

JULY 8, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, note taker: K. Kubas

Short hand for speakers -
GM: Commissioner Galambos Malloy
DG: Commissioner DiGuilio
FW: Commissioner Filkins Webber
A: Ana Henderson
N: Nicole Boyle
K: Karin Mac Donald

| IDENTIFIER | DESCRIPTION | NOTES/QUESTIONS | FINAL DIRECTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|---|------------------|
| | <i>SO CAL ADs</i> | | |
| COACH | | <p><i>GM</i> – I did express my concern about the finger going into Cathedral City but I acknowledge that we have had public testimony about that. <i>FW</i> – Does this designate a local COI if it is two agricultural communities that are far from each other? And the ripple effects to San Bernardino, San Diego. <i>GM</i>- We have had extensive and conflicting testimony about this area. As we have moved throughout the state, we have often found people outside a community saying what should happen to a community, but I have tried to listen to people from Imperial and what they want. I think the lack of pop. Density in the county, when you talk about what a COI is in LA, I think that is different in Imperial. I would support this visualization moving forward. <i>DG</i> – The issue of local is similar to Nor Cal; I am not concerned about that. I think that we struggled with this area and we heard conflicting testimony, but it sounds like they were saying the same thing; there is a difference in the Coachella Valley. I feel like we are giving them both what they wanted and this is the best visualization we have.</p> <p><i>Blanco</i> – I differ with the fact that it is 50/50 testimony. When we put imperial with E. San Diego, we had all of E. San Diego saying they had nothing in common with Imperial. Imperial people said they had nothing to do with the eastern mountain area, since we are a desert agriculture community. I think there was tremendous displeasure with Imperial being with E. San Diego and that was the only other option. <i>Aguirre</i> – We have to go beyond the COI and to look at political disenfranchisement for the farm workers, in this particular area, we were informed that they generate 5 billion dollars worth of product, the COI is one of survival. To a farm worker, 90 to 100 miles isn't that far, especially with the way we commute currently. I would argue that this map should have the connection between Imperial and Coachella, that orbit of survival is</p> | ok |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|----|
| | | <p>not only E/W but goes across state line into Yuma area and goes to Palm Desert. This area has a distinction in class; one community is marginalized and deals with lack of services, racism, etc and other is wealthier and caters to tourism. <i>Raya</i> - I think this is an area where we take in COI testimony and we look at our own knowledge and experience and this is an opportunity to weigh the testimony and look at what ties the people in this area together. One tie is healthcare, there are a lot of clinics that are meant to serve a very closely related community that do not have access. There are a lot of ties that we are aware of and this is an opportunity to exercise our judgment. <i>Ancheta</i> – I think there is enough COI testimony to support this. There has been public testimony that this is a Section 2, though our counsel has said it is not. The communities are not closely connected, but given the facts here, I think this could be a Section 2 district and this is drawn to support that. <i>Forbes</i> – I support this district regardless of Section 2 consideration. The two things that drive this for me: 1) What do people who live here want? When we were in Palm Springs we heard people who did not live in the Coachella/Imperial community. 2) Also the farm workers in this area are mobile and work in East Coachella and it makes sense for them to be represented here. <i>Ward</i> – I do not support the subjective idea of a mobile COI. I like this districts respect of county lines. We are using COI like farm workers (freely admitted to be mobile) to me that does not fit the definition of local. I do think this represents county lines well. <i>FW</i> – Imperial county residents identified San Diego connection in the pre-draft 1 map hearing. The public comments on the web are pretty much even. When you take away politics from it (which is what <i>Aguirre</i> was talking about), the agriculture numbers are closer to 2 billion dollars for the region, and I have looked very closely at this. <i>Raya</i> – I think we need to be careful in our assessment of testimony not to apply labels that are not entirely un-weighted words. “Politics” is a weighted term. <i>FW</i> – Partisan words have been used re: this district in the testimony.</p> | |
