a hardline now
24
    will not only affect the population within the districts
    within Orange County, but it will also create a
2.5
```

population --1 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Overage? MS. HENDERSON: In San Diego County that 3 will need to be made up. So I won't -- I can't comment 4 on reasonableness. 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: No. But I mean, 6 7 mathematically, is it a viable constraint for us? 8 mean, are we creating a situation where we're not going to be able to make up the population? Ву 10 MS. HENDERSON: We will lose growth. 11 doing this, we lose population in the district in San 12 Diego that will need to be made up somewhere else, and 1.3 we will change the population of the district within Orange County that will also need to be adjusted. 14 15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So we're looking at 16 Temecula, Murrieta as possibilities? 17 MS. HENDERSON: Temecula, Murrieta are 18 possibilities. Moving -- right now a portion of 19 Temecula is in San Diego County -- moving that border 20 further --21 COMMISSIONER DAI: North. 22 MS. HENDERSON: -- north to take in more 23 perhaps Murrieta and Temecula -- although eyeballing it, 24 it looks like just a portion of Murrieta. And then 2.5 adjusting all the San Diego districts to equalize the

population.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. I would just like to just point out one overlying factor to all of this. The reason we're getting into all of those problems is to protect essentially what appears to be two districts, and only two districts, which is the airport with Inglewood and Anaheim and Santa Ana together. And that's what's causing the ripple effect throughout this entire region all the way down to San Diego and the Riverside County line at Murrieta and Temecula. And we are disrupting quite a number of COIs including the border at Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, Orange County at Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor. We're potentially disrupting the border at Orange County at San Diego and all for essentially trying to respect two districts that are not in Section 2.

So that's what's happening here with these iterations. So to the extent in which the commission wishes to reconsider some of the draft maps we have now while we still may be able to, you know, keep some of those ideas and respect some larger, you know -- quite a more number of COIs rather than just respect one or two. That's what I'm seeing as happening right now, and I'm very concerned about these ripple effects all the way down the coast.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Galambos
Malloy?

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm definitely open to seeing some other configurations. You know, one thing that we had discussed briefly, and I don't think the commission really came to a decision on whether we felt comfortable with it was actually that we could respect the airport COI at -- I'm referring to LAX -- but we could actually separate out the very costal area right next to the airport, which is -- essentially opens the pressure valve and allows us to move population around the western coast of Los Angeles in a way that we can't -- if we block the airport and include all of the land area all out to the west.

So, you know, that is one, I think, fairly simple thing we could do that would allow us exponentially more flexibility at this point in the game.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And I would point out that there's significant -- even though we had the testimony about the airport being with Inglewood -- there's significant testimony written and some in person -- but basically written because I think people may not felt comfortable saying this -- there was significant testimony in the written comments saying

that Hawthorn costal is really not -- doesn't belong with Inglewood. And so we do have a lot of testimony to that effect. So I think that could be an interesting thing to explore, and we do have public to that effect.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think we should leave you open that option with the COIs. In other words, moving Hawthorn.

MS. HENDERSON: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that to make sure we're clear.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Blanco.

think you brought it up earlier that you had thought about the idea of going behind the airport and -- and really the area that's coastal behind the airport, opening up -- that up. And I was pointing out that there were a lot of written comments saying that part of Hawthorn really did not feel that connected to Inglewood and the interior. You know, there were people at the airport that in -- people that worked at the airport and lived in Inglewood but we had residents in the coastal area who were saying, "That's really not our community."

So we could sort of look at a combination of both things here at the airport where people work being in that district and the people that live on the costal area not being in that district.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Forbes.

2.5

absolutely no objection of taking the airport off of the course on the bottom, but it seems to me that the districts that we were roughly drawing still had 96,000 too many people. I mean they have to go somewhere, and they can't go east because we don't want to go -- and I can't blame them and they can't really go north. Then they have to come -- that population, it has to move southeast regardless of the airport, and that's going to bump into Orange County.

I think Commissioner Weber is right that we might want to give them the flexibility to work in Orange County as they need to work in Orange County with that regard to the Santa Ana/Anaheim district at this moment.

MS. HENDERSON: And if I could just interject. Regardless of the hard line O.C./San Diego border is going to cause a population issue that we have to address in San Diego regardless of what happens in the other districts.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. And we did have some testimony about the cluster of cities, you know, the furthest south that -- you know, despite Camp Pendleton, a barrier. There are a lot of people who

live in those areas and actually work at Camp Pendleton. So there is some testimony even though they would prefer to stay in Orange County, if we had the to link them, it would not be out of the question.

1.3

2.5

Commissioner Parvenu, you had something?

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I want to agree with what was said earlier. There's a narrow stretch just west of the airport, Dockweiler Beach, and I believe that might be a state park. So there are environmental similarities along that coast if we have to open up, more or less, a safety valve. It's going to look narrow, very narrow, but considering the population shifts, I think that may be the way to go.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm also wondering -is some of this created -- I'm not sure -- by putting
the Calabasas area back in?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Any thoughts on that?

MS. BOYLE: I think I would like to keep

Calabasas with west San Fernando Valley, but at this

point, I can't determine whether it's helpful or not.

I'm actually working on it at this moment. I might be able to --

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: There's another place in there where there's a lot of population.

MS. BOYLE: It is. I would like to keep it

with west San Fernando Valley, but then we're essentially splitting that COI of Oak Park, Agoura Hills, and Calabasas into three districts now if I don't keep it with Agoura Hills.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I just ask or say a few sentences about the population issues we're going to deal with if we keep the hard line on the southern O.C. boundaries.

MS. HENDERSON: Sure. So the districts in the first draft map extended from San Diego up into the coast -- let me put up the first draft map, so you can see.

COMMISSIONER DAI: And the problem with the first draft map was Newport/Dana Point. If there's a way for us to keep it whole at least and with it's sister cities it might not be --

MS. HENDERSON: So here we have the first draft map, and you see the district across Camp Pendleton, across the districts here that are included, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, and Dana Point. And you see the population here is a little bit over a hundred and twenty to 30,000. So if we establish a hard line between Orange County and San Diego, that's taking about 130,000 people out of the districts in San Diego County. They need to be made up somehow.

So you could -- one way to do that is to use the Temecula area that extends further north and the Murrieta and possibly a little bit further depending on where we make the cut right now. That puts more population back into the San Diego County, the NESAN District. The remainder of the district within San Diego will have to be adjusted in order to afford the additional populations on the NESAN District.

2.5

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And right now we only have two cities that are split under this map, right?

MS. HENDERSON: Under the --

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah. It'd be El Cajon and Chula Vista. So if we shifted everything down, we'd be splitting more cities.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Diguilio.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can I just discuss a general thing. If we were to do Orange County/San Diego rough border, I think there's been some argument saying San Clemente being included because of the connection.

I was going to ask, as Ana said, to push it down, and I'm wondering with the valve come back up would be, which is saying is Temecula, but if we regroup, I think we are going to go back to this area.

I think there's some regrouping that can be done, because if you regroup and you kind of do like

Escondido, San Marcos, Fallbook, and all -- you know -well, kind of the 15 corridor, if you had to push more of San Diego in there, I think there's some more similarities in the area with Riverside.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

I mean, having being been a firefighter in that area, I know that the link is there as opposed to the coast. So I mean, I think there is some justification if we had to push into Riverside.

COMMISSIONER DAI: COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Well, I think it's If the valve is there, it's something to an option. look at.

> COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Forbes.

That would be --

COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, on my census is that we should have as flexible of a border there as we can, because, again, I go back, if we're looking at 350,000 people moved into Orange County, I want all the flexibility I can get. I mean, we may have to put 150,000 of Orange County into San Diego rather than come in the other direction.

And so I think at this point, until we sort of see what the implications are of that ripple effect, we want to give them as much flexibility as they can have. I hope they can have a hard line, but I'm not going to bet the farm.

think what we need to do is be clear about our preferences but that -- you know, I think it's going to be difficult to do a hard line at this point in the process because we are still -- there's still some uncertainty in some of our other districts, and we do not know what the full ripple effect will be.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Filkins Weber.

'rippling' to me -- going back to this morning when we discussed the Visualization 2, which is potentially a Section 2 in San Bernardino that pulled additional population from Glenn Avon and Rubio and Mira Loma -- if I'm not mistaken, that was around 64,000 or 70,000 people. And I thought, "Where are we going to get those additional people?" And I thought to myself, "We already have the split in Temecula, which is -- be more than likely, if we went with that visualization, we'd be picking Temecula up and putting it back into its Riverside County home."

So this is the ripple, and that's what's potentially happening, and I thought that might have worked at that borer, but now we're looking for population. So if we go to Murrieta and pick up that

other 100,000 people, where are we going to get the other 100,000 people for the Riverside districts, because you're butting right up against the Section 2, and we don't have anywhere to go. Otherwise, you're going to be going Banning Beaumont. And then now you're back all the way down to the border and we're -
COMMISSIONER DAI: I think we have to leave

2.5

that border a little bit flexible. I mean, I think in an attempt to keep Dana Point whole is important.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Can I just -COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I think we really have to be realistic about this. When we started with our first drafts, you know, we were working with a larger population deviation. We're really -- at this point, we're being precise, and I think we need to step back a little bit. I don't like the idea of these splits, but on the other hand, I think we need to not think that there's something magical about counties. They're all different. Some of them have a large population. Some of them have small populations. Some of them -- I mean, they're political boundaries, and if we really decided to draw our maps based across the board on county lines, we would be -- with the deviations that we have -- I mean, it would just -- face it. It just wouldn't work,

because that's not what the counties were built to do.

They're political boundaries for other purposes not

built for congressional redistricting purposes.

2.5

So I think that one thing -- I know looking at this sets us back in some ways, but I think we need to remember that there's a reason why this is in there in the same area and in the same categories of Communities of Interests in the county. And that's because it is very possible that there are things in our communities that transcend county lines.

And a lot of the -- you know. So I think we've gotten -- you know, because it was possible do it when we had a greater deviation. We got used to the idea that we could do counties.

I think we just need to be clear with what we're dealing with here and think also about -- without getting frustrated -- think about the Communities of Interest that exist that may not be bounded by counties, and those are just as important as county lines that are really for local county politics not for other purposes.

So I just want to, you know, have us all not get so frustrated here.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, I do want to point out that these were population balanced. Our first drafts were, so this was not a population deviation

problem. They were within one person so -- and that's what we had within the first draft. And, again, I don't think it was terrible. It was not nice that Dana Point was split, but someone is going to get split in the congressional. That's just the way it's going to be because of the one person deviation.

1.3

2.5

So can we relax that restriction between the San Diego County and Orange County border and also relax it -- we're going to have to relax it -- it's already relaxed on the Riverside/Downey but also we're talking LA County and O.C. as well.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would be in favor of that.

commissioner filkins weber: And I wouldn't only based on the Community of Interest testimony and, again, we're doing this at a sacrifice for two districts. So if we're going to consider the possibility of Anaheim, of Santa Ana for a potential Section 2 at the assembly level, why do we need to look at it from the congressional level?

So, again, here's another balance that if we can consider with testing more Communities of Interest with the iteration that we had in the first draft map and maybe work on -- because I think we are able to potentially put Dana Point back into South O.C. when we

changed the San Gabriel to Diamond Bar district --

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Why don't we pan down just to remind us what our first draft looked like for Orange County.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And can I clarify for Commissioner Filkins Weber there were three different counties out, three that were referred to as possibilities to relax. Are you against relaxing all three or some subset of the three?

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: I can't argue with the population issue at the Riverside/San Diego.

It's -- we've been through every iteration that that's where the push might very well be in respect to a greater number of Communities of Interest.

I just was of the opinion that the San

Clemente -- there were a few people because of their

connection -- but for the most part San Diego said they

didn't want to go to south O.C. and south O.C. said they

didn't want to go to San Diego even though I do

recognize that there were a few members of the

population in San Clemente that did have some ties to

Camp Pendleton.

But I think in respecting overall Dana Point and the input that they have provided and respecting south Orange County, that's where I just see a more

definitive line. And I think that we could respect that based on the changes that we were considering to make to Chino Hills, La Brea, Yorba Linda and changing that Diamond Bar district. Where as where I thought when we changed that, we pulled those cities out, that we were likely to be able to pull in San Juan Capistrano and San Clemente into the Orange County district as I recall, but maybe I'm just confusing days and line drawing at this point.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Ms. Henderson.

COMMISSIONER Filkins WEBER: I'm not sure.

that I think we heard two really strong Communities of Interest in this area. The API predominantly Vietnamese community and the community that -- the Anaheim/Santa Ana community and not only did they have what they were talking about but they were also talking about what was not there, what was not their community of interest, that they did not want to be with certain other parts, because they felt they were completely distinct socially, culturally, politically et cetera, and that came from both sides.

So I guess I don't see this just as an accommodation for the Santa Ana/Anaheim. I think we have a lot of things going on in this entire area that

1 have come up. So I'm not prepared to say that that's 2 what's driving everything. We're -- you know, this is sort of a --3 COMMISSIONER DAI: We have a population issue in San Diego, too. 5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I mean, there's a lot 6 7 of things that are influencing this whole situation. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And then it 8 becomes a question of weighing the testimony and what 9 10 was important. Again, you asked me this several times 11 when I was chair. Please have us tell us whether it's 12 assembly level or congressional level. So maybe we need to look at it in a broader frame as to what 1.3 communities -- like Anaheim/Santa Ana. 14 15 I mean, if we're going to look at it as an 16 assembly level, maybe that's where we can respect that Community of Interest, because we're working with 17 18 smaller population segments and respecting COIs at that 19 level. Then we're getting into this broader scale. 20 That's all I'm saying is that there's a balance there 21 based on the interest of the public. 22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Ms. Henderson. 23 MS. HENDERSON: So I just wanted to walk us 24 through our first draft map, which is reflected here.

So -- and the first draft, we did not have Santa Ana and

2.5

