

**JULY 9, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, note taker: K.Kubas**

Short hand for speakers -  
*GM*: Commissioner Galambos Malloy  
*FW*: Commissioner Filkins Webber  
*N*: Nicole Boyle  
*K*: Karin Mac Donald

IDENTIFIER	DESCRIPTION	NOTES/QUESTIONS	FINAL DIRECTIONS
	<b><i>LA SDs</i></b>		
EVENT, LALBS, LAPVB	Eastern Ventura is with Topanga, Malibu, Reseda, all the way to Sherman Oaks, stops at Santa Monica border	<p><i>Barabba</i> – The issues that have been raised have merit and I look at what you forced into because of shifts of population, you had to cut the rest of the AD, it seems like we have paid a pretty heavy price to take that pop. That was shifted down south. <i>Aguirre</i>- The discussion yesterday, previous visualizations had shown Santa Clarita with East Ventura. It seems if possible if we could look at that iteration or provide direction for mappers to do that again and rotate population in a clockwise fashion so we could get to some of <i>Barabba</i>'s concerns about SFV. <i>Parvenu</i> – Can I see exactly where the boundaries were? Good, they do coincide with the neighborhood councils. <i>GM</i> – The testimony we are getting from the public about connecting coastal to inland pop is important. I have seen strong proposals coming from the public that take the west side of LA and going from Malibu and doing a coastal district going all the way down the coast, to what extent did you consider that and where did you get into trouble? I would like to unite more S. Bay cities than we were able to do at the AD. <i>K</i> – Malibu issue we can fix no matter what, there will be tradeoffs in north. Long Beach / Orange district would have to happen if you want Thousand Oaks and Santa Clarita. <i>Blanco</i> – And SFV issue that <i>Barabba</i> brought up? That ESFV isn't connected to WSFV? Pacoima. <i>N</i> – I could try to draw it more up, it would be harder to describe ripple effects for me currently than in the ADs but I can be prepared for that on Mon or Tue. We can't change much around those LA districts. We can shift further down and bring in more of Lomita area and removing Cerritos and Artesia will also affect what is happening in the NE corner. <i>Dai</i> – We have an essentially immovable block of districts in the center, because of VRA, so this requires a rotation of pop</p>	<p>Connect N/S access leading to LA port in LALBS. And keep port connected to San Pedro.</p> <p>(putting Compton/Carson district with the port)</p> <p>Look at AAARC/Unity map in SW portion of LA</p> <p>Separate EVENT (Santa Clarita with E Vent.) and put Santa Monica with LAPVB</p> <p>Look at ESFV as per <i>Barabba</i>'s comments.</p> <p>Look at splitting Westchester at Lincoln Blvd, 1 or 105.</p> <p>Consider putting airport not with Inglewood on SD level</p>

clockwise or counter clockwise and hard line between OC and Long Beach or OC and San Diego so there are only so many places where we have been given permission to let the population flow. We would strand part of pop in the North if we do what the public is suggesting this morning. We should allow Q2 more of these gates to allow population to flow through. I am very uncomfortable with Beach cities SD. *K* – There was some reference about some solutions that other groups had made, but those districts also radically changed things up north. I think we are pretty comfortable with what we have achieved with section 5 and section 2 and that constrains us. We need to know if it is essential for us to put E Ventura with Santa Clarita even if it causes problems other places. We will be able to fix coastal area. *GM* – Splitting Westchester along Lincoln, 1 or 105 which would bring that line of skinny beach eastward. *Barabba* – My question is, if you moved E Vent. Into Santa Clarita, would that help better combine SD in SFV? Pacoima to West Hollywood is quite a stretch. I would support E Vent. with Santa Clarita, to help the SD in SFV. *Ancheta* – Polarized voting analysis didn't support section 2 in Kings, but it is section 5, which isn't that different. *Parvenu* – I agree with *GM*'s suggestion regarding sliver of beach near Westchester. But airport is west of Lincoln so you would be moving airport to west... I think there are some reasons to keep that sliver of beach, environmental, etc. My concern is shifting airport west is not good. *Dai* – I think we need to be open to allowing airport to go elsewhere, we have received a number of public comments about Westchester wanting to be part of Del Rays and beach community. We should try to dignify that in another district. We should give our mappers leeway, satisfy VRA and listen to testimony. *GM* – I'd like to connect N/S access leading to port in LALBS. And keep port connected to San Pedro. *Blanco* – AARC map reflects that they are comfortable with the clusters and they have a lot of what we have talked about with the Valley and keeping the coastal, and it shifts clusters to N/S corridors. Please look at this map. *FW* – I agree with *Dai* about Westchester with that testimony, we can get rid of the beach sliver. I concur with E Vent. if we considering going with E/W for SFV, as per recommendations of *Barabba*, what happens to pop in Lancaster and how far does it push into San Bernardino. *K* – It is hard for us to know all of the ripple effects currently; there are too many moving parts. *K* – 180k people need to come out, before we pulled them from Victory Valley and Antelope Valley, can we have some leeway of where to pull them from? *All* – yes. *K* – Also, in the Unity maps, they had Covina with Pomona Valley and that was one of the bigger changes.