| BBCOH | | <p><i>Ward</i> – I am concerned that it doesn’t look compact. <i>Dai</i> – We had a lot of testimony between Coachella and 29 Palms so this was an attempt to illustrate the testimony. Also keeps Beaumont/Banning area together. Our concern is that it splits San Jacinto Valley but I don’t know if we could fix it. I think they are together in the other two maps. <i>DG</i> – I think if we go to COI we have a basis for why it looks this way. I think this is a balanced district. <i>Dai</i> – We heard testimony from Cathedral City’s mayor about a good place to split it if necessary. <i>FW</i> – Other than adding Palm Springs and Palm Desert, this is similar to our draft map. This received kudos at the draft map stage. <i>DG</i> – There is a reason that cities, counties and COIs are all on equal playing field and here there is COI that provides the reason why the county break is ok. <i>Ward</i> – This district represents some of my concerns about some of the decisions because I</p> | ok |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|
| | | understand that county lines need to be broken sometimes but when we draw a district that does violate lines (lines are an objective landmark), there is no reason to move the line at Desert Hot Springs to make it a more compact district. <i>FW</i> – You aren’t going to get population in South, you would have to cut 2 counties in one AD, and there are foothills there. <i>Ward</i> – It is not an aesthetic issue, I am commenting on the process of how we apply criteria. | |
| MTRMV | Added Grand Terrace. A - We were asked to add unincorporated Rialto in the above RLTFO district so we had to get more pop. for this one. | <i>Dai</i> – Colton and Grand Terrace testimony linking both so there might be more testimony after this. <i>FW</i> – Good Hope and Romoland are not with Perris here but they are whole at CD. <i>DG</i> – Why did we not include Mead Valley? <i>Dai</i> – This was based on COI testimony about March Air Base being tied with Moreno Valley, Perris, etc. <i>Ward</i> – I had the same question as <i>DG</i> . I know March ARB ties to Moreno Valley, what was the testimony? <i>FW</i> – March ARB is not longer in use and we heard testimony... <i>FW</i> – This did not receive any criticism on the web. <i>GM</i> – I lived in Colton and I see their connection to Grand Terrace but they are at a crossroads and there are connections from Colton going west on 10 and going on 215. | ok |
| RIVJU | | <i>FW</i> – Lots of public comment in support of this district. | ok |
| MGOBN | Murrieta is split, 2323 people are in San Diego based | <i>Blanco</i> – I just wanted to say that no matter how you draw a district, people can still drive from one place to another. It is about political representation. <i>FW</i> – Transportation is a COI. <i>GM</i> – Those two things are not contradiction each other. We got testimony in So Cal about people’s communities being clustered around freeways. It doesn’t always work out that neatly <i>Forbes</i> – I disagree because I think in rural areas, effective representation is access. <i>DG</i> – French Valley is isolated? It is not with its neighbors? <i>FW</i> – It is problematic. <i>Dai</i> – Maybe we can make Hemet more whole and put French Valley back in, do a population rotation | Keep Murrieta whole Revisit putting French Valley in and rotating population to make Hemet less split. |
| POMVL | | | ok |
| RLTFO | | | Swap unincorporated areas of Rialto for Grand Terrace (this was done already??) |
| SBCUC | Rancho Cucamonga is still split | <i>Yao</i> – We need to try to keep Rancho Cucamonga whole or away from LA county. A – It is split less than it was before. <i>Yao</i> – I think the overall perspective of how Rancho Cucamonga is taking the brunt of our problem. <i>Ward</i> – I agree with <i>Yao</i> ’s concern, the compactness of the district as well. Can we make it up in LA? <i>Yao</i> – It is 160k which is probably nearly impossible to move around in LA. A – <i>Yao</i> gave us a dividing line but we are happy to look closer with you offline. | |
| MISBK | Majority of Hesperia is | | |

| | | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | here, and portion that sticks into Oak Hills is divided. | | |
| MSKID | | <i>Parvenu</i> – Why is that top part of Crestline dangling? <i>A</i> – If it is split we will pick it up. <i>Dai</i> – There was a public comment to swap Adelanto with Mojave. Adelanto is closer with Victor Valley. <i>Ward</i> – There was testimony asking for Edwards and China Lake together. <i>FW</i> – Edwards with Lancaster? General direction to explore NW corner including Rosemont, Mojave, California City, Boron. | Pick up North part of Crestline. General direction to explore NW corner including Rosemont, Mojave, California City, Boron. |
| ISAND | | <i>FW</i> - If you are looking to get population for French Valley, taking Valley Vista and Hemet are worse. <i>A</i> – Maybe taking park of La Quinta. <i>Raya</i> – How important is it to move French Valley in, with impact on larger communities? <i>FW</i> – I think <i>Raya</i> is right, it could be far more damaging. <i>Blanco</i> – Can someone speak to French Valley’s pop. and COI? <i>DG</i> – It looked geographically like it was probably linked with the communities near it. But I think the impacts of maybe splitting Hemet further or going into Coachella are too great. <i>Yao</i> – In this small area, are there communities north of 74 that are tied only to this area. I am worried about empty space that is north. My concern that using 74 as a divider and separating people that have no access (at bottom of this district) | Look at consequences of moving French Valley into MGOBN. |