```
Anaheim together, and we had the district coming up from
San Diego, up to and including San Juan Capistrano and
part of Dana Point.
            So the issue that I've been talking about
with San Diego population is not affected that much by
the internal workings of the district in Orange County.
It's really being driven by the hard line.
            COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So this is what
my understanding was. The only visualization that we've
asked for, for this area right now it sounds like was
the Anaheim/Santa Ana district. So what my question is,
is I thought that we were -- we had asked to see the
visualization that puts Chino Hills, Diamond Bar out of
that San Gabriel district and puts it with La Brea,
Fullerton, and Yorba Linda.
            COMMISSIONER DAI: That's what we currently
have.
            COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                         No.
                                              There's --
this is the current district, which cuts off Fullerton,
La Brea, and Yorba Linda.
            COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.
                                       I'm sorry.
                                                   This
is the first draft.
            MS. HENDERSON: First draft.
            COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Correct.
                                                   So
```

I'm saying when we're moving from the first draft and

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

providing instruction to Q2 for visualization, we haven't seen the visualization of -- in the manner in which it's going to impact the remaining portion of Orange County with the district that puts together Chino Hills, Diamond Bar, La Brea.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: There it is.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: We also gave instruction on the Westminister, Garden Grove, Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach at the same time we gave the other instruction.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. We're at 5:30. We've been on O.C. for an hour and fifteen minutes.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I want to see if we can get consensus. We've talked about -- you know, we already split Temecula at that county line. That has already been breached. You know there has been Community of Interest testimony about at least San Clemente. So I think that it should be fair to say that that most southern boundary can be breached as well.

You know, again, it's not ideal, but we need to allow some flexibility for our mappers here to try to address some of those issues. We have had lots of testimony about the four corners area, and this visualization shows that, and then we've also asked them

to look at possibly a balanced district along the coast that has part of O.C. and part of Los Angeles or Long Beach area. Yes, Ms. Henderson. MS. HENDERSON: My question, I just wanted to ask if this was the visualization that Commissioner Filkins Weber had in mind. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Yes. I forgot that you had had that up there. This is with the Santa Ana/Anaheim district, correct, that you have already fixed. MS. HENDERSON: Yes. Yes. We had a second iteration of the Santa Ana/Anaheim, because we received direction to draw it without any of the City of Orange, not split Orange, and that's what the first one was that we showed you. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay, but this one, I don't see the overpopulation in -- in the Orange Coast area, which I thought we were already overpopulated by 90,000 when we --COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, here we have a WEST G district minus three hundred and eighty. And then there's the --MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. So there's an

under-population here. You know, when we are starting

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

out, we need some direction about where to go with this.

Adding some of the hard county lines left us with some questions about whereabouts --

1.3

2.0

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. I'm getting a little confused here. Is this -- because if we need to add 379,000 to the WEST G district, then why wouldn't we be going north to have Los Alamitos, Buena Park, Rossmoor into that district?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Still wouldn't be enough people.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, I know, but I'm trying to understand these different visualizations, because to me, it looks like identical to the one that said the coast is overpopulated. And now this one shows 379,000 dollars less -- or 379,000 people less. So another visualization that we saw an hour ago -- I mean, WEST G was fine. So I'm just trying to understand the difference between what we're looking at here versus what we saw previously.

MS. HENDERSON: Just a moment.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. At this point, while they're looking at this, we had thought about getting to some assembly districts before our business meeting at 6:00, but if everybody just wants to focus more -- Commissioner Ontai, I know you wanted to

1 address some congressional districts in San Diego. 2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's correct. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But we do have 3 a hard stop at 6:00, so we'll have to go back there, and 4 we won't be getting to any assembly districts more than 5 likely before our business meeting, and it does set us 6 7 back a little bit. So we'll have to be better. I'll be 8 better, more strict, tomorrow. COMMISSIONER DAI: I was going to say, we're 10 actually going to have very limited time with our 11 mappers on Sunday, so we actually should try to start on 12 the assembly if we can. 1.3 So, Ms. Henderson, what else can we --14 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. So I just wanted to say that the way that the last one, the first iteration 15 16 we were trying to show without Orange because we were 17 directed not to split Orange, was going off to the first 18 draft map, and that's why the populations looked so 19 different, because we hadn't drawn out more of the 20 county in that iteration. 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So this is the correct 22 one? 23 MS. HENDERSON: Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER DAI: In other words, does this 25 also reflect the population problem in the Long Beach

```
1
    area, or is that not in the same map?
2
                MS. HENDERSON: No.
                                      That's off of the other
    iteration.
3
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So this is
 4
    what's left. I mean, this is the preferred version of
5
 6
    Santa Ana/Anaheim. Is that the commission's
7
    understanding?
                MS. HENDERSON: Let's zoom in and take a
8
    look.
9
10
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Because this
11
    looks different because the Orange Crush is all green.
    So this looks different than the other one that I had
12
1.3
    made the recommendation that I thought this needed to be
                So I'm trying to understand.
14
    filled in.
15
                MS. HENDERSON: So if you look at kind of --
16
    I don't have -- so this was specifically part of Orange.
17
    The one that we were looking at earlier today did not
    included any of Orange City. The direction that we
18
19
    received was not to split the City of Orange.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER YAO: That's a 95,,000.
21
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO:
                                     This is a
22
    visualization with the split in Orange City that the
23
    testimony said was okay.
24
                MS. HENDERSON: It's closer to it, yes.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: It's actually a little
```

```
1
    bit more.
                MS. HENDERSON: We will refine it based on
2
3
    the --
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Does this also reflect
 4
    the testimony about putting Westminister, all that area,
5
6
    back in with the Coasts Mesa and Huntington Beach and
7
    all that?
                COMMISSIONER DAI: That's why it's showing
8
    that it's overpopulated by 380,000.
9
                MS. HENDERSON: That the district that has
10
11
    the aqua colored square in it is under-populated.
12
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And O.C. coast
13
    then it's still overpopulated by 95, or is this little
    table from a different iteration?
14
15
                MS. HENDERSON: I think the table is from a
    different iteration.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: That's what I
18
    thought.
19
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So, Commissioner Blanco,
20
    I think you're echoing the testimony that we had
21
    received saying that it was okay to go to the coast from
22
    the Garden Grove district essentially and from
23
    Huntington Beach?
24
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: It was on both sides.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Make up the
```

population --

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Can we look at it? Can we instruct them to look at this as a possible solution to Orange County with adding to the WEST G from the coast with adding Huntington Beach and Fountain Valley and that COI testimony to see what this might look like, because I think we still might have the hard line at San Diego but this might save a lot of -
COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And we got lots of testimony to that effect.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: We did. Can you work on that, and let's take a look at it with this iteration and see how that would work.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I would still like to see if we're willing to relax the line at San Diego County given that we have had testimony about San Clemente. I just -- I feel like we need to have more than one relief valve, otherwise we're going to end up going all the way into Riverside and not be able to do anything with that population.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Can we just give them permission, and say it's a midline. I mean, they know that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: They know that.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Just give them

permission.

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: In that regard, if there's a possibility of salvaging Dana Point with south O.C. and considering the San Clemente as a relief valve, if we -- when we look at those iterations --

MS. HENDERSON: Sure. So would the direction be that we should try to maintain a hard line if possible. If not possible, try to keep Dana Point in O.C., and if not possible, we'll tell you why.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Correct, and that would be Dana Point and south O.C.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And for those that are looking at that weird finger around Irvine, I think it's important for people to understand that Irvine, the track, has a particular shape of the way that area is designed, and that it's also trying to keep the university -- because I know that you look like why is that there -- but that has to do with the City of Irvine.

MS. HENDERSON: And if I can clarify just to double-check, we're still directed to look into the option for the Long Beach and coastal areas if we need to do that for population for Los Angeles County districts.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, yeah.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Okay. Anything
2
    more in this area? Then we can maybe move to some --
                COMMISSIONER DAI: We have to finish San
 3
    Diego, too.
4
                COMMISSIONER FINKS WEBER:
                                            Oh, I'm sorry.
 5
    Anything else, Commissioner Ward, for your area?
6
7
                COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just going to ask,
    I had notes that said Rossmoor was back in. I just want
8
    to make sure in this iteration, that's the one we're
9
10
    working in now, is it in or out just so I can put it in
11
    my population count. Out?
12
                MS. HENDERSON: It's out of this, but that's
13
    one of the areas that we're looking at for the Long
    Beach, LA bubble.
14
15
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    Right.
                MS. HENDERSON: Possible fix.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Any other
18
    thoughts? I mean, there are going to be some choices
19
    that we're not going to have to want to make, but that's
20
    why we get paid the big bucks. So -- okay.
21
                So let's look one more time at San Diego and
22
    see if Commissioner Ontai or Barabba had any other
23
    thoughts on that.
24
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, I just want to
2.5
    make sure that you're clear on what we can do in San
```

```
1
    Diego County. So if you look at the maps that we've
2
    drawn, initial maps of northeast San Diego maps, they're
    on two cities that are split, and I've looked at closer
3
    maps of those two areas, and that looks fine to me.
 4
    was concerned that it was carving up a big chunk of the
5
    city, but they're actually very logical points for both
6
7
    El Cajon area and Chula Vista, so it's okay with me what
    you've drawn.
8
                I just want to make sure that if you're
9
10
    going to push the population down on the coastal areas
11
    to make up the population challenge we have in the north
12
    is that we don't split the densely contiquous coastal
13
    cities that are all along there as you look at -- as you
14
    manipulate it.
15
                So any questions about that?
16
                MS. HENDERSON: Well, I can say that we can
17
    try to avoid city splits, but I can't make any promises.
18
    So are you directing us not to split any of those
19
    cities?
2.0
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would prefer you not.
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, this is -- let's be
22
    realistic.
23
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI:
                                      Yeah.
                                             Right.
                                                     Right.
24
                MS. HENDERSON: What's the direction?
2.5
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Go ahead. That's fine.
```

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah. I mean, you're on the record that you don't like city splits. I think all of us can say that.

1.3

2.5

MS. HENDERSON: We will attempt not to split cities but there may be areas where -- where due to population constraints that we have to do that and we will highlight those for you.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Otherwise, I think it's fine.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Diguilio.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I actually just had one thing to suggest as to see if the commission likes it. Again, I think there's -- the issue with the -- federal issues with the water rights, the ocean, I thought that the coastal district could go down to Coronado because Coronado right now, again, it's Coronado all the way up, and if you were going to do that, you could switch out some of the population in that -- whatever that is -- the core San Diego district, right? Yeah. Thank you.

But if you took Coronado in there, and you raised it up, if we took care of the issue with the ferry, then you could swap some of the northern part of -- the part that's east of Encinitas, which is inland. I'm not sure what that is that's east of

1 Encinitas, but, again, it's a big chunk that goes 2 inland. You could switch out the population there with that of the main part of San Diego. 3 Yeah, that area there could go into the one south of it, and then you can pick up Coronado along the 5 6 coast. 7 The only other issue, and I don't know. Ι mean, it's -- I know it's a very long district, but 8 we've had this on the coastal areas where we had these 9 10 very long districts. The other thing that I was 11 thinking of was that you have a military base at 12 Pendleton, and then you have the naval issue down there. 1.3 So those are federal military aspects that you can keep in one district, too. I don't know if that's too much 14 in one district. 15 16 Okay. Ms. Henderson has something to say about that. 17 18 MS. HENDERSON: A question. Are you 19 envisioning a district that goes all the way down coast

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Correct.

from Pendleton down to Coronado?