LAVSQ		<i>Parvenu</i> – Can we get an estimate of how this is going to change the African American numbers? <i>FW</i> – I think we will be seeing this in presentation next week, to see how she has balanced our concern with public testimony. <i>FW</i> – Airport with Inglewood in AD, <i>GM</i> mentioned putting Compton/Carson district with the port. <i>GM</i> – Competing testimony for where Westchester should go, competing testimony for where airport and port should go.	
LACVN		<i>K</i> – We could put East Pasadena in and take San Marino out. <i>Raya</i> – San Marino has a broader interest with being northern communities.	San Marino with communities north, Pasadena, etc.
RIVMV		<i>Blanco</i> – Possible Section 2. Yesterday it went very fast. In AD, one was over 50 and the other was close to 50. <i>Dai</i> – I think the labels are in the wrong area.	
	<b>LA CDs</b>		
AVSCV	Split in Lancaster, Quartz Hill is slightly split.	<i>Parvenu</i> – Where is Lancaster split? There is a train track that separates E/W; I just want to see N/S street. <i>N</i> – This was a population exchange with the North; it would have to be with Ventura or through San Bernardino.	Clean up Quartz Hill split
SFVWC	Porter Ranch is split.	<i>FW</i> – Beverly Hills connection to the valley? If we had to consider keeping Beverly Hills with Westwood and West LA, where could we get pop. for this district? <i>N</i> – Studio City. <i>FW</i> – That would be consistent with COI about keeping Studio City with Sherman Oaks. <i>Blanco</i> – By going too far into LA, the West Valley would be dominated by LA politically. <i>N</i> – The swap isn't quite even so we'd have to go further down into Hollywood Hills who has a COI around managing fire around Griffith Park. <i>FW</i> – Is that community whole at a different level? <i>Blanco</i> – I think this area is with Griffith Park in the AD. Fire is more of a local issue. <i>Parvenu</i> – Maybe come into Universal City for an even swap? <i>K</i> – It is better to take Toluca Lake than Universal City. <i>All</i> – ok!	Take out Beverly Hills and put in Studio City, Toluca Lake.
SFVET			
WLADT		<i>GM</i> – What if we took Santa Monica and coastal communities on the side and sent them north and refigured inland communities? If we kept coastal side and maybe E of the 405 or West LA and inland, more of a piece there? <i>Forbes</i> – Move E line of that district and move it west, shorten it up. <i>FW</i> – We would be running into airport again. <i>Raya</i> – Can we scrunch the Eastern corner of it? Like moving the line above View Park-Windsor Hills (below 10 freeway) and	Look at fixing how Santa Monica Mountains people have different interests than Mid-City people.  You can try to move Miracle