| SSAND | Made Barrio Logan whole here. Removes Imperial Beach for pop reasons. | <i>DG</i> – Now the line has been moved East slightly. <i>Blanco</i> – I think that is okay, because before the ferry this was the entry to Coronado, correct? <i>Ontai</i> – Yes. I will check that you got all of City Heights. African American community appears to be split between the two districts. <i>A</i> – For this region we were directed to look at Unity map, so the lines are very similar. <i>FW</i> – <i>Ontai</i> we encourage you to look at the street level off line. <i>DG</i> - This is Section 2. | |
| LMSAND | | <i>Dai</i> – This splits LGBT community. <i>Ontai</i> – There is testimony that Linda Mesa should be in this district. <i>DG</i> – Take out of La Mesa and then repopulate CNSAND. <i>A</i> – Already 0.7 percent over populated. We have very sparse population and we are talking about splitting cities like Spring Valley or others. Again, the Unity maps were the lines we looked at as per CRC direction. <i>Raya</i> – LGBT testimony, Claremont and Linda Vista testimony. Trying to place all three of those exactly so that we don’t have to worry about huge chunks of population. Instead of getting rid of Linda Mesa. <i>Dai</i> – It might be easier to move the LGBT community to CNSAND. <i>A</i> – Concern is that the area is very densely populated and the deviation. We are able to address some of these issues in the CD, but with the bigger district we were able to address it better. <i>Ontai</i> – Should I still give input about how to address these areas? <i>A</i> – Some of these changes are too large but any input you want to give is accepted. <i>Ancheta</i> – Is it the API that is | Move Linda Vista into LMSAND and check shape files to put LGBT community (College West area) into CNSAND |

| | | | |
|-------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | coming from the northern district? <i>A</i> – Last meeting we were told to take Linda Vista out of CNSAND, and we were following neighborhood layer. <i>Dai</i> – Claremont is not split? <i>A</i> – Not split. <i>Dai</i> – Linda Vista is not in a coastal district. Swap Linda Vista into LMSAND and move rest of API community into CNSAND. Please check the shape files. <i>Blanco</i> – If it doesn't work, we need a backup plan. <i>FW</i> – If that can't be done, then the commission is satisfied with areas we have here. <i>Parvenu</i> – I share <i>Ontai</i> 's concern about wanting to see things along the street level. In San Diego and LA the street level is very important. | |
| CNSAN | | <i>DG</i> – I don't know how comfortable I feel with too much going on offline because I don't want things being greatly shifted around offline. | |
| RCHMM | | <i>Ward</i> – Why didn't we bring this to the coast for compactness? <i>DG</i> – We discussed this last time. | ok |
| NCSAN | | <i>Blanco</i> – I think this district addresses many complex concerns we have heard, I am happy with this. <i>Ontai</i> – I am too. <i>FW</i> – Is Vista split? How much is in the other district? <i>Dai</i> – Was it for population? <i>A</i> - Yes. Split is 25k people. <i>Dai</i> – Vista was wanted by Escondido, San Marcos, and also by Encinitas. <i>FW</i> – Is there another way we can cut it where the Vista is whole? <i>Raya</i> – There is significant testimony linking Vista to Oceanside corridor, maybe more than San Marcos | Look at testimony re: Vista and see if you can move it around and make a more favorable split |
| MURTM | | <i>Ontai</i> – Looks good. | ok |
| STHOC | | <i>Ward</i> – We heard some explanations for links of Laguna Woods with Laguna Hills. <i>A</i> – There is a small portion of Lake Forest that is currently in. <i>Dai</i> – Does it make more sense to split Lake Forest more and put Laguna Woods in? <i>Dai</i> – It is under populated so you might be able to work with deviation a bit. | Consider adding Laguna Woods and <i>FW</i> will work with <i>Ward</i> on Lake Forest. |
| CSTOC | Irvine is split at 5. | <i>Blanco</i> – We talked about this split, and it is the businesses along the 5, they aren't residential areas. | ok |
| WESTC | | <i>Ward</i> – Costa Mesa being in brings a compactness issue for me. <i>A</i> – We thought Costa Mesa should maybe be split a different place. <i>Ward</i> – There was COI testimony from Huntington that maybe they want to be with Costa Mesa. <i>FW</i> – Wondering if some of Costa Mesa is more connected to the Wetlands there, maybe it can move up to where the finger is. Split the bottom instead of the top. <i>DG</i> – What is that finger population above Costa Mesa? <i>Ward</i> – If we take Laguna Woods from CSTOC, then we can add population from Costa Mesa into CSTOC. <i>DG</i> – There is a military place in Seal Beach? How linked is the military station to that area? <i>Ward</i> – Yes it is connected to Seal Beach and Los Alamitos. <i>Raya</i> – The split of Costa Mesa in the southern part makes more sense from a socioeconomic standpoint too. <i>Ward</i> – Having read all the public comment for this area, there was a lot of comment about Irvine being with | Split the bottom of Costa Mesa instead of the top. |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|