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MS. HENDERSON: Okay. If it's okay with the commission, I'd like to have us double-check the COI testimony, because for some reason Del Mar, Encinitas areas are -- I can't quite put my hand on what the issue

```
is but it's -- there's a flag going off in my head.
1
2
    I want to double-check.
                COMMISSIONER Diquilio: It's not Encinitas.
 3
    See how far east it goes past Encinitas.
 4
                MS. HENDERSON: Uh-huh.
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I'm not sure if
 6
7
    there was something that was related to that testimony.
    I heard a lot about the costal communities. It's Rancho
8
    Santa Fe and all those. I was wondering if we could --
10
    I think if there is some link between that area in
11
    Encinitas but if it's based on a coastal issue of water
12
    rights or military then I think you could switch out
1.3
    Rancho Santa Fe into the main part of --
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI:
                                      The Rancho Santa Fe
14
15
    issue is an assembly issue. They want to be on the east
16
    side rather than on the coastal side, but that's an
17
    assembly issue.
18
                COMMISSIONER Diquilio:
                                        Right.
19
                Commissioner Raya, did you have something to
20
    say?
21
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I was just going
22
    to say that the Pendleton, Oceanside area, I think a lot
23
    of the testimony would indicate, yes, it's on the water,
24
    but it's not coastal in the same way that you would
2.5
    think of any of the other cities heading south from
```

```
there is pretty much Carlsbad, Encinitas, and so on, and
1
2
    so on, Arcadia. Um, so --
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: They all have -- I
 3
    mean, they all have a coast, but they have a significant
 4
    portion that's inland as well too, but since they all do
5
    touch the coast, there are federal coastal regulations
 6
7
    that are associated with each of those communities, and,
    again, I don't know if that's a justification or even if
8
    the military basis of it would be kind of book-ending
9
10
    both of that very long district. I don't know if that's
11
    something that --
12
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think that's looking
13
    at a pretty long and fairly diverse --
14
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, and I was
    trying to address the issue of Coronado going all the
15
16
    way up to -- though downtown.
17
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: Right. I think I agree
18
    that there could be some adjustments there, and I
19
    think -- but I'm not sure where they would happen just
20
    because down there at Coronado, it's such a tiny little
21
    strip. I don't know.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So is there some
22
23
    direction to Q2? Would you like them to look at --
24
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, they could
2.5
    certainly look at -- look at Commissioner DiGuilio's
```

suggestion. I don't know what impact that will have going east, and then, you know, I'm still, in my mind, struggling with the issue of poor San Clemente sort of orphaned out of Orange County.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And, again, the logic behind that, Commissioner Diguilio? I still don't understand why you see that as a problem.

Well, I quess

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:

originally, I saw that Coronado as kind of a coastal community. I mean, there really isn't much.

Commissioner Raya is right, and it got linked kind of with the whole inland actually, a very inland district there first of all.

And then when you look at the -- so that was one issue. The second one was the coastal issue, the federal water, and the third one was the military basis. The military -- I don't know what to call it. What is it? Naval installation, and then the Camp Pendleton.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think a lot of the

testimony for the coastal district stopped at Del Mar essentially.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah, but when you talk about the north coast, I think that's what they were saying. I think for congressional -- I think it works for assembly. If we don't want to feel like

```
1
    exploring it, it's fine. I just wanted to throw it out
2
    there. If it's just too much of a reach, then --
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I'd leave it the way it
 3
    is.
 4
 5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Was there any
    specific direction that you were giving them regarding
6
7
    San Diego besides, "keep it the way it is."?
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No. I think the real
8
    problem is going to be how to address northern
9
10
    boundaries with Temecula and Orange County, so you can
11
    work out the population equity there. I think the rest
12
    of the county looks fine.
1.3
                MS. HENDERSON: Okay, but -- so you know
    that if we do bring in more population there, we will be
14
    affecting the other districts.
15
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I understand.
16
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Well, do you have
18
    enough latitude to redraw these areas?
19
                MS. HENDERSON: I believe so.
20
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. So we have fifteen
21
    minutes left. Do you want to look at any ADs?
22
                MS. HENDERSON:
                               Um, yeah. We're going to
23
    start, since we have this computer loaded up, we'll go
24
    back to Orange County.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                   Okay.
```

```
1
                MS. HENDERSON: And we'd like to look at
2
    some of the new potential Section 2 districts first of
    all, and this one will be the Santa Ana/Anaheim.
3
                So in this iteration, you'll see that we
 4
5
    also avoided any splitting of the City of Orange.
6
    I'm not sure if there's any thoughts about the dividing
7
    line, if any, going into Orange.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Be consistent with our
8
    previous direction? Yes?
9
10
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't remember what
11
    we said on Orange in the assembly.
12
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Well, it's the
    same idea, that orange area at the Orange Crush, which
13
14
    doesn't have much population, ends up connecting Anaheim
    and Santa Ana a little bit better, which is -- that's
15
16
    where Disneyland is at again, west of the 57.
17
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I thought so.
                                                      I just
18
    wasn't sure.
19
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: West of the 57,
20
    correct. Right in that area.
21
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So does that reflect
22
    it right there?
23
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: No, it's not.
24
    it's orange right now. Orange is orange.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No, we did not divide
```

1 Orange.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: So this is currently at 50.27 percent.

MS. HENDERSON: I need to double-check on this, but after I said, "Should we do something with orange?" I wanted to make sure that if not, the LC map is drawn that way. So I will double-check, but I just wanted to check in on it, if the direction would be consistent with it in terms of --

understanding we're going to make this compact based on the manner in which Mr. Brown is suggesting that this could be described as compact. You need that area, because that's the only way that there's going be Latino households that connect the geographically compact areas of Anaheim and Santa Ana is with that area that's out right now.

MS. HENDERSON: The Orange County area.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: The little orange area at the crush. It's my understanding anyway. I mean, certainly correct me if I'm wrong if Mr. Brown has advised you of something else, but I thought that that was the census block area that he had looked at to combine the two Communities of Interest.

COMMISSIONER DAT: Commissioner Ancheta.

1 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't recall that. 2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I don't think Mr. Brown was that specific on that linkage, and, again, 3 we may want to simply look at the percentage of the 4 block percentage to see how those populations line up. 5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I remember him saying 6 7 that he had sort of shifted from that notion of 8 contiguity that was his original concern, and that when he had looked at this and had really seen sort of a 9 10 scatter map, it really, you know -- it's like one sort 11 of line that goes up and it doesn't matter that they --12 that there's a scatter instead of one here and one here, you know, separated at north and south. 1.3 And so I don't remember him saying that we 14 15 have to -- that if we had -- I don't know that we'd want 16 that there, but it wasn't dependent on that whether 17 there would be contiquity or not. That's what he said 18 he had changed his mind about. 19 So I mean, if we want to do it for other 20 reasons but that was no longer a notion for him the way I understood it. 21 22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I think he left 23 it up to us. One thing I'm concerned about is the 24 deviation. The .7 --2.5 MS. HENDERSON: It's .72 now, yes.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Is that as far down as you could go given you're trying to maintain a 50 percent plus?

1.3

2.5

MS. HENDERSON: You know, I'm not sure if we tried to get more on the deviation. We can look at that.

at that, because this is one of those suggestions that I know some of us were concerned about yesterday where, you know, in congressional, we gave ourselves the room for Voting Rights Act to be able to go over the deviation, but we didn't vote on that for Section 2 districts in the state district.

So if you could give us an analysis of what it would, you know -- what happens if we go to our maximum deviation on this. Does it take us below the C map? That would be really important to know.

MS. HENDERSON: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, and I think actually that area will help you.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Because I am concerned that somebody might say we had the ability to do it and we didn't do it, because we set a standard that was not required by Prop 11 where as the Voting Rights Act was required.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. So I would follow previous direction in terms of that part of orange and a 2 thinner sliver as needed of Garden Grove. 3 Okay. MS. HENDERSON: 4 Okay. Commissioner Ward, 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: do you have comments on these other changes? 6 7 COMMISSIONER WARD: (Shakes head.) COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Barabba? 8 9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: As I recall, one of 10 the reasons we got more comfortable with connecting them 11 is when you did the Hispanic population, the area, that 12 whole area, had Hispanic population in it not just 1.3 the -- where we're adding in the Orange Crush. But I don't have to see it. I'm just -- you 14 might just want to confirm that. 15 16 MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Okay. So moving on, 17 this is assembly district dealing with the eastern 18 Patella Valley, Imperial County, and the border. 19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Did you want to 20 get into that right now? I mean, you're going to be 21 here ten minutes, and this is an area that has the most 22 conflicting Community of Interest testimony than any 23 other area in the State of California, and you have ten 24 minutes. So if there's any other one you wanted to look 2.5 at -- or when were you planning on discussing this at

```
1
    the assembly level this week -- weekend or --
2
                MS. HENDERSON:
                                  Yeah.
                                         Um --
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Or were you
 3
    expecting to do it today?
4
                MS. HENDERSON: We're just trying to get
 5
 6
    through as much as we can.
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI: We have to discuss them
    all.
8
                MS. HENDERSON: We have to discuss them all.
9
10
    It's going to take us a while to switch computers, so
11
    that's why we're just doing the ones that are on this
12
    computer.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Okay.
14
                MS. HENDERSON: So no particular --
15
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: I just think
16
    that we won't get through this issue in ten minutes.
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Anyways, an alternative
18
    for the AD is one that's been suggested by the public,
19
    which is eastern Coachella to the border, it's Imperial
20
    County. This one is showing it's still going along the
21
    border there.
22
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Because you
23
    need to make it up for the population. You can't get
24
    the entire population when you cut out --
2.5
                MS. HENDERSON: We were asked to do that.
```

```
1
    We were asked to construct it going along the border.
2
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Really?
                MS. HENDERSON: Yes, really, we were.
3
                                                        The
    direction we were given was to split eastern Coachella,
4
    add all of Imperial County, and the border areas of San
5
    Diego
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                     Okay.
8
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Where exactly is the
    split in Coachella?
9
10
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Not across the
11
    border. They have to find people. So when we tell them
12
    to find people, they have to find people.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, but --
    I know that.
14
15
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Oh, no. I was
16
    answering Cynthia's question. I didn't hear your
17
    question. If I was being rude, I apologize.
18
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Oh, I see.
                                                  I see.
19
                MS. HENDERSON: So the eastern Coachella
20
    Valley and this eastern portion in this part has
21
    Whitewater, Desert Hot Springs, Desert Edge, Sky Valley,
22
    Cathedral City, Indio, Desert Palms, Indio Hills,
23
    Coachella, Thermal, Mecca.
24
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And what's the
25
    reasoning behind that?
```

MS. HENDERSON: We were just -- I think there was some public testimony about the eastern Coachella Valley.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Some?

COMMISSIONER DAI: There was tons.

MS. HENDERSON: -- defining it. I thought he was asking a question.

area -- and we can get into it but we have seven
minutes -- but we've asked for this, this just being an
iteration, but we may very well need to make a decision
as to whether this is viable for this commission,
because our first draft assembly district for this area
also received quite a bit of testimony in support of our
draft map as we already had it existing at the AD level
and at the SC level as well as congressional level but
equally.

So there is testimony from east Coachella to be with Imperial but based on the magnitude of comments of public input all of which I have read every single one, it is -- definitely needs further discussion if this commission were to consider this iteration.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And in reading those comments, I assume you read all the overwhelming comments by east San Diego, not the Riverside County

people, not the Coachella Valley people, not the Imperial, but the east county San Diego people who said, "We have absolutely nothing to do with Imperial Valley with the desert with that population socioeconomically. They're farm workers. It's agriculture. It's desert."

And I mean, it was just as strong coming from east San Diego saying, "We really have nothing to do with the desert," than it was with the eastern Coachella. So I want to make sure we characterize completely the testimony, because we have a lot of people saying, "Let's keep Coachella whole," and then we have people saying in San Diego, "I do not want to be with Imperial," and you have people in Imperial, "I want to keep a Community of Interest with the farm worker communities of east Coachella."

Commissioner FILKINS WEBER: And I do
recognize that, and this is the primary reason why we
have to analyze all of this public input, because it's
coming from all different directions. East San Diego,
technically the individuals that were submitting that
testimony were Alpine, and there were some very strong
reasons as to why we needed to pay attention to that.
So you've got that area, but that doesn't mean that it's
not -- Imperial is not necessarily connected to San
Diego County, and there's a tremendous amount of public

input testimony, objective findings, as well as my personal knowledge of the area that I feel that this commission needs to discuss, because this is one area where there's going to be a balance between recognizing whether east Coachella, 100 miles away from the only other Community of Interest that they talk about, which is agriculture, at the bottom constitutes a local Community of Interest.