		<p>moving it North. <i>FW</i> – Miracle Mile has nothing in common with Inglewood. <i>Parvenu</i> – My objection to moving that line up, we are creating a near finger. You want to keep the areas that are there together (Mid-City, Miracle Mile, Crestview) there is a lot of E/W transit there. I prefer this option than dipping down further on the coastal side. <i>GM</i> – When I look at the Crenshaw area, I could see dropping down the northern border of the Inglewood district to make more of an E/W district. <i>Parvenu</i> – I think that I would disagree; that would put Baldwin Hills and Crenshaw with places West that it doesn't have things in common with. I think the current boundary is good, it can't go up into the Koreatown sphere of influence <i>Raya</i> – E of the 405 works...<i>FW</i> – Do you have some idea of how to fix this? We are fine with Malibu and the west side of this. Do you have some suggestions and we can tell you yes or no? <i>N</i> – If we take Calabasas out, we could group this area with Glendale and Burbank. The other option is Long Beach/Orange. <i>K</i> – But we would also need permission to move a ripple through the LA area. <i>Forbes</i> – I think there is a lot of testimony that Calabasas belong with Santa Monica Mountains and the trade-off is too much. <i>Dai</i> – I think if you look at who gave the testimony, there were residents who identified with WSFV. Other people not from there were always putting them with the mountains. <i>Barabba</i> – If Mid-City and Miracle Mile would they go West? <i>Parvenu</i> – There is a lot of E/W transit in that area. I think we should leave as is. <i>Barabba</i> – I agree. <i>FW</i> – It's true, population goes west. <i>Parvenu</i> – And the 10 freeway if a unifier. I think we are going to have to wait and see what we hear. I think there is a significantly different pop in that block. Population in West/Mid Downtown is different from Santa Monica Mountains. <i>Blanco</i> – I agree, it's not a question of whether they have transit to the Westside, but it is about fair representation. It's not just this area; downtown is linked all the way. Downtown to Malibu... there are low income and immigrants in that downtown area, I don't think those people are going to be fairly represented there. <i>Dai</i> – Consider Brentwood, Bel Air? A clockwise rotation. <i>FW</i> – Then where do you put Mid-City? <i>K</i> – Can we split Hollywood if we need to? <i>FW</i> – It is big. <i>Raya</i> – I think in the CD that would not be a problem. <i>Forbes</i> – You don't gain enough pop in Brentwood and Bel Air. <i>N</i> – Could I try to move Mid-City and Miracle Mile north? <i>FW</i> – Yes.</p>	<p>Mile and Mid-City north.</p> <p>Don't move Inglewood district border north or south.</p>
IGWSG	Florence-Firestone, Exposition Park, Alondra Park, Gardena split at Rosecrans. Picked up	<p><i>Yao</i> – Is split in Gardena greater than population of El Segundo? <i>N</i> – Yes, would you like to swap Gardena with El Segundo? That is possible. <i>FW</i> – But the COI testimony is that El Segundo is coastal, not inland with Inglewood. <i>Yao</i> – If there is no interest in doing that, then leave it alone.</p>	

	Harvard and Hyde Park instead of Del Rays.		
PVEBC	Carson is split.	<p><i>FW</i> – Where is Carson split? Is the Cal State whole? It looks like it. <i>Blanco</i> – We can move on but I know that in talking yesterday with VRA counsel, there were concerns about Compton, Carson and Lynwood together. There are concerns with COMP district. <i>Dai</i> – This is a diverse district, it lets us go down to the port to keep transport corridor and keep other communities together we were not able to do before. Keeps beach cities together, respects API communities in West Carson and the Japanese community. <i>FW</i> – We can’t balance every COI at every level, I have socioeconomic concerns about Carson/Wilmington vs. Palos Verdes Estates. Maybe we want to rethink the airport? Spreading the port a bit more. If any commissioners might agree about looking at the larger picture. <i>Raya</i> –I agree, from the view of fair and effective representation. <i>Blanco</i> – Yes, I agree and want us to remember about the possible section 2 in COMP at this CD level. <i>Parvenu</i> – I don’t have any recommendation at this point but I know that I disagree with what is being discussed as alternative but I don’t have a response at this moment. <i>GM</i> – As I understood testimony related to the airport, there was a deep COI around Burbank airport and those issues are on the federal level. I would prioritize having airport connected to Inglewood on the CD level. <i>Parvenu</i> – I agree. <i>Blanco</i> – I also agree that airport matters most in CD. My point is that Compton/Carson is potential Section 2. <i>Yao</i> – The airport connected to the federal was my point as well. <i>GM</i> – We need to figure out how to move forward and there is uncertainty about how to navigate COMP district re: Section 2. Are we waiting for more info to move forward? <i>Ancheta</i> – Counsel’s advice was not specific. I have more concerns about overconcentration at the district nearby (Downtown, etc.). <i>Parvenu</i> – Is the direction to leave IBWSG as is? <i>Forbes</i> – There could be a swap of Inglewood with Downtown to address overconcentration problem. <i>GM</i> – It id “de-concentration” not “dilution”.</p>	
COVNA		<p><i>Dai</i> – Put South El Monte in to include with El Monte. Will bring up LCVAP.</p> <p><i>Blanco</i> – The airport needs to stay with Inglewood in CD. <i>FW</i> – I think that the airport could go either way. <i>Dai</i> – It seems like it is the airport or the ports. And with these concentrations, I think that we need flexibility. VRA is the higher priority.</p>	<p>De-concentrating ELABH, DOWNTOWN districts re: VRA.</p> <p>Flexibility on airport, ports, Cerritos/Artesia on OC border, COMP/Carson to ports.</p>