| | | coastal area and we have read and understand it but cannot accommodate it. | |
| SNANA | Picked up Orange Crush. | <i>Blanco</i> – I think it looks more compact and travels less distance. <i>A</i> – Includes portion of Anaheim, Orange Crush area of Orange, portion of Garden Grove and most of Santa Ana (except for Little Saigon). <i>Ward</i> – I have reservations about this district but will wait for our legal counsel. | ok |
| TUSTO | Anaheim Hills is split. Orange is split. Irvine is split. Tiny piece of Lake Forest is here. | <i>Dai</i> – If we didn’t include Orange Crush, would the LCVAP be below 50? <i>A</i> – If you want us to look at it, we can. <i>Dai</i> – Some people said connect Central Anaheim and Garden Grove. <i>FW</i> – I don’t know if it would really change, when we added Orange Crush, did it change the LCVAP? <i>A</i> – By adding it we had to take out some other areas and I think it raised it a little. <i>Ward</i> – Mayor of Orange testified to not divide the city. There are citizens writing in how they have been sliced into multiple districts and how that was detrimental. The mayor said there was a place to split it but that was not preferable. Is there a version that does not split Orange? <i>A</i> – We presented the option without Orange Crush last Friday. | ok |
| ANAFI | Anaheim is split. | | |
| DBRYL | Deviation is over currently | <i>FW</i> – Given population, La Habra Heights with La Habra? <i>A</i> – We need to work out the border with Folsom too. <i>Dai</i> – The COI also included Hacienda Heights which is probably too big. <i>Yao</i> – Can we try to narrow the deviation? <i>A</i> – We think the problem might be on this layer and we think we have this fixed. | |
| | SO CAL SDs | | |
| ISAND | Coachella Valley whole, Imperial County, Eastern San Diego county. | <i>Blanco</i> – What is the CVAP? <i>A</i> – 28%. <i>Dai</i> - Isn’t there a problem putting East county here due to testimony? <i>A</i> – It seems like there were issues with nesting in San Diego and this was trying to go on direction given at the hearing. <i>Blanco</i> – I think this is a hodgepodge of a lot of different interests. We took painstaking time to put agriculture communities together of Imperial and East Coachella but now there is rural San Diego there and I don’t have a suggestion yet but I look at it as being problematic for fair representation. <i>Dai</i> – I thought we were going to nest East Coachella’s AD with West Coachella’s AD. I didn’t think we had abandoned nesting. <i>FW</i> – I thought the same, so that we would not have three counties in one SD. <i>Dai</i> – Can we look at assemblies again? I think we will be able to nest most. <i>A</i> – We have an odd number of districts in San Diego and the question becomes where to put the population. <i>Barabba</i> – If we don’t do this, we have to combine 2 San Diego districts with OC districts. <i>FW</i> – Look at nesting COACH with BBCOH, keeping desert together. MURTM with ISAND or Rainbow Valley district? <i>Dai</i> – We had talked about blending to keep more of San Diego together and more of OC together. <i>DG</i> – If you took top of Banning/Beaumont and match it with ISAND, take East San Diego from ISAND and put it into MURTM | Change this to not include Eastern San Diego? Commission did not like this visualization. |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>district and also into NESAN. Take out Eastern San Diego and blend the rest together. <i>Yao</i> – I think Imperial county is driving this. There are a lot of COIs and if we let Imperial county drive the other districts that is a bad idea. The only way Imperial can move is to West or North. We have to accept that they have to go some place. <i>Dai</i> – We should just nest those 2 together. <i>FW</i> – Nest at AD level for Riverside county. <i>Dai</i> – E and W Coachella. Riverside whole. Blending MURTM and East San Diego county district. <i>FW</i> – Blending based on COI in San Diego. <i>Raya</i> – This is an opportunity to be really artistic. I could not find a way to nest. What was going to make for fair and effective representation that it is just so stretched out. <i>Ontai</i>- I agree with <i>Raya</i>, it is difficult. San Diego has 3 million people. <i>Dai</i> – I think you can nest mostly in Riverside and you can't abandon it. <i>A</i> – Partial nesting and non-nesting complicate things. There are some districts here that are nested. <i>Ontai</i> – Do you think there is a solution here? <i>A</i> – This is one solution, one might be to go to OC, and one might be to go through other side of San Diego. If we go into OC, there are ripple effects. One thing could be to keep all the smaller rural communities together... <i>Ward</i> – What about this configuration works against fair representation? <i>FW</i> – We had that discussion, <i>Blanco</i> addressed that. <i>Dai</i> – Is the preference to join population through the coast of through Murrieta corridor? Join through Riverside or through OC coast?</p> | |