1.3

2.5

So there's a lot to discuss here and we have four minutes between -- by the time that --

COMMISSIONER DAI: There were also an option that kept Coachella Valley whole with all of Imperial as well. What were the numbers on that? That was a previous visualization I think. That was too much population.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That would be too much --

separate this, and we need to look at it step-by-step, and if this is a viable option that this commission wishes to consider in light of the testimony that I'm afraid falls pretty much 50/50 -- and for political reasons and nonpolitical reasons and we may have to weigh that and look at it. If this is a viable option in comparison to, again, the voluminous input we

```
1
    received that -- from the community members that wish to
2
    keep the AD district as it exists in the draft map,
    which has been overwhelming as well --
3
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, if the question
    is whether we should look at it, I think we should.
5
 6
    Whether we have time enough in four minutes, we might
7
    have to extend it beyond that.
8
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But I would definitely
    say I would keep this visualization as a possibility.
9
10
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So what does this mean
11
    for the surroundings districts? Let's just pan out a
    little bit.
12
1.3
                MS. HENDERSON: So the first draft map
14
    included pretty much all of the eastern Riverside
15
    counties. So there is a portion immediately to the west
16
    that you can see is underpopulated by 288,000. They'll
    need to shift --
17
18
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:
                                                 I'm sorry.
                                         Where?
19
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Oh, in San --
20
                MS. HENDERSON:
                                 Yes.
21
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Okay. So does
22
    this change the assembly districts of Moreno Valley in
23
    Riverside or was that able to remain the same with
24
    Riverside and --
2.5
                MS. HENDERSON: We have -- we haven't drawn
```

```
1
    it all the way out yet.
2
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But that
    does -- this would impact the manner in which the
3
    assembly districts respecting Moreno Valley half of
 4
    Riverside, Perris, and in the assembly, and the
5
 6
    Riverside split with Jarupa Valley and the manner in
7
    which we nested those together, this visualization for
    Coach will impact the entire -- the entire rest of
8
    Riverside County. Is that correct, or were you to able
9
10
    to maintain any other assembly districts with this
11
    configuration?
12
                MS. HENDERSON: We have not drawn it out
13
    more than just this visualization.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
14
                                              I see.
15
                MS. HENDERSON: So I can't answer it any
16
    other --
17
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    So my question is did you
18
    consider going north into the 29 Palms area to pick up
19
    population in the the underpopulated district there?
20
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Could I just ask,
21
    does that Coach district go down and hook -- is that
22
    bottom hook in San Diego?
23
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              It goes all the
24
    way across the border.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: So it does hook.
```

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. 1 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Have you had a chance to see the unity map district that they drew here? 3 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I mean, for -- I 4 feel there's some legitimacy in splitting the Coachella 5 6 Valley adding it to Imperial but not to the length --7 you're linking two things. You're linking Imperial both with Coachella and in San Diego. I think either we have 8 to bring the tail back and push it up into Coachella or 9 10 the other way around. 11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Which is what the 12 unity map does. 1.3 MS. HENDERSON: So right now the blue border is what we believe to be the correct unity map. 14 I will send you an email shortly that -- apparently the maps 15 that are on the commission's website aren't the correct 16 17 ones, but we think these are the correct ones. So this 18 is the unity map. 19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Where is the numbers? 20 MS. HENDERSON: We -- they didn't provide them. So --21 22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: They're in the 23 handout. 24 MS. HENDERSON: Again, the reason our 2.5 visualization went along the border of San Diego is

that's what we were directed to do. So if that's a question, that's why it was done that way.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: So it looks like the unity map takes in almost all of Coachella. It leaves out a few communities, a few cities.

assertion -- although I think our counsel does not believe there's an assertion to the issue here -- but I believe it is asserted by the unity proposal that this is also a Section 2 district.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's right.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So the unity map also puts east San Diego County with -- it looks like south Riverside there.

MS. HENDERSON: Yeah, that's correct.

recall, Mr. Brown was not of the opinion when he had looked at this area that this was a Section 2, because the unity map is giving us -- giving that to us because they're putting two areas to together that create a certain percentage of Latinos even though we don't see a compact -- I mean, a geographically compact area of minorities in Riverside and Imperial when you put them together.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Mr. Brown said the one

he felt was absolutely out of the question as a Section 2 is the one that goes across congressional -- one that goes over -- on this one, he said that one day he wakes up and he sees it as a Section 2. And the next day he wakes up and he says, "Well, maybe not."

2.5

So he really -- he was not definitive. He said sometimes he sees it and he realizes that this is you know -- a sparsely populated area. And that there's a lot of the, you know, population that might look far apart but that it's really not and that other days -- you know. So he has not -- he sort of -- this is one of those ones he kind of put to us. He was very definitive about congress, but he was not definitive about whether this was or was not a Section 2.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: It's three after 6:00.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: It does give a total population of 467,000 for assembly.

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think the question really is if we split eastern Coachella and western Coachella, what's the natural place for western Coachella to go, and it probably would make more sense to go up then to go over to the 29 Palms area, I would think.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But there's a

lot of testimony that we could get into, the details of which -- what really does constitute east and west, and what cities you would have to split for that population, and then we would have to look at that potential impact on the rest of the county.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct. But I think if you do it that way, then you don't impact the other assembly districts, which people were pretty happy with.

So I think that's what we should be looking at is going into the 29 Palms area, Beaumont, Banning, Cherry Valley area rather.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And then are we under-populating that because we were taking out Mono and Indio.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, again, Mono and Indio was just -- was freedom that we gave them to either keep that or not but I think that's how we deal with it. That's the logical place in my mind for the western Coachella area to go, and then it doesn't disrupt our other assembly districts.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I agree.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I'd like you to explore that instead. I think that makes more sense than --

MS. HENDERSON: So what's our direction just

to make sure I have it down.

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: For an additional visualization because I don't know that this commission has said that this will be --

COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that -- I mean, I think that we can look at exactly what cities we're taking here, but the western Coachella could go. Take the Beaumont, Banning area instead and go up into the 29 Palms area. We heard a lot of testimony about the connections between those communities.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But what cities are you considering west Coachella, is what the issue is, to put into -- up into the Banning Beaumont.

I think that's what my problem is, because there is conflicting testimony as to what constitutes east and west, and there is objective data that I have to contribute to this issue as to what constitutes east and west. But, again, it's 6:05.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I would say review the testimony. I mean, there's definitely an overlap.

Definitely Thermal, Mecca, Indio, Coachella, those were all, I think, consistently included. And then, you know, it went up to -- again, there was a variation in the testimony if it went up as high as Desert Hot Springs. So --

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: But if you want to know what actually constitutes the east Coachella plan for Riverside County, we can take a look at that, and I can get that information to Q2 because there is a designated east Coachella plan for -- and it's a districting -- not a district plan but an economic plan and planning, you know, from a planning commission for Riverside County that identifies east Coachella.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Ms. Henderson, if
we -- because the flip side of this was all the east
county folks saying that they had -- that that was miles
away and that they had nothing in common with Imperial
Valley. If we didn't pursue this option, then what
happens with that? You know, how do we deal with that
issue that we have really? I mean, talk about
different. East county San Diego with Imperial Valley
is really different. So how would we deal with that?

that Imperial County, like all these sparsely populated regions, is going to be a long district whether you put them with San Diego, whether you put them with Coachella Valley. It's something about compactness and local is not going to apply when you have to put a big unpopulated district -- or county with something that's going to be more heavily populated. So once we get rid

of that idea about these long districts, then you have to look at where does it belong more. And, you know, I -- the way I'm looking at it, at least in terms of assembly, there are some more links with the Coachella Valley.

2.5

And if that's the case, and you kind of work with these assumptions, then what I'd like to see is what we can do with Imperial County with Coachella and where the splits would have to come in as one of the options. There could be other options, but let's at least look there.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: We're still going to have to get into that assumption because you're making an assumption that's not necessarily -- I mean there's conflicting issues about.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: You're right. I understand. What I'd like to do is --

COMMISSIONER DAI: Strongly --

assumption and saying, "Let's -- I would like to see what this assumption leads to." If you'd like to look at another one, let's do two. But I just feel like there's balance in them both, but there's more linkages, I think, economically and socially with the eastern part of Coachella Valley with Imperial County.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So --

2.5

at that option, because if you look at the population growth that's affecting Imperial County -- this section right here, the southern portion, the border area of San Diego County -- that's the two areas where they can pick up the population. So this is another option.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So the alternative is to start from Imperial County, go up, grab eastern

Coachella as much as possible to make an assembly district, and put western Coachella in with -- I would suggest going north into the Beaumont Banning area and going around to the -- into the 29 Palms area.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's an option.

COMMISSIONER DAI: That would be my suggestion, and then picking up population going north. That's the desert area. That way we could keep the desert together.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we should at least look at it. I mean, especially given the actual residents of Imperial County that turned out in droves to tell us -- I mean, they're kind of pinned in an awkward corner of the state and that -- this is essentially what they want and maybe, you know, clearly, we're going to have to weigh a lot of conflicting COI.

```
1
    This may or may not be what we end up with, but I think
2
    we, you know, really owe it to look at it in more depth.
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And they also reminded
 3
    us that they would have a really difficult time being in
4
    a similar district with east -- I mean, like I say, it's
5
    not just who they want to be with. It's like who they
 6
7
    don't want to be with, and I will tell you, because I
8
    know this area, that east county San Diego, I can't
    think of a community less aligned with Imperial County.
9
10
    I mean, it is a predominantly Anglo community with --
    you know, first.
11
12
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              That's not the
13
    only area that it could be hooked up with, San Diego.
14
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I'm just saying that's
    where we sort of went, you know, and in order to not go
15
16
    into wreck havoc with large, highly populated areas of
17
    the City of San Diego.
18
                COMMISSIONER ONTAI:
                                     And, again, we just
19
    have that areas there, plus San Diego County down there,
20
    where they can pick up that population. Imperial County
21
    has no other choice but to make up those numbers.
22
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. So you have some
23
    direction for this area.
24
                MS. HENDERSON: Yes.
2.5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: I think that was where
```

```
there was most -- I mean, people were very happy with
1
2
    the Riverside and Moreno Valley ADs, so I'd like to try
    to protect those if we can, because we actually got lots
3
    of positive feedback on those districts and those nested
 4
    very nicely as well.
5
                So I think if we go up and over, that way it
 6
7
    will not disturb the Moreno Valley ones and then with
8
    that -- I know you're turning into a pumpkin. So we'll
    go ahead and let you start breaking down unless you
9
10
    would like anything else from us.
11
                You haven't worked something out yet for LA
12
    for congress based on our previous direction.
1.3
                MS. HENDERSON: We do have one tiny question
14
    for clarification for direction we got dealing with the
15
    Fontana AD. There was direction to include
16
    unincorporated by the IEAAREC and we just want to get
17
    direction as to what specifically --
18
                COMMISSIONER DAI: It was a little sliver.
19
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Incorporated
20
    park --
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So if you can, it didn't
22
    look like it had a lot of people in it.
23
                MS. HENDERSON: We just wanted to make sure
24
    that we had what we -- you were talking about.
```

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Do you have the

2.5

```
1
    AARC recent post-draft map iteration?
2
                MS. HENDERSON: I think we just got it.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: As I recall, I
3
    thought it was north of the 15.
4
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.
 5
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So somewhere
 6
7
    right in there where that little spike is at.
                MS. HENDERSON: Okay.
8
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So you'd have
9
10
    to compare it to where they had said.
11
                COMMISSIONER DAI: And just to be clear,
12
    that's inland empire, AARC.
1.3
                MS. HENDERSON: Okay. Then I'm not sure.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: They actually showed a
14
    map, and it was during a public hearing.
15
16
                MS. HENDERSON: Okay. So it was pre-first
    draft.
17
18
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Post-draft and
19
    likely from the San Bernardino hearing.
2.0
                MS. HENDERSON: Okay. We'll go back and
    find it. Thank you.
21
22
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. We're going to go
23
    ahead and take a break before we begin our business
24
    meeting. So let's go ahead and take ten minutes.
2.5
```

```
1
                (6:13 p.m. break taken.)
2
                COMMISSIONER DAI: All right. Let's get
3
    going here. Are we live?
4
                THE VIDEOGRAPHER: You're live.
 5
                COMMISSIONER DAI: All right.
                                                Welcome back
 6
7
    to the Citizen's Redistricting Commission. We are now
8
    going onto our business meeting. We are going to
    hopefully be able to truncate this and adjourn sooner
9
10
    than 7:45, which we currently have.
11
                So we're going to go ahead and start with
12
    finance and administration and -- but we before we do
1.3
    that our chief council, Mr. Miller, has a quick
    announcement.
14
15
                MR. MILLER:
                             This will confirm that in
16
    closed session today the commission met with its counsel
17
    to discuss threatened litigation in connection with the
18
    preparation of maps.
19
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
20
                So with that, I'm going to go ahead and turn
21
    this over to our finance and administration,
22
    Commissioner Galambos Malloy.
23
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent.
                                                            Ι
24
    have three very quick updates, and then the last item, I
2.5
    think, will take a little bit more time. The first is a
```

report back regarding our certification process with the Secretary of State. As I believe we alerted you to, our executive director, Mr. Claypool, has initiated conversations with the Secretary of State.

1.3

2.5

Is there anything you'd like to tell us at this point, Mr. Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: They were prepared to take our full and complete plan, and then we thought they were the ones planning it. So we are right now planning it together with them. And Rob Wilcox is actually doing most of the work on that, and we will keep you posted, but at this point, it's very preliminary.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you for moving that along.