| CSTIV | Some of the overpopulation here will move into Long Beach. | <p><i>FW</i> – If we gave you the flexibility, that could keep the OC/LA border fixed? <i>A</i> – Where it stands right now the idea was to go into Long Beach. <i>Dai</i> – There was testimony connecting Dana Point, San Clemente and San Juan Capistrano. If mappers went up the coast and grabbed all three communities that wouldn't be the worst thing in the world.</p> | |
| POMSB | Same as before, nested | | ok |
| WSTAN | | <p><i>A</i> – There is no nesting partner on the other side which is why we reconfigured the district to include as much of OC as possible.</p> | |
| SB | | <p><i>A</i> – We were restricted by Pomona Section 2 so <i>FW</i> – This puts Adelanto back in, which is good representation of what we talked about in AD. <i>Yao</i> – Are the streets the same in AD for Rancho Cucamonga split? <i>A</i> – Yes.</p> | |
| | SO CAL CDs | | |
| COACH | No change | | |
| PRS | | <p><i>FW</i> – Direction was to look at pulling Temecula into the district.</p> | |
| SBRIA | Prior option 2, lost pop in RVMVN district. | <p><i>FW</i> – Direction was to go south, Highland San Bernardino boundary that got crossed. <i>A</i> – In the process of drawing out we had to take some pop from ONTPM. INMSB became over populated and we took Highland there to make up. <i>FW</i> – My concerns: Eastvale split. Norco is split from Corona and Eastvale. <i>Dai</i> – I think you can move</p> | <p><i>Dai</i> – Move San Jacinto and Hemet into PRS and move Beaumont/Banning into desert district. <i>FW</i> – You could take</p> |

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | line up from Eastvale which can be corrected, I see the problem here, where do Highland and Redlands go... <i>GM</i> – Is there a possibility to swap btw Riverside/Moreno and San Bernardino so that Highland is more connected to its east neighbor. Like Yucaipa. Like an E/W orientation up there. <i>A</i> – We could go counter clockwise through Ontario/Pomona. Pick up Eastvale and Norco or unincorporated areas to west to make up what we would be losing from Highlands. <i>GM</i> – I agree that I have a lot of concerns about this but I think we only have a few options. <i>FW</i> – You are disenfranchising a small city. <i>Dai</i> – I thought the other direction. <i>A</i> - We could try; there just are not as many pop centers. <i>FW</i> – If we put Highland and Mentone with Yucaipa... I'm trying to see where it got over populated before. <i>A</i> - We could go into Banning Beaumont. <i>FW</i> – That makes more sense to go with Yucaipa. Keep Redlands/Highland together. <i>Blanco</i> – This is based on because we are taking this district, the SBRIA making it a Section 2 instead of ONTPM. <i>FW</i> – Did you make visualizations for option 1? <i>A</i> – We were focusing on those two districts. We were asked to draw out 2 Section 2 districts and we have that visualization. <i>Dai</i> – My other idea was San Jacinto Valley, there might be a way to rotate the pop around there, also I agree with <i>Blanco</i> , maybe going back to the first option. <i>GM</i> – Can we provide general direction at this 4 corners swap and do some other exploration on the other option. Can we look at both? <i>FW</i> – <i>Dai</i> and I can work with Alex off line to get this worked out. | Perris or Corona, put Norco and Corona back together. |
| MMRHB | | <i>Blanco</i> – What is the finger on top of Poway? <i>Ontai</i> – City limits, a wild animal park. <i>FW</i> – I am concerned about Laguna Nigel split. <i>GM</i> – I have similar concerns about it going south but can you also make it whole? <i>A</i> – If we want it in OC, we'd probably have to split some cities in San Diego. If we want it in its entirety in San Diego we'd also have to split some cities in San Diego. No splits in N San Diego currently | Try to make Laguna Nigel whole but not as important as where it is. |
| IMSAND | | <i>A</i> – Barrio Logan was reunited in San Diego. | ok |
| CHNCS | | <i>A</i> – Altered district to include EQ CA lines for LGBT COI. Changed split of El Cajon. <i>Dai</i> – Did you find small split of Rancho Santa Fe? | Correct split of Rancho Santa Fe if possible. |
| CSTSN | | | |
| STHOC | Anaheim Hills is split from Anaheim. | | |
| SNANA | | | |
| OCCST | Includes Seal Beach | <i>Parvenu</i> – With OCCST where is the Long Beach line? <i>Ward</i> – We have ignored a lot of the testimony from North OC in these districts. <i>FW</i> – Why is the Long Beach port split from Long Beach, there isn't much population there? | |
| | | <i>GM</i> – I don't want to give much feedback as we get closer to LA border without seeing LA's districts. <i>A</i> – We explored putting greater Little Saigon with Garden Grove and | |

| | | | |
|-------|---|--|--|
| | | Westminster but it created a big population problem. That was very difficult to do | |
| LHBYL | | A – This was dealing with overpopulation to the north, when Claremont and upland got in, added Chino here. GM – I am glad Hacienda Heights is connected | |
| | LA ADs | | |
| LAAVV | | Dai – City Splits? N – Oak Hills is split. FW – Natural border with Oak Hills, since it is non-contiguous. Dai – This keeps Lancaster/Palmdale together and matches it with other communities. FW – We recognize that Adelanto is part of Victor Valley but there weren't many other places to get population. | |