I also wanted to alert the commission to a small but nonetheless important issue. We are having difficulties with our transcripts from the Northridge meeting on late May. You might remember that day, I think, was a taxing day for our court reporter, and the court reporter has not turned in the transcripts for the meeting and has effectively gone MIA. So the agency has actually brought in the Reporters Board enforcement division to compel the court reporter to actually hand over what materials that she has. But in the meantime, we're pursuing another option, which would be operating

1 from a CD of the event or potentially working off of the 2 website to transcribe it that way. So, again, staff will find a solution to the 3 problem and the one that can be done quickly and with 4 the least cost to the commission. So hopefully that 5 will be resolved within the next couple of days. 6 7 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Commission Galambos, 8 which date was that again? COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: 9 It was May 10 27, Northridge. 11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Oh, Northridge. COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Could I ask what the 12 13 problem is. COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: 14 Well, the 15 problem was, if I remember correctly, that day was one of the days that informed our decision to actually break 16 17 up the long days and have two court reporters; that the 18 shifts were just so long combined with the complexity of 19 the information that the reports were having to input; 20 that, you know, some court reporters rose to the 21 occasion, and others -- it was more than they could 22 bear. 23 So now, as you see, we do a shift in our 24 court reporters, and it seems to be working out much 2.5 better. So hopefully, that will be the last casualty

along our court reporting system.

1.3

2.0

2.5

The third item is regarding the contract with Q2, our line drawing consultant. As per our conversation the other day and our business meeting, Ms. MacDonald is in the process of preparing an invoice for submission, which I will work with CRC staff to expedite for review. So if there's anything that we need to bring back to the full commission, you will hear about that in the future.

Which moves me to my fourth item, which is the one that I think bears the most attention on your part. I have been tasked by the commission to do some further investigation and analysis of our contract with Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher, our Voting Rights Act firm, because of some concerns that we had made requests of the firm to participate in various activities and had heard that they declined some of those requests because of the concern that they were approaching their billable hours cap.

When we heard this, of course various commissioners expressed concern, Mr. Miller was able to provide all of the necessary documentation for the firm's billable hours in addition to their right-off hours, which are very substantial. I think it's important for the commission to know that the firm has,

in effect, been donating a lot of time and investment to make sure that they are really positioned to support us as our Voting Rights Act attorney.

1.3

2.5

The concern was if we're approaching our billable cap and we still have a lion's share of work ahead of us and some of the most critical aspect of this exercise yet to come, can we, as a commission, be assured that Gibson Dunn will get us to the finish line no matter what it takes?

I am pleased to report that after today's lunch meeting, we do, as a commission, have a direct assurance from Mr. Brown that they are on board to get us to the finish line, and that they are giving us that assurance with a more nuanced understanding of what it will actually take, down to the micro-level of day-to-day as we go through the coming months and six weeks.

I feel that our discussion today over lunch was, however, preliminary in that Commissioner Ancheta and his role as one of the leads on the work plan, he will need to meet with Mr. Brown in some more detail to really map out day-to-day what it will entail and where we need to be.

The other piece which I wanted to bring to your attention was in reviewing the billable hours and

the right-off hours that the firm has exercised on behalf of the commission, there have been a total of 18 staff on the part of Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher that have been conducting various levels of assignments in regard to our case. Of those, we have only formally reviewed the background and qualifications of four.

2.5

You remember in the initial stages when we were reviewing firms, we had essentially, Mr. Kolkey, Mr. Brown, and then two of their associates. This contrasts greatly with the manner in which we've been operating with Q2 staff.

On Q2 staff, we have -- after some investigation, it came to my attention that we have a clause in their contract that says, "Additional non-key personnel may be assigned to this project to help with map and report production and public input coding. Any such personnel should meet the minimum qualifications as stated within the IFB and be subject to approval by the commission."

So what this means is every time Q2 has added staff no matter the level -- you know, senior staff, junior staff, note taker -- we have been reviewing and approving their resumes as they come much as we have been doing with our own CRC staff even down to our interns, who are making \$10 an hour. We're still

approving to make sure that there are no conflicts of interest.

1.3

2.5

So when I first looked at this I thought,

"We have 14 individuals at Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher

that are working on this case, who -- we really don't

know who they are." However, there's a reason for that.

In the Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher contract, there is no

such stipulation that is listed in their contract. If

you review it, and as such, they are, in fact, within

their rights to add additional staff to the case without

it having to be subject to the super majority approval

process that we've been going through for Q2 and for our

CRC staff.

I asked Mr. Claypool for a little more clarification as to why the two contracts were constructed differently, didn't have, in fact, the same language, and he reminded me about the timeline when all of this occurred that we were essentially trying to bring on our technical consultants, our mappers, at the same time we were trying to bring on our VRA firm.

Because of that, there was a bit of a divide, and so Raul and Dan took the lead on drafting the contract for Q2. They essentially used state boilerplate language, which included this clause, and it's my understanding that the IFB for the line drawer

and the RFI for the attorney, since they were going out at the same time, the legal advisory committee is actually the one that took the lead on the attorney piece of it.

2.5

At this point, you know, we can allow the legal advisory committee a chance to weigh in as to how we moved through that process, but in my opinion, after having reviewed the situation, it's really neither here nor there what happened at that point. The point is we have signed contracts that are dictating the terms of our working relationship moving forward, and therefore, we have a situation where one of our technical consultants is subject to a different level of scrutiny across their staff than our other one is.

That said, I have discussed the matter with Mr. Brown during our lunch meeting today, and one option that we may be able to offer to the commission is some sort of written statement from Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher to confirm that the staff that they have added or will add at any point when they are working with us have, in fact, been cleared for the the same level of conflicts of interest consideration that all of our internal CRC staff and Q2 staff have been operating under.

So that's my summary of the situation, and I would like to invite -- if Mr. Claypool or anyone from

the legal advisory committee would like to weigh in, I'm going to open the floor.

2.5

MR. CLAYPOOL: That was a very accurate summation. There is only one clarification. The language that went into Q2's contract is actually not state boilerplate language, and that was actually added into the language by this commission upon your full review. It was -- we had a meeting and in one of the meetings, we said we have to place them at the same level of scrutiny. So after that we placed that language so that it would be acceptable.

MR. MILLER: thank you also for a very good report. I just wanted to say two things. I have -- back up. The firm has been clearing its associates pursuant to our policy as the work has gone, and I have received since Mr. Brown's presentation today, the written confirmation that Commissioner Galambos Malloy is referring to.

I'd also note that one of the advantages of using any firm of this size is their ability to respond very promptly to questions as they come up by having a depth of lawyers to turn to. If we were to ask them to provide those resumes and then act on them when the commission meets and then permit them to work, I believe it would compromise the quality of the representation

that you're able to obtain by using a firm of this size.

1.3

2.5

Nonetheless, I will send you momentarily the written confirmation of the internal conflict check pursuant to the commission's conflict policy.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Legal committee, I would invite you to comment and then it's

I wanted to add -- oh, I'm sorry. I was looking down -- is that based on the manner in which Mr. Brown has advised us that he would provide, I guess, confirmation to the commission is based on the fact that there's a term in their contract that confirms that any members of their staff would not have a conflict of interest.

So their contract -- he's willing to abide by the contract to make assurances for the staff that he has had working for this commission do not have any conflicts of interest. And he's following the terms of our contract that does outline the conflict of interest in that regard. So I'd be satisfied with the statement that he provides to us regarding the additional staff.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'll just make a short comment. I was not directly involved in these discussions. However, I have been an associate at a large law firm, and that's why I am not particularly

troubled by the fact we haven't had some of this stuff cleared sort of in advanced, because I can tell you that as an associate, you get assigned a project, and you're basically told, "Go to it." And it's not a question of -- because of time constraints and so if it had been required prior to being -- doing the work, the work wouldn't have gotten done in a timely manner.

1.3

2.5

So I'm not particular troubled by this. I am glad to have the assurances -- there will be assurances to make sure there are not conflicts of interest. But as a practical matter, working in a large law firm, this is not a major concern.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: If it is of interest or for purposes of clarification, of the fourteen additional staff that we had not had previous awareness of, ten of those are providing right-off hours, meaning they are not at cost to the commission; three individuals are providing billable hours to the commission; and one individual has provided a combination of billable hours and right-off hours.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner DiGuilio.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I guess I'm feeling at this point that I'm very troubled that there was not equality in these contracts to start off with to be honest. That we -- from the very beginning of this

commission, the conflict of interest and the ability for us to sit down in that was huge, and for the excuse to be given that it's a large firm and that you have to get work done and that you have to have people at your whim is -- I think is false in terms of a justification for that.

1.3

2.5

We have a small firm that's had to have every nook and cranny be run through this commission, and commissioners have questioned every hire. We've been doing that because it's important for us to examine the staff that's going into our consultants and to even have an opportunity to look for a potential conflict of interest. I mean, that's what this commission is based on, and we didn't even have an opportunity to do that with Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher.

They made the decision for us, and now post-fact, we have to take their word for it that there's no conflict of interest. I still have a problem with the way the whole thing was done, and I don't buy the justification that when you're in a large firm, these things just happen.

This is the commission. That's not how we operate, and if that's normal for them, then I think maybe they, you know, maybe need to take a look at what's the purpose of this commission, and, you know, we

have to have some equality here that's going on. I'm just very troubled about how that all came about, and I'm more troubled about the explanation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I have to say I have been similarly troubled, and I think that part of that is, again, when we go back to the early days when we were initially considering going into a contract with Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher that we found that there were some conflicts that we had not been made aware of that the firm had not revealed, and I think that the truth is that it was a missed opportunity on our part that we did not build a contract that had clear language around this, but if it's really, I think, in the interest of transparency, my preference would have been that we would have had instruction to review with additions to the team much in the manner that we are doing with our own staff and with our other consultants for purposes of having parity across the board on who we're requesting what information from.

But that said, what happened, happened. I think these are the options presented before us, and so the statement we have from Mr. Brown is, "We have confirmed that all associates and summer associates

working on the CRC matter have done so in compliance with the conflicts policy expressed in Government Code Section 8252 subdivision A-2 and are not engaged in federal, state, or local lobbying redistricting issues."

1.3

2.5

The only question I would have in reviewing this is actually to confirm whether, in fact, all of the individuals doing work are associates and summer associates, or whether there's anybody that might have slipped through the cracks on their summation there.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ontai.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Um, going back to the cost control, so exactly how are they going to stay within the contractual amount? Are we looking at additional expenses?

to Mr. Brown, he has expressed that we are not to expect a budget augmentation from his firm that -- you know, clearly from the amount of right-off hours that they put into this case that -- you know, they could have already been over their hours if they really wanted to bill us for all of that, but they are committed to get us to the finish line, and they know the key decision points we've walked them though, what it will take between now and getting a second draft map out, what the process looks like between the second draft and the third draft, and

the really key process of putting together a legally defensible report to accompany the maps.

1.3

2.5

And they have assured us that they are going to be available and responsive and George also expressed that he -- his preferences is when he is needed that he makes the effort to be there in person as well. So for what it's worth --

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes. A couple of points. I think Commissioner Galambos Malloy sort of summarized -- I think there has been a number of concerns regarding the conflicts of interest policy and I -- again, I -- because of problems that occurred early in the relationship -- that we might have exercised closer diligence on the contract language but notwithstanding the -- the advantage of having a large law firm is that there are associates who are quickly mobilized to do the work.

However, when there aren't -- for example, I think one associate put in quite a lot of hours -- that type of regular employee I think would be appropriate for vetting normally.

But, again, I understand the tradeoffs, and I'm not entirely comfortable with the compliance statement that they have issued, but I think at this

point, simply move forward, because we need to keep moving forward, you know, to the extent that we might want to conduct some independent review, because we do have names, and we can certainly do some research based on the website. We might want to do that. That's what we did in the other issues that came up previously with the firm.

2.5

Ontai's query just about what we're trying to do. I do need to talk to Mr. Brown more specifically, but I did outline at the meeting earlier today that we, of course, need him for very key points in the process, certainly minimally reviewing products that Q2 develops after receiving line instruction -- line drawing instruction from us. Certainly, we would want him to be at line drawing meetings where we are focussing on Section 2 districts, production of the report certainly.

And then -- actually, I'm not sure if -- I
think this is in the contract, but I didn't confirm that
when I looked at it very quickly late last night, but
I'm presuming that in terms of preparation for the
submission to the Department of Justice at this level
will play a significant role in adjusting the final
submission to the justice department.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: At this time,

we are on course to get out of here at 8:00 o'clock at this point, based on that level of discussion.

Technical is up at the 6:45.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSION DAI: Commissioner Yao and then Commissioner DiGuilio, and then that's going to be it.

COMMISSIONER YAO: I think to error is human, and we understand it, and we can accept the explanation, but the question I have for Mr. Miller is what do we need to do between now and the end of our test. We now understand the mistake. We were at fault in terms of having the contract the way it was. So are we going to have modifications to the contract in terms of if they're not authorized to add any new personnel to work on our contract without clearance?

In other words, what do we need to do now that we understand what the real requirement is and how we're going to move forward to make sure that we need the intent of the popular --

MR. MILLER: I believe you're meeting the intent of Prop 11 now. It's the matter in which the firm was vetted, and the internal procedure there following. If you wish to do more, we can look for a way to do that, but I don't believe you're presently at risk.