| LASCV | Simi Valley whole, Santa Susana, most of Chatsworth (split), Castaic. | DG – Chatsworth, Porter Ranch and Granada Hills want to be together, hopefully in SD. Dai- Sometimes those were with Simi Valley and Moor Park | |
| LASFV | Granada Hills is split. | Blanco – We got testimony for Tujunga to be with La Crescenta but I see that we can't do it for population. What they were asking for with those three cities together was a large population. | |
| LASFW | Burbank is split, Encino is split. | GM – Burbank city split info? We got some testimony about where it could be split. Parvenu – Does that capture the Burbank airport? We don't want to split the airport from the city. FW – There is a split of that entertainment area. Dai – Look at COI testimony for split in Burbank and look at possibility of ... N – There is a slightly different option for keeping Burbank whole. DG – We are looking at all of these in one option. | Look at testimony of where to split Burbank. Bring in triangle of airport to make it whole. |
| LAVSF | | Yao – Reseda was split previously, are they whole now? N – Yes. FW – Bell Canyon finally gets to be with Valley. Good fix of the valley, Nicole. | ok |
| LAMWS | | Forbes – UCLA? Barabba – In the district below. | |
| LAWSC | | GM – Are Venice and Santa Monica split? N – LA Beach communities have been split here. | |
| LAIHG | Inglewood district. Gardena split at Rosecrans as per API community | | |
| LAPVB | | | |
| LALBS | San Pedro, the ports, Long Beach, but part is split. Long Beach is split 2 times here. Includes Long Beach triangle of Compton. | | |
| LAWBC | Vermont Vista, Compton, | Parvenu – I am very pleased with these. These reflect the Unity map. GM – There are | |

| | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|
| | Carson, Wilmington. | refinements but as a potential base you have come a long way. | |
| LAVSQ | Exposition Park, Vermont Knolls, Florence-Graham, Florence-Firestone, Gramercy Place. | | |
| LADNT | Koreatown, Commerce, Bell, Pico-Union, Little Tokyo, Maywood. | <i>GM</i> – This is a long district but within the district you have several strong COIs. SE cities, API communities. | |
| LAWSG | South Pasadena split was corrected; more of El Monte was picked up. | | |
| LAELA | East LA | <i>GM</i> – If there are city splits will you mention them? <i>K</i> – Yes. | |
| LAGVP | La Crescenta-Montrose, Los Feliz, Hollywood Hills split, Thaitown, East Hollywood. | | |
| LASGF | Pasadena is split. | <i>GM</i> – Pasadena split? <i>N</i> – Currently is based on population and is in N because S would not have been as clean looking. Split is 10057 ppl in with Glendale. <i>Raya</i> – Boundary there? Along the Arroyo ok. | |
| LACVN | West Covina is split. | <i>GM</i> – Unity map has very similar lines. Do they split West Covina as well? <i>N</i> – No. | |
| LAPRW | Most of Montebello, most of Pico Rivera, Hacienda Heights, La Habra Heights, Whittier, La Mirada. | | |
| LADNN | Bell Gardens, part of Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Cerritos, Artesia, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens | | |
| LASGL | | | |
| | | 2 nd option | |
| LASGL | All SE cities together. | | |
| LADNT | Maywood and Bell taken out. | | |
| LADNN | Bellflower included. | <i>GM</i> – A variety of COI testimony that ties these cities together, we have been trying to figure out the right balance. | |
| LALBS | Still with both ports but | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | split San Pedro. | | |
| LACVN | Avocado Heights and Monrovia moved out. This helps keep Burbank and Pasadena whole. Glendora is back into district and Monrovia is with Foothills. | Option 3 | |
| LAWSC | Miracle Mile with Hancock Park | | |
| | Splitting through LA COI three ways. Jewish temples now united | | |
| LADNN | Hawaiian Gardens and Lakewood now with Long Beach. | | |
| | | <i>Nicole</i> – Please explain which COIs you want to preserve. <i>FW</i> – Of three options only one has the ports separate. <i>N</i> – Yes, like splits in Burbank, splitting Hollywood COI, splitting Pasadena, keeping SE cities together. <i>FW</i> – Ok so that is gist of what direction we will be making. <i>Barabba</i> – Silver Lake going with ELA. | Silver Lake going with ELA |
| General Discussion about the above presented options | | <i>Barabba</i> – My impression was that these three options could be mixed and matched. <i>FW</i> – Correct. <i>Barabba</i> – For me, option 3 where Burbank and Pasadena were not split seemed the best and ports are separated. <i>DG</i> – Should we start with this option and ask people for areas of concern and see if they can be addressed here? <i>FW</i> – It respects Torrance area, airport with Inglewood, seems to be consistent with COI. <i>Ancheta</i> – I’m concerned of overconcentration of Latino pop. <i>Dai</i> – Can we use this as a starting point? <i>GM</i> – Option 3 and 1 were what I liked. Split in Pico Rivera, share concerns about over concentration. <i>DG</i> – If we keep outer frame out much flexibility do we have to address the high number of Latinos? <i>N</i> – We could have some E/W configuration. <i>Blanco</i> – In 1 I had problems with Artesia