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Last word?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think just in terms of moving forward, that's fine. My only concern is with the conflict of interest, and I understand we've been sent their reassurances, but, again, I feel like this is from a firm who had conflicts of interest that did not bring it to our attention at the beginning of this contract. So their judgement in terms of what constitutes a conflict of interest I think is suspect. So -- and I'd like to see if we could have Mr. Miller, since the resumes are not being provided to us personally as commissioners, then we need to have a commission representative take a look at those to confirm that there's no conflict of the interest. Because if Mr. Miller says there's none, then I will assume that that will be sufficient for the commission, but until then I just find it troubling -- or problematic to have a firm that's shown questionable review of conflict of interest and themselves be able to make that determination for their own staff. So can Mr. Miller review those resumes and

assure us that there is no conflict of interest with those 14 people?

MR. Miller: I will speak with Mr. Brown.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think we need to

do more than speak with him. I want to see if you can do that. When will you let us know when that can take place?

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think the idea that -- I put together a spreadsheet that has all the names and breaks down along who we had already approved and who we hadn't and that -- you know, I think it could go two ways. I think, you know, I was very clear in requesting for Mr. Brown the resumes, the CVs, and he declined.

So we could reach out again and say that the commission is requesting this information again as a full commission, and if he declines again, then there's other ways to do research on the names.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: He doesn't have to come to a full commission, if he doesn't want to come to a commission. I'm saying I would trust our legal counsel if there's some confidentiality issues, then I'm assuming that he could report to us, right? If GDC doesn't want to report to the full commission, I'll accept that, but I would like to have some type of CRC review of that because of the issues that we faced when we first hired them and their lack of the knowledge of conflict of interest.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: I will pursue the subject with Mr. Brown.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER ONTAI: One last question. So if the firm has been watching the commission all this time regarding -- about being careful about conflict of interest, did it not occur to them at any one moment that that would be an important issue to us?

MR. MILLER: I think that question is perhaps best posed to the firm itself, but I believe if Mr. Brown were here, the answer would be that it is important to them and indeed conflicts are a matter of ongoing importance in a law firm and that for that reason, they have routinely in place internal procedures to protect against conflicts, which is why he was able to provide the certification that I forwarded to you.

worked in this area a long time. I often had to get pro bono lawyers and ran into a lot of conflicts and ran conflict checks with law firms. That's not the conflicts that we're talking about. Conflicts checks that firms routinely run are about clients, whether they are representing a client and they have a conflict because they represent either another client or the issue you would be representing, taking the opposite side in another case.

```
1
                That's not the conflicts we're talking about
2
           I think the conflicts we're talking about here
    are the Prop 11 conflicts of interest. So those are
3
    completely unrelated things that just because they're
 4
5
    running conflict checks at a law firm, does nothing for
 6
    our purposes.
7
                MR. Miller: I certainly understand the
    commission's concern and as indicated for that reason
8
9
    and on the basis that the concern is raised, we'll
10
    continue to pursue this with Mr. Brown, and report back
11
    to the commission.
12
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    Thank you. Do you have
13
    anything else?
14
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, that is
15
    all.
16
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Would you like to defer
    any of those other items for Saturday or Sunday?
17
18
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY:
                                                I think
19
    actually we are -- I think we're in a good position to
2.0
    defer until the next business meeting not this weekend.
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Great I'm going to
22
    turn --
23
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think --
24
    wait.
           The exception to that -- again, is if we have
2.5
    information -- because my sense is that this issue has
```

going on for a while without the commission's knowledge. So the moment that we have some communication from Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher on this issue, I think we would like to just go ahead and address it.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm going to leave an unfinished business item on the agenda for the next couple of days just in case.

I'm going to go ahead and turn this over to Commissioner Diguilio now for the technical topics.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Okay. I think for the sake of brevity, again, there's some items here that were ment in case we need to address them such as the micro calendar or -- let's see -- review of public comments. I think a lot of those can be pushed over until later.

So I think the real important things we need to address are really the VRA review and the narrative report. So maybe we should start with some VRA updates if Commissioner Ancheta has them. Do you feel like that is something we can take care of today?

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I don't -- I think at this point, the team has completed not quite everything but pretty close to everything in terms of covering the congressional districts and focussing particularly on LA County. So I think in terms of just giving us some

things to work with the next couple days. I think we're in good shape, and I think I need to have a specific conversation with Mr. Brown regarding Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher's limitation in meeting our needs.

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Did you want to discuss any of the issues around that one district? You said you were concerned about the population deviation.

a population discussion, I'll defer to Commissioner

Diguilio. It is one example -- where -- and, again, we weren't able to pass a motion yesterday, but it's illustrative of problems that can arise when the deviation is too tight in terms of trying to meet competing needs within the Voters First Act.

So, again, that's one example where we -- in order to comply with Voting Rights Acts, which is to hit a 50 percent mark, we would have had to go over the plus or minus range on the total deviation for state map. So that would have been perhaps an exception if the change were higher, it would have been within the range.

I think there are a lot of other examples, and I'm just sure we're going to see them as we go through the assembly maps, simply because there are a number of places where counties and cities might be kept whole if the deviation were not quite as high, assuming

```
1
    the VRA, we have a couple of examples already.
2
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Parvenu.
                COMMISSIONER PARVENU:
                                        That's exactly my
 3
    question. Are the maps that the team has worked on thus
 4
    far, in other words the VRA compliance Section 2,
5
    possibilities -- well, I'll call it visualizations.
                                                          Are
 6
7
    they available for our review prior to our next
    discussion so we can at least have an advance
8
    observation on that?
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO:
10
                                        I think the
11
    realities of these is actually the Q2 staff is up very
12
    late the night before trying to implement --
1.3
    particularly when there is only one day break -- that
    handoff is -- I think if they get them out late
14
    enough -- our staff has had a midnight cutoff for them
15
    to be posted but sometimes they're -- Q2 is up even
16
    later, 1:00, 2:00, 3:00 in the morning. So if they're
17
18
    not up the night before, Ms. Shupe on our end has agreed
19
    to post them as soon as possible the next morning.
2.0
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Commissioner
    Ancheta.
21
22
                COMMISSIONER ANCHETA:
                                        Just sort of one last
23
    point on -- this is going into general work.
                                                  I think --
24
    I think this may have been in the closed session, but I
2.5
    will make the suggestion anyway regarding the need for
```

the commission to try to closely document it's rationales for this is a smart thing to do. I think we have always wanted to do that but I think at this point, however -- because we certainly have it on video and within transcripts. But as a ruling forward, I think Commissioner Dai and Commissioner Barabba worked out the framework for the final report and that we should try to set into motion some mechanisms that allow us to -- as we're going into the drafting stage now -- to make sure that we're logging some of this, so we're not sort of going back, having to recreate our discussions by looking at transcripts, but we have an ongoing note-taking or summarizing process now.

1.3

2.5

You know, we don't have to have the discussion right now. Commissioner Diguilio can talk about this a bit more and hopefully implement it, but I think we do need to have that kind of a discussion to try to make sure that we're documenting carefully the steps we're taking as we're saying, "These are the districts," and we're creating the districts.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Commissioner Yao and then Commissioner Filkins Weber.

COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah. I totally support that suggestion, because one thing I don't believe we have done adequately is documentation of the rationale

and the decisions by district. We document. We certainly have transcripts. We certainly have videotapes capturing our conversations, but none of those are tied to the 177 districts that we're making decisions on.

2.5

So whether we need a separate person or whether we need to, after the fact, capture those kinds of information, I think it's -- to me, I feel that it's absolutely necessary.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Filkins
Weber.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: This is what's troubling to me, and Commissioner Yao is right. This has been an ongoing discussion that Mr. Yao has brought up time and time again. We are in the last four weeks here, and I don't understand why we can't have a member of staff designated to document our decisions when we're looking at visualizations as we go along, because we are having thorough discussions that Mr. Brown has said are good as far as identifying Communities of Interest. And that we are making decisions about line drawing and we're doing it all in here, but we don't have enough time either as commissioners or staff for that matter to go through our videos to do this.

Now, I have a checked earlier today, and as

I understand it, Kyle had been taking notes, but the notes that Kyle is primarily obligated to capture at this point is direction to Q, and I -- if she gets the the basis for that direction, that might be okay, but the idea is that she's documenting the direction that we're giving but not necessarily the basis for which is going to form our narrative reports as Mr. Brown has asked we do for each district.

1.3

2.5

So I'm a little concerned as we're getting into this decision making and we've done it today, and we're going to get into it for the next two days. So I this this commission has to take a look at someone here in our meetings to document this, and I don't know that it's a commissioner that's participating.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Can we get to this topic when we start talking about the narrative report?

Are there any other questions or --

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I thought we were talking about the narrative report. Commissioner

Ancheta was on this agenda. So --

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: It starts with the VRA, but it applies to everything else.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think that's a very good point, and that's something that we've been dealing with. We had, as you recall, we did have some

staff doing some note taking for a while, but we found that if you're not as familiar with kind of the course of the conversation, some of our notes from our staff -- and I believe Ms. Johnston was doing them -- had left some gaps and some inconsistencies that we were concerned about.

1.3

2.5

So that's when we turned it back over to staff -- or I mean commissioners. But we have been in talks with Q2 and they have been formulating a list of some justifications for what we've done with each, and that's something that Commissioner Dai and Commissioner Barabba are working on right now and will be reviewing that.

And on a side note, also one other thing we've been building -- they have building some trail -- our district has been changing so significantly that part of it is waiting until we have some more formality with the districts to compile the COI and our directions that are related to it and that -- because every time we meet, it changes why a district is made. It's a moving target, but they are aware of the justifications for each district, how we met the criteria in the district.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So let me -- I think this will shortcut a lot of this if I can just give my report on the final report. So Commissioner Barabba and I had

a discussion, and we also moved in Mr. Miller to discuss not only what the final report should look like but also what exactly it would release with the second draft maps, and I went into this a little bit earlier.

2.5

And the plan right now, just given the time crunch that we have and our need to focus on the maps, we had originally talked about really releasing a draft final report with the second draft map and I think that's probably unrealistic given everything that we have yet to do.

There's also no requirement for release of the report with the fourteen-day public review. The only legal requirement is for us to release the final maps no latter than August 1st. So that has fourteen days before we certify the maps.

So given all that and since we obviously want to do a good final report, we are not going to attempt to do that but to use this time between now and August 15 to really, you know, put a good final report together rather than having to release an interim version.

So what we talked about for the second draft maps I need by July 14 that we will release all the information that we did for the first draft map, i.e., you know, PDFs of every district, the equivalency files

will be available, and, you know, a general -- we will have a press to go out with that, which Mr. Wilcox will address and Commissioner Raya will address with the high level messages about our second round of input hearings and, you know, our chance to incorporate additional maps on our first draft into the second draft map, and then we will be releasing objective statistics as well. So total population deviation example number of city splits et cetera. So a lot of basic information like that, and we will have some statistical information on each district as well.

2.5

So that's the plan for the second draft map, that level of detail, and that level of detail was pretty much calculated by the weekend. After our first draft map, we thought we were going to go ahead and release them this time with the second draft map from.

For the final draft reports, Mr. Miller kindly provided me a copy of a previous report that accompanied the special masters maps, and basically, the descriptions were very brief on each district, often just describing what cities and counties were in each district and sometimes with very generic rationale for why they were grouped together but often not a whole lot of detail and also the same kind of statistics that we're applying to the second draft map.

We actually really like the format that CAPAFR used to use. So that information could be presented in a very standard format without a lot of verbiage and probably indicated key Communities of Interest or whatever some basic rationale for certain key districts.

2.5

So we're looking to exactly how much detail we would need to go into for every district as opposed to certain districts. For example, we know that Section 5 district and Section 2 district are going to require a greater level of detail.

So that's what we're going for. I spoke with Ms. Henderson earlier this morning, and Q2 has confirmed that they should be able to certainly provide all of the statistical information on all of the district. You know, that's something we could give them a heads's up on, and they said that they should be able to provide that.

So that will be the bulk of the report.

There will be -- what Mr. Claypool is calling the preamble. The first part of the report is basically background on the commission, the acts, and what formed the commission, the process that we were chosen. It's background information on the Citizens -- our very first you know, California Redistricting Commission.

Mr. Claypool is the best person to write it, because he's probably written it at least a million times already to talk about the process.

1.3

2.5

So that's Section 1, and then Section 2 will be the legal basis for -- and the context for all of our decisions. They'll go through each of the criteria. Q2 will be, of course, providing a report with those statistics and how we adhere to each of the criteria in the constitution.

And Mr. Miller, in combination with Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, will be supporting them, of course, on the report on our compliance for the Voting Rights Acts. He will be responsible for pulling together that section, and that will probably be very legal, and this will be for the courts. This is probably not something that the average member of the public is going to be that interested in reading. So we will be looking to Mr. Wilcox to be providing executive summary of key sections of this report.

And then the final section is the bulk of the report that Q2 will be providing most of the district-by-district information. They're won't need to be commission oversight on the rationale and the Communities of Interest. This is the reason we've been asking every commissioner to kind of think about it.

```
1
    We're trying to give Q2 direction as we give direction
2
    as a group now, what were the Communities of Interest
    that we were attempting to keep whole, so that we can
3
    describe the district and why the district was formed in
 4
    the way that it was.
5
                Mr. Miller, do you have any other comments?
 6
7
                MR. MILLER: It's our intention to make
    Section 2 fascinating, well-read, and an engaging
8
    portion of the entire report.
9
10
                COMMISSIONER DAI: We're looking forward to
11
    that.
                COMMISSIONER FORBES: Would you like to do
12
13
    the first signing at the bookstore?
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Blanco.
14
15
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So it sounds good.
16
    The only caveat I would have is when you said maybe
17
    looking at some districts here that -- I would not pull
    out any district and talk about it with the exception
18
    for the Section 2 and Section 5.
19
2.0
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, that's what I'm --
21
    certain districts are going to require more details.
22
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But -- so maybe I
23
    misunderstood, because I think that in terms of --
24
    unless they are Section 2 or Section 5 districts,
2.5
    there's nothing that should be treated or highlighted or
```

underscored one district more than another.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: No. Right. I was just trying to indicate that we would not be subject to the same, you know, requirement for detail that we probably really want to invest the time in writing about Section 5 and Section 2 districts.

Any other questions or thoughts on the construction of this report?

Mr. Ward?

COMMISSIONER WARD: I haven't read the -- I think you said 91. Is that what you were referencing earlier?

COMMISSIONER DAI: It might have been the earlier one that Mr. Miller had forwarded me to look at. I read one of them.

that standard policy just generally across the states and things, because I seem to remember at the beginning of the process that's something we had talked about was -- and my kind of expectation was that if we were going to have a little narrative as to why each district was drawn the way it was drawn besides just statistical information.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. But my suggestion -- the reason -- if you look at the CAPAFR,

their presentation of districts, you know, they have 1 2 information and tables, and it's presented in a standard way, so that there's not a lot of fluff. And so that 3 kind of gets to the point a lot better than having to 4 write paragraphs of each district and information about 5 each district in a very standard way. And I did talk to 6 7 Q2 about it, and they said, you know, it's a lot of formatting, but they could do it. And I think it would 8 be very easy to the public to be able to digest this 9 10 information if they want to look up their district. 11 Okay. So that's the framework that we're 12 working under, and we'll definitely be asking for 13 assistance particularly from the commissioners who 14 really eyeballed and had more attention to thinking 15 about the Communities of Interest as they were trying to give direction to Q2. 16 17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So you mentioned that 18 Gibson, Dunn and Mr. Miller would take the lead on 19 the --20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Section 2. 21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Legal section 22 completely or just Section 2 and Section 5 because I 23 think all of this is legal under -- the application of

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Correct.

the criteria is all a legal matter.

24

1 MR. Miller: just to make sure we're saying 2 the same thing, we agree with you. COMMISSIONER DAT: 3 Yes. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Technical has 4 five minutes remaining. 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Any other thoughts or 6 7 questions? I mean, Q2, again, will be doing this, but 8 it will require oversight, because, you know, at the end, we're going to think about, you know, this is how 9 10 we want to present each district. Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Four minutes, and we 12 will pass. 1.3 COMMISSIONER DAI: I'm going to turn this 14 over to Commissioner Raya. 15 COMMISSIONER RAYA: There are two items that 16 we have been discussing. One is what we can post on the 17 website, or how we can be of help to the public in gaining an understanding of deferrals, and I'll let 18 19 Mr. Wilcox address that in a minute, because that's 20 something he's working on. 21 And the other is to consider releasing the 22 second draft in Los Angeles, to have -- third draft --23 I'm sorry. Final draft, the real one, as opposed to 24 these other unreal ones -- considering the release in

Los Angeles that we would have a big hoopla in LA, and,

2.5

again, Mr. Wilcox can report on that, because he's been looking into potential venues. So --

1.3

2.0

2.5

MR. WILCOX: right. And in talking about that, let's talk about the second draft release and then the final. On the second draft, since we'll be here in Sacramento, I have secured the Governor's conference room in the State Capitol for news conference in the afternoon.

For July 28th -- and I think one of the things we were going to talk about is the logistics of if we do it in Los Angeles, if you wanted to hold your meeting there, a couple of days beforehand, because you are scheduled to have a --

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah. We do have a business meeting -- two days -- a business meeting on the calendar. So that would be a decision the commission would have to make to put the whole thing together. You know, we have some good possibilities for venues, so that would be something to consider.

I mean, I don't know that we have to decide that today, but we won't have a lot of time to decide it in order to post --

MR. WILLCOX: And I come back, since I'm looking into that right now, I can come back at the next business meeting with, you know, the possibilities that

1 we have. 2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Galambos 3 Malloy. COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would be very supportive of this as acting chair for that 5 6 session. I think that, of course, we had our extensive 7 outreach effort in southern California, but in terms of 8 our day-in, day-out business meetings, we have really favored Sacramento, because we've had easy access to 10 space and to our offices, et cetera. And I think it 11 would be a very important gesture at this stage in the 12 game to hold our final release in southern California. 1.3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Yao then Commissioner Barabba. 14 15 COMMISSIONER YAO: This is just a question of 16 clarification, is this press conference held at the end of July when we release what's called the final draft or 17 is this --18 19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Final map. 20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay. I heard the term 21 just used now -- or is this -- okay. Draft map. Okay. 22 I have just been corrected one more time. 23 Now, would we at that point in time on July 24 the 28th have voted on it already, or are we coming back 2.5 in mid-August and give it its final approval.

need to understand the definition that we're -- that we're discussing right now.

1.3

2.0

2.5

the 28th in order to -- but we have to give the fourteen-day notice. So this would be a vote -- we'd have two days -- well, I'm assuming then we'd have two days down there because of the travel time. Then the 28th would be the vote. We could also -- you would also have to find -- make sure that the venue has two or three extra days. If for some reason we can't reach a vote, we have to have a couple extra days. We do have a drop deadline of the 30th -- the 31st.

No. It has to be submitted on the 31st because we have to -- it has to be reviewed until the 14th in order for us to -- to be delivered on the 15th. So whatever the last day of July is -- the 31st. So actually, our last -- it has to be submitted in. So we have three extra days. You have to have those three extra days if for some reason -- which I'm sure we won't need them.

COMMISSIONER YAO: So, again, the question is are we having a press conference for the -- whatever we want to call it -- on July the 28th or are we going to have a press conference on the release map after we officially approve it?

```
1
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: I think the idea was
2
    to maybe do both because I think --
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    They coincide.
 3
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: They coincide.
 4
    we release the final map, they'll be inquiries into what
5
    we have done. So I think there will be something
 6
    then -- and I don't know -- a final one or more of a
7
    ceremonial one when we hand it over to the State.
8
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                   That's the certification.
10
                Mr. Claypool, do you want to answer that
11
    question about the times.
                MR. CLAYPOOL: The 31st is your absolute
12
13
    last day if you can't -- if the 14 days is problematic,
14
    but you don't want to be sitting there on the 15th and
    wondering whether midnight means anything. So the 31st
15
16
    is -- and then like you said, Rob is working on the
17
    ceremony up here with the Secretary of State.
18
                COMMISSIONER DAI:
                                    Okay. Was it
    Commissioner Ancheta?
19
                COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, first I'll take
20
21
         I think I may have had the dates mixed up with Mr.
22
    Wilcox. I know he did want me to check in with Q2
23
    regarding whether the timeline works, but I think the
24
    basic question and problem was if we're pushing it to LA
2.5
    and we have a Berkley-based consultant pushing stuff
```

maybe right to the day we actually vote on them, that puts pressure on them to get it done a day earlier.

1.3

2.5

Now, again, we're trying to build the timing so that much of what we're going to probably use in the final map is coming in the second draft, but it does put that pressure into the system.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Sorry, it was Commissioner Barabba.

COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I'm uncomfortable going to LA, and the reason is I don't see Sacramento as as region. Sacramento is the State Capitol, and we're doing something that affects the entire state, and it seems to me that since it's of sufficient importance that the press might be able to find their way here, because they do it for other major events. So I would be -- I don't understand why we would have to be down in LA to do this.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Parvenu.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I'd be comfortable with LA. I have a few recommendations. Are we looking for an auditorium-type of facility in terms of a venue? Are we expecting a very large crowd, because I'm expecting a very large public turnout for this with plenty of parking and other amenities at the venue.

Another option would probably be -- that was

mentioned earlier was Laney College by that being close to Q2 statewide database, if Q2 is as well. COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Commissioner Galambos Malloy then Commissioner Blanco.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No. My thought was that in thinking of when to schedule, I think this issue of flexibility is important to keep in mind, so it may be difficult. We may want to schedule the press release for later within our drop dead dates available to us to make sure that we're ready.

I mean, I think it's a tricky balance. we could find a venue that had some flexibility and might be available on several days in a row, then we would know that whenever we're ready to hit the presses, that we can go ahead and move that way.

And I also am of the opinion that it is very important that we have press events at both milestones, because we know it will be in the press, and we need to be the ones bringing the story. So that's -- yeah. That's my opinion on that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Sorry. Commissioner Blanco.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So I want to take a step back and have us really think about what

2.5 Commissioner Barabba said. There's something about -- I mean, I think I understand the LA decision in terms of -- I don't know -- it's central in its reach and all that, but there is something that feels kind of -- I don't know how to put my finger on it -- kind of political about it in a way like we're trying, you know, like we're to trying to make a publicity splash or something. Whereas, I do -- there's something about doing it in Sacramento that -- this really is about, you know, state legislative district. Obviously, it's also about congressional, but it's about government. And I guess I just would just like to hear more about why LA, because there is something neutral and symbolic and important it seems to me about the Sacramento location for when we're releasing a map to redistrict California.

2.5

Whereas the other feels a little bit more like we're -- I don't know. It doesn't have that same official feeling to it. It seems a little bit more publicity driven.

MR. Wilcox: Yes, and I think the thought was because we have done so much of the public input hearing across the state. We've been in all the media markets, and now these press conferences, we are here in Sacramento, that it was a thought to go to Los Angeles, which is a huge media market and, you know, to have that coverage there with those major television stations to

kind of spread it out into a north and south. We just wouldn't do just Sacramento every time. It was a thought to kind of spread the word, and then we would be back here again on August 15th.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Sounds like people may want some time to think about this.

COMMISSIONER FORBES: I just wonder whether we -- I mean the capitol is a clear state venue. I can't think of a venue in southern California that would have that same kind of stature that everybody would agree that this is a centralized place that the state is represented in represents the state. So -- it's -- find an appropriate venue that makes it hard for me to think of southern California.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Wilcox, have you had a chance to research venues at all. Or what would be some of our options?

MR. WILCOX: Well, I'm looking into -- one possibility was the California Endowment for the meetings. Also they have great facilities for press conferences. The other option would be for the press conference in Los Angeles City Hall.

So what I could do is I could research this more and bring back possibilities if you wanted to discuss it at a later point.

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Madame chair?

COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER RAYA: Just so Mr. Wilcox doesn't spin his wheels maybe we could just take a little straw poll about the feeling for having something in Los Angeles.

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Could ou explain before -- because I think we should -- the difference between the 15th -- which one will be of more magnitude -- or, you know, the 15th or the one right before that? That would be helpful for me to think about.

MR. Wilcox: Yeah. I think the news value, the coverage will be July 28th, in fact, because on the 15th they will already know what the districts are. Why you, I believe, would want to have definitely the 15th in Sacramento is because that's really ceremonial. You are officially adopting and you want to be seen in the State Capitol, and we could do ceremony at the Secretary of State, and that is a very important key in the venue. I'm not sure if the venue -- other than being able to reach out to a greater press pool in the southern California area is as important for the 28th, because they will be focused on what the districts are going to be.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Any other kind of thoughts. Commissioner DiGuilio.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Yeah. I think -- I'm never short of thoughts, right.

I guess I'm trying to balance with the idea that we haven't really done -- we haven't focused a lot up in northern California I'm trying to balance the idea of going down to the southern California to try and have a little better outreach there.

But I guess I'm torn because I guess I feel like Commissioner Barabba a little bit that this is related to state government and this is the capitol, and this is where it seems to belong in terms of its relevance, and I think a press core could go either up here or down there. I don't think it's just a matter of what is our role in this, but I think the second draft map will be a bigger -- a bigger presentation. So should it be in at the capitol where it's more relevant in some ways, or should it be in southern California just to increase our outreach. So I don't know. That's just kind of my thoughts. I guess I'm more inclined to do it in northern California.

COMMISSIONER DAI: So I'm going to weigh in on it. I've kind of been ruminating on it while everyone else has been talking. I kind of like the idea

```
of doing it at a southern California venue, and then a
1
2
    northern California venue. I tend to agree with Rob
    that the certification part is ceremonial and absolutely
3
    should be in the State Capitol and I think he's
 4
    absolutely right in the fact that that media market is
5
    much bigger in LA. We know that we're going to be
 6
7
    covered by more than the Sacramento Bee regardless, but
    it's kind out of -- one is almost more release to the
8
    the people and one is more of a government ceremonial
9
    kind of a transaction.
10
11
                So I'm on the side of favoring doing that at
12
    the moment.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: I think Mr. Wilcox has
14
    something to say.
15
                MR. WILCOX: Yes. And I just want to say
    that if we hold it in Sacramento or hold it in Los
16
17
    Angeles, we're going to get plenty of press. That's not
18
    the real question is that we're going to get plenty and
    the television will share. So we don't need to worry
19
2.0
    about that at all the.
21
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner YAO and then
22
    Commissioner Ontai and then Commissioner Forbes.
```

COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, I wish I know

what we're going to be doing on the 27th, and I wish I

know what we're going to be doing on the 28th.