and Cerritos with SE. <i>N</i> – It is possible to swap with Alex’s region. We can do more if we are willing to split. <i>Yao</i> – I don’t think having Artesia and Cerritos should be there either. <i>Barabba</i> – Another thing to do is look at neighborhood boundaries. <i>Forbes</i> – I wouldn’t want us to overpopulate a district. If we are going to increase Latino population anywhere than it needs to be from central districts that need to be reduced. <i>Ward</i> – Keep county line hard. <i>Dai</i> – I thought Buena Park, Artesia and Cerritos COI could go across border. I think that is equal with county line. <i>Blanco</i> – LASGL option 3 is at 71 percent, and LAWBC Latino | Option 3 preferred Move Artesia and Cerritos out into La Palma’s district, they also said they have an interest with Buena Park. Possibility of moving Lynwood out of LASGL into Compton/Carson district, Paramount also listed as possibility to go into Compton/Carson. If moving Lynwood is really difficult, we can keep concentration of Latino |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>CVAP drops to 38. That seems to me like natural to unpack and put more pop in this district to the west. <i>N</i> – Like Lynwood in there? <i>Blanco</i> – SE cities people said Lynwood could go to Compton/Carson. <i>DG</i> – I think we don't need the hard line on the county level, as we tried to do that in San Diego and had to break it many times. <i>FW</i> – This commission likes option 3? And then we can work on the nuances? <i>Blanco</i> – I need to point out that in all three options we have split up coastal corridor by going from Westchester out to the coast. We have significant testimony saying that beach communities should not be split and that they do not feel they belong with a district going east (El Segundo and coastal Westchester don't want to go east). <i>FW</i>- But Westchester also wanted to be with Playa del Rey and they are and that Santa Monica considers itself South Bay. <i>GM</i>- We have competing COI here. Westchester needs to be linked with Playa del Rey and Playa Vista. <i>DG</i> – It looks like you built all of these with the hard line intact. Can you see if we do something with moving this around, can we link those places as a unit (Westchester, Playas) break from Inglewood and go down the coast? <i>N</i> – The option is to break up Inglewood and Westchester? <i>DG</i> – Yes. <i>Parvenu</i> – The reason this does appeal to me is keeping the Westchester and Playas together, you keep the environmental COI, E/W corridor in El Segundo that links to places East. I think we should take into consideration all the work and COI that went into this. <i>Yao</i> – In terms of separating El Segundo and Inglewood from Westchester, you'd have to push some of Long Beach into Orange County. El Segundo with airport is not out of line. <i>Blanco</i> – I stand corrected, looking at the recent emails about this, people were complaining about a previous iteration that had a sliver, now that their communities of concern are connected, I think it is ok. <i>GM</i> – Think about orienting Venice toward the north. Santa Monica and Venice have been referenced in the same breath. <i>N</i>- Moving Venice with Santa Monica would mean picking up Miracle Mile into LAWSC. Another shift would be to pickup Westwood. <i>Forbes</i> – I would choose Miracle Mile. <i>GM</i> – I agree. I think Venice is more flexible. <i>Blanco</i> – I don't like adjoining districts where one has Latino CVAP that is really high and one is a lot lower, so looking at Lynwood. <i>N</i> – Moving Lynwood in would be a significant difference, it would separate SE cities from themselves. <i>Dai</i> – What about Paramount into Compton/Carson district? <i>Blanco</i> – I think it is a feat to keep all SE cities in one AD, and we can keep them together in SD and CD. <i>N</i>- Artesia and Cerritos could go with OC? <i>GM</i> – This area has clear and consistent testimony that the SE cities wanted to be whole and together. Even in face of COI, the local community is describing themselves in these terms. <i>Brown</i> – I would still say they are over-concentrated. <i>Forbes</i> – If you move Artesia and Cerritos into OC, that part is diluting the LCVAP and that number is going to go up. <i>FW</i> – The realization is that we have a concentration of</p> | <p>CVAP.</p> <p>Would like to see options; what would option with Lynwood mean? What would split in Downey mean?</p> <p>Try splitting Downey (Firestone Blvd.)</p> <p><i>Parvenu</i> will give advice about where to split Downey if needed.</p> <p>Why is Hacienda Heights in LAPRW and not with Walnut/Diamond Bar? This is an option</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Latino pop, which is where they live; we aren't doing this on purpose. If we are going to less concentrate these districts by putting inconsistent cities in there... <i>GM</i> – Just to remind the commission, we looked at over concentration here not long ago, what we saw was the dramatic impacts of bringing those percentages down, we are going to have one or two districts that are more concentrated than we prefer but we are really hemmed in on both sides. <i>Raya</i> – If it means putting not like minded communities together, I think we should just go with what we have. <i>Ancheta</i> – If an area is segregated it doesn't mean you couldn't have intentional segregation. There are other sources of liability you have to be concerned about. <i>Raya</i> – We aren't creating these circumstances. <i>Parvenu</i> – Downey does not want to be split. <i>DG</i> – If splitting Downey solves two or three other things than maybe we should do it. <i>Blanco</i> – Especially if we have a potential Section 2, then I don't think we can keep trying to elevate cities over section 2. <i>Parvenu</i> – Is Downey whole in SD and CD? Then 2 out of 3 isn't bad. <i>GM</i> – I would like to see options; what would option with Lynwood mean? What would split in Downey mean?</p> | |