23

24

2.5

right up against the deadline, the press conference, if we do run into situation where we have to burn midnight oil, the press conference is the furthest thing from my mind.

2.5

The idea is really to do a -- this is our last chance to release a good map. Okay. And I would just assume to focus our attention in doing that as compared to having to be in a different place and settle and different desk and having to worry about these other details that really doesn't contribute to a good set of mappers.

Like I said, if I know that we have time and we clearly have a choice as to where we would like to do this, I would do that. But at this point in time, I would say if we understand where we are, we probably can do our best work right here, because we don't have to worry about the peripheral. So I would probably vote for holding it in Sacramento.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ontai.

COMMISSIONER ONTAIN: I like the notion that having the second draft release in Los Angeles underscores the notion that we're doing these maps for the people, and by being LA it shows this is the people's maps and there's a certain amount of symbolism behind that. Staying too close all the time to

1 Sacramento separates from the rest of the people. 2 going down to LA I think sends a warm and fuzzy message that this is the people's map, but then end it very 3 formally in Sacramento with all the certification of the 4 map with all the pomp and ceremony. 5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Forbes. 6 7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I think ideally I would have had the second draft be released in 8 southern California and the final map and the 9 10 certification occur up here. That option is off the 11 table. 12 So one thing is that if it's the commission's will to do it in southern Califonia -- I'm 13 not saying it is -- but if it is that the venue be 14 15 something that is perceived as belonging to the entire 16 public. That's why I wouldn't do it in Los Angeles City 17 hall. That's not this entire public. You might want do 18 to one or use one of the UC campuses. At least that 19 belongs -- anyway, a venue that would be perceived as 20 belonging to the people of California. 21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Galambos 22 Malloy. 23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: And you have 24 three minutes.

COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I wanted to

request -- probably a member of the technical team could just clarify again I think the notion that we would be actually refining maps at this stage of the game is not exactly what I had envisioned or what I think is actually feasible. So can you just walk us though at that point in time, what we will really be going.

1.3

2.5

That that's why we will not be refining maps. That's why we're doing the live line drawing session. We will see what we get as we go. It won't be give direction and we'll go back and work. And so what we will be getting at the point will be the final maps along with all of the the reports, and that's partly why we're giving Q2 those days before so that they can -- they can't make any changes if there's an "I" that's not dotted or a "T" that's not crossed, this is it for them.

So in that sense, we won't be doing any line drawing. There won't be any need for that. I think the only thing -- I think has Commissioner Yao had mentioned if at that point -- we do have to vote, and if we have haven't been able to come to agreement, then we will need all the time it takes or again, the last thing on our mind will be press conference. We may have to go three extra days if we have to have a discussion.

So I don't think the press conference should

drive what we're doing, but I'd also like to think optimistically that at that point we will have a good sense of where we stand. So it's just kind of two sides of one coin.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta.

COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I would like to remain as optimistic as we all are sounding. I'm not so optimistic about our staying on schedule. We don't typically stay always on schedule to be honest, and we may have significant conflict when it comes down to the final maps. And I think while I understand and -- I worked in LA for many years. It's a great place to get national attention. You will get full attention of the local media markets certainly.

I want to build in some time to make sure we get our maps right, and I think if we go down to LA, we're compromising, and I would rather have that safety factor built in. We will get coverage regardless of where we are.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Times up.

Well, now we're getting to the point where we might be repeating ourselves a little bit.

COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I like Commissioner
Ontai's idea of, you know, these are the people's maps,
and if we -- in that regard, then it's a citizen to

```
1
    citizen, so how do we kind of stage that, and I think
2
    that getting away from politics of Sacramento and
    politicians in Sacramento metaphorically set some
3
 4
    distance from what we've been entrusted to do, which is
    develop maps that are outside of the influence of
5
 6
    legislators, so I like the idea of going to Los Angeles
7
    for reason.
                As far as venues are concerned I would also
8
    offer the University of Southern California as a
9
10
    university that is right in the middle of all of those
11
    areas that we talked about earlier today. Just a
12
    suggestion.
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. So our time is up.
1.3
14
    Do we want to take a straw poll.
15
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: I saw let's take a
    straw poll. Maybe we're evenly divided, but I think
16
    it's better to know right now, and then we can decide.
17
18
                So if I could just ask for a show of hands,
19
    how many people are willing to go to Los Angeles or
20
    think it's a good idea?
21
                Okay. Preference Los Angeles, please raise
22
    your hand, and somebody down there count.
23
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY:
                                                Not to
24
    micromanage, but this piece about the venue is key.
                                                          Ιf
```

we had the wrong venue in southern California, I would

2.5

```
not be supportive of going to southern California.
1
2
                COMMISSIONER DAI: I like the idea of
3
    finding a place that belongs to Califronia, so I like
    the idea of a UC.
 4
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: Rather than USC.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
                                              Seven to seven.
 6
7
                COMMISSIONER DAI: This is not indicative of
    our final vote.
8
                COMMISSIONER RAYA: There are some people
10
    who are from USC.
11
                So did we have enough hands to at least look
12
    into it? Did you guys count.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Yeah.
                                                     Seven to
           Seven in favor of Los Angeles. It was seven
14
    seven.
    hands up.
15
                COMMISSIONER DAI: So I voted for it under
16
17
    the assumption that it would be a people's place and
    also that at that point, it's going to be too late to be
18
19
    doing last-minute changes to our map.
                COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: For me, it's not
2.0
21
    about doing changes. For me, it's about if for some
22
    reasons there's a deadlock. I just don't want to have
23
    to have the press release driving our decision to be in
24
    southern California. Even though -- we will feel
2.5
    pressure if we're in souther California specifically to
```

1 reach that people, to have a press conference. 2 I want us to have full -- our full attention to -- I'd rather be up here and say, "Oh, that was easy. 3 Too bad we didn't go to southern California." Than be 4 in southern California saying, "Oh, my gosh. We have to 5 cram in three days, " so I was just cautious. 6 7 what mine. COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean, here's what I 8 suggest is we schedule for the 30th, but we would get 9 10 there on the 27th, and if we all can come to a vote, we 11 spend a couple days in Los Angeles. But if we can't --12 because we have to be done by the 30th anyway, so we 1.3 just gain the time by coming a couple of days earlier. COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Four minutes 14 over, and you're cutting into legal again. 15 16 COMMISSIONER DAI: So did that sway anyone? Is it worth looking into? We really don't want to waste 17 18 Mr. Wilcox's time if there really is no interest, but I 19 mean, it seems like there's significant. 2.0 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I don't know if 21 you can call a split significant. 22 COMMISSIONER DAI: It's half of the 23 commission. That's significant. 24 COMMISSIONER RAYA: How about this as a 2.5 compromise, so that we don't take any more of legal's

time. We could take another couple of days to just explore whether it's even a possibility to get a decent venue that meets all of the conditions that people are interested in. If not, then, you know, we -- we'll be here.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: Mr. Wilcox, you don't think it would take you all that long to -- I don't know if you need to contact -- you could probably just Google or find or, you know, just put together a list of things that you think might work and --

COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And in terms of being politics, I might take the endowment out of the equation given the fact that the Irvine Foundation put so much toward the redistricting process and then to go to another foundation might -- I'm just saying, there's little things like that that might be issues.

COMMISSIONER DIGUILIO: Could I ask a question. Maybe Mr. Wilcox will address this later, because whether we're in northern or southern, we should have -- shouldn't feel pressure to reach a press conference. So what is our flexibility if we don't reach the deadline, our date on the 28th, can we just reschedule for each second day.

MR. WILCOX: Absolutely. You have your press conference when you are ready. You build it, they

will come.

2.5

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: In terms of the state educational facility, we should also keep in mind Cal State LA which is a state college as well as UCLA and Northridge, too, I thought that facility was -- plenty of parking. You may want to do it at Northridge.

COMMISSIONER DAI: If you have any suggestions for Mr. Willcox, why don't you send him an email.

I'm going to go ahead and turn this over to Commissioner Filkins Weber for legal.

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: I would turn it over to Mr. Miller. There's just two items on here.

The final map preparation I think was put on here, but I think -- I don't know if this was part of the report or what the thoughts were on that, but the litigation RFI, we can hear from Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: I think Commissioner Dai did cover the final report well. I have prepared a request for information for litigation, which I have provided to Commissioners Forbes and Blanco for review. This document stems from our meeting last week and would solicit qualifications and interests from law firms to support the commission in litigation.

Just as an adjoiner to that, I mentioned

```
1
    earlier the Supreme Court had gotten in touch with us.
2
    No great news there expect that I do think it's
    interesting to note that they're looking at their own
3
    procedures and docket and case load in anticipation of
 4
    what they could be receiving as a result of
5
 6
    redistricting activities. Which is another way of
7
    informing ourselves about the potential importance and
8
    complexity and magnitude about the cases that may come
    on the heels of August 14th.
9
10
                Perhaps -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.
11
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: If you're not
12
    finished, I just have some questions. That's all.
1.3
                MR. MILLER: Go ahead.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: I don't think I
14
15
    was present at the time that there was some deligation
16
    to Commissioner Blanco and Commissioner Forbes, so I do
17
    have some questions regarding the statement of work and
18
    experience. So I'm not certain whether we should just
19
    do this later or whether you wanted --
2.0
                COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just talk to us and
21
    we'll --
22
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER:
23
                COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Along the
24
    final report, I felt like there was a hanging question
2.5
    around. Commissioner Filkins Weber had brought up the
```

```
1
    note taking about the rationale behind the decision or
2
    direction we were giving. Did we close the loop on
3
    that?
                COMMISSIONER DAI: Do you want to -- I feel
    like Q2 is going to be able to provide us with a good
5
6
    rough draft to start with, and with commission review of
7
    that, I think we'll be in good shape. I think they have
    done a pretty good job of tracking that, and I don't
8
    know about you, but when I look at a district I can
10
    say -- at this point, I feel like I memorized a lot of
11
    that. I don't know that it's going be as hard as we
12
    think it will be. So that's my sense anyway.
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: One other
1.3
    question. I might have missed this, because I was a
14
    little distracted maybe on keeping track of time.
15
                Can you guys give us an idea of when the
16
17
    request for the invitation would go out to firms.
18
    sorry.
19
                MR. MILLER: as soon as possible.
                                                    That's
20
    not very helpful is it.
21
                COMMISSIONER FILKINS: Well, I quess as soon
22
    as it's signed off on by the Commissioner Blanco and
23
    Forbes.
24
                MR. MILLER: I think that is the right
2.5
    answer.
```

COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBER: So I just need to convey my question to them. Okay. Thank you.

1.3

2.0

2.5

We have five minutes, and I don't think

legal has anything further. If there's no direction

from the commission for any additional issues to legal

that I can document for next week, I would close my -
COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Yao, do you

have anything?

COMMISSIONER YAO: We went away from the public information to legal. It's really a question for the public information group. Are we satisfied with the way we released the first draft, because a number of emails that we have received complain about the fact that the PDF map doesn't give us enough information.

I know that there are various sites like LA Times and so on and so forth that have capabilities and -- including those institutus. Are we comfortable with releasing the second draft and the final map in the same manner. Again, this mainly is driven from all the public comments about our web release as being something less than totally desirable.

COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Specifically when it comes to street, specific streets. I've gotten plenty of emails about the level of specificity.

MR. WILCOX: I think we are going to have to

rely on other sites to be able to have that kind of quality and ease. With our technical requirements and what we're able to get from Q2 and those kinds of files, what we can do is make those links and those resources more prominent on the website and easier for the public to find.

1.3

2.5

COMMISSIONER DAI: You may not have found it, but there is a couple of links and sort of other resources.

MR. WILCOX: Helpful resources.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Helpful resources right on the map page. So if you click it, it takes you to the LA site or the redrawing site.

COMMISSIONER YAO: So I guess what I'm suggesting is that at this stage in the game, we don't see any of these as being a conflict of interest in the assistance to the public. We should freely link them to all these other sites that provide that kind of services for us.

MR. WILCOX: I would think so because we can't -- we don't have the ability to be able to provide that to the public. So it's one way for the public to be able to easily access that.

COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Are there any other items? If not, this meeting is adjourned.

```
1
                  (Whereupon the FULL COMMISSION MEETING
    adjourned at 7:44 p.m.)
 2
 3
                                 --000--
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Brittany Flores, Certified Shorthand
4	Reporter in and for the State of California, do hereby
5	certify:
6	That the foregoing proceedings were
7	reported by me stenographically and later transcribed
8	into typewritten form under my direction; that the
9	foregoing is a true record of the proceedings taken at
10	that time.
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my
12	name this day of July, 2011.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	BRITTANY FLORES, CSR NO. 13460
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	