| LASGL / LADNN | | <p><i>Blanco</i> – Artesia and Cerritos do not belong with Norwalk and Downey. We already have a problem with this. <i>Forbes</i> – But what about the increasing Latino concentration? <i>Blanco</i> – I'm not talking about that yet, I'm talking about these areas that do not feel connected to core of LA and there is no COI testimony to support this. <i>DG</i> – To <i>Forbes</i>' concern, it might be a more E/W type of district. <i>Forbes</i> – In regards to VRA, I would be reluctant to take Artesia and Cerritos out. <i>Ancheta</i> – Unless we lock in at this point, we've run out of time. We'll have to change scheduling. <i>GM</i> - If Q2 explores Lynwood and moving Artesia, Cerritos, if those don't work out well, can you live with this? <i>Blanco</i> – We have testimony saying Lynwood and Compton are a community. <i>Ward</i> – I have concerns that mirror <i>Forbes</i>' concern about Artesia and Cerritos together. <i>Yao</i> – VRA is issue we are addressing, splitting Downey or moving Downey into that highly concentrated district will probably make the most impact. I don't think we have any choice but to do that. <i>Parvenu</i> – I agree with <i>Yao</i>, even with the testimony because that seems like a logical step to take at this point. Downey is not that much unlike cities to the west. If we are keeping it whole in other. <i>Dai</i> – Why is Hacienda Heights in LAPRW and not with Walnut/Diamond Bar? This is an option. Also, Whittier with La Habra Heights and La Habra was in testimony. <i>K</i> – That might ripple up to Pasadena and Burbank splits.</p> | No specific direction but possible options listed above |
| LASGF/ SBCUC | | <p><i>Yao</i> – Include National Forest all in one district, or as much as possible.</p> | Include National Forest all in one district, or as much as possible. |

| | LA SDs | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Simi Valley and Santa Clarita districts | | <i>DG</i> – When you get down to Pacific Palisades, Bel Air and Malibu, that is too far. Malibu up to Santa Clarita, people didn't like. But Malibu with Calabasas, Agoura Hills. I think that Simi Valley and Moor Park wouldn't ever consider being with Malibu. <i>GM</i> – CAPAFR map submission approach is creating coastal district from Malibu to Rolling Hills. <i>DG</i> – Isolating E Ventura that has to go somewhere... <i>GM</i> – By the time you get further down, and join cities inland I think there is arguably more of a community there. <i>Barabba</i> – We did a good job keeping SFV whole and now it looks like it got split up. <i>DG</i> – Try to put E Ventura with SFV? E Ventura going to Malibu is bad. <i>Dai</i> – It seems like we need a clockwise rotation all the way through. <i>K</i> – We really need to talk about OC, Long Beach and San Diego. <i>GM</i> – Once we get to LA proper, that may also impact and help direction in the North side. | E Ventura all the way to Malibu and Bel Air is bad. A lot of public testimony received about this. |
| LASGF | | | ok |
| LACVN | East Pasadena is made whole | <i>Blanco</i> – In first draft this was at 57 percent Latino CVAP and now it is at 45. We are going to need to discuss what we changed here from the previous, given also that there is polarized voting here. <i>N</i> – Previously Covina was nested to south; LACVN (old version) went from Irwindale to La Mirada. <i>K</i> – In the last version we had 4 that were over 50 and we improved these numbers overall. | |
| LAPRW | Includes Artesia and Cerritos. | | |
| LAWBC | SE cities with Compton/Carson | <i>GM</i> – Hybrid nesting? A blending? Did you try two E/W districts from LAWBC and LAVSQ? <i>N</i> – With guidance about the COI breaks that would be possible. <i>Barabba</i> – Why didn't you nest here? <i>N</i> – I didn't want to split the COI. <i>Barabba</i> – It might be interesting to see what the nested district would look like. <i>Parvenu</i> – I understand what <i>GM</i> is saying but there is more affiliation with N/S communities, in terms of institutions, activities, I don't know if an E/W orientation works for me. I think what we see here is my preference. | |
| LALBS | | | |
| EXTRA CONCERNS | | <i>FW</i> – We gave permission earlier to alter Riverside/San Diego border at Temecula and South OC/ San Diego. <i>Ancheta</i> – RPV analysis on Kings was inconclusive so Kings is not a Section 2. | RPV analysis on Kings was inconclusive so Kings is not a Section 2. |