		<i>Parvenu</i> – Why would IGWSG need to change? <i>FW</i> – Because we might have to move airport and Westchester. <i>Parvenu</i> – I prefer the airport to be aligned with IGWSG. <i>GM</i> – We need to confirm with counsel about Section 2 in Compton/Carson district so that we know what legal requirements we will have to abide. <i>Ancheta</i> – Counsel was not firm on saying we had to draw it as Section 2, he said take a look at it. <i>K</i> – We will look at 50 percent plus CVAP while preserving COIs. <i>All</i> – yes.	Give leeway in looking at COMP, port COI in COMP and leeway on the airport, port.
Long Beach		<i>Barabba</i> and <i>FW</i> – Port needs to be with Long Beach. <i>Ward</i> – I agree, when you look at OC testimony, this boundary is tie for the most testimony. This district breaks up COI. Buena Park and Cypress have divergent interest, but Long Beach doesn't. <i>Dai</i> – Some testimony about Seal Beach and Long Beach, but not Huntington. Los Alamitos wants to stay in OC. I don't know if we have flexibility going north, this is being caused by the port and I don't think we can have it both ways. <i>Raya</i> – Did DG say yesterday that Seal Beach had a connection to Los Alamitos? <i>FW</i> – There is a naval base in Seal Beach. <i>Raya</i> – Is Lakewood whole in this district? <i>N</i> – It is split for population reasons. <i>Blanco</i> – COI are on the same level of county line in Prop 11 so in some situations, we compare a COI and sometimes they take precedence. <i>FW</i> – It is diminishing fair representation to have a small place like Rossmoor with LA. <i>Ward</i> – The OC line speaks loudly as a hard line. It is a COI. <i>Barabba</i> – I appreciate the need to try to honor the county line, but this would not be the first time we have done that.	Leniency with Seal Beach/Long Beach to see if that eases pressure for Los Alamitos/Rossmoor COI.  Flexibility at Cerritos/Artesia border.  Bring port into Long Beach district.
DWWTR	Parts of Lakewood.	<i>FW</i> – Consider putting South El Monte with Covina district. <i>Dai</i> – Pick up population with La Habra Heights, which has been associated with Whittier in testimony before.	South El Monte with Covina, you could pick up pop. In La Habra Heights.  Artesia and Cerritos together could be moved out if needed.
DOWNTOWN		<i>Dai</i> – 61 is not that bad. Unless you have a suggestion. <i>Ancheta</i> – I don't have a specific suggestion but COMP is at 40 so maybe there could be a population rotation there. <i>Dai</i> – Which argues for moving north for COMP. <i>Blanco</i> – Maybe there is possibility to take pop going E or N. <i>Ward</i> – Is compactness a concern when there are multiple Section 2 issues here? <i>Ancheta</i> – There are two compactness types: Gingles and the other. I think these look good. I don't think we have a compactness issue in these districts in my opinion. <i>Blanco</i> – Walnut Park as an option to rotate into COMP.	De-concentrating DOWNTOWN districts re: LCVAP – rotate population to even out the higher percentage districts.  <i>Blanco</i> – Walnut Park as option to rotate into COMP
ELABH	Melrose is northern	<i>Parvenu</i> – Silver Lake and west of Melrose LGBT community. And this also	Go to street level and make

	boundary	splits a Thai community, but their main center is together. This district might have to get wider. <i>GM</i> – Please make sure USC and surrounding area is whole and together.	USC and surrounding area whole.
SGMFH	ESFV. This splits Miracle Mile from part of Hancock Park.	<i>Raya</i> – Beverley Hills is going South and Studio City is coming out. <i>Dai</i> – Maybe make Glendale is whole. <i>FW</i> – This is all going to change when it picks up Claremont	Studio City out as per previous direction.  Make Glendale whole here.  Include Tujunga with La Crescenta (take it out of this district) and bring boundary approx to the 210.
COVINA	<i>N</i> – Picking up Claremont will fix some issues down south but the 49.77 LCVAP makes that not a viable option.	<i>N</i> – What communities in the Foothills can be split? Yao – We are trying to get this district above 50 percent right? So whatever we can do to make that happen. <i>Blanco</i> – It has to be over 50 percent? <i>Ancheta</i> - Yes, it hasn't been handed down as a decision yet, for it to be less. <i>Blanco</i> – We had a Section 2 policy to the extent that that helps some of these section 2s. I assume we have already done surname analysis to see if 49.77 is really 50. <i>K</i> - Since the CVAP understates, it is very possible that this is in reality over 50 percent. <i>Blanco</i> – Is it reasonable for us to declare that? <i>Ancheta</i> – We can do that. Could someone sue? Yes but it is unlikely that they will with this set of circumstances and this number. <i>Blanco</i> - I am inclined to go that way, because I think the statistics are undercounts. <i>Ancheta</i> – I think this is probably a Section 2. <i>Barabba</i> – I would be startled if any statistician said the real number was below 49.77. <i>Raya</i> - If we shave off some of the foothill (Glendora) and add South El Monte as was discussed previously, that should take care of that number.	Shave off some of the foothills/Glendora and add South El Monte, hopefully this will boost LCVAP
<b>LA CDs overall (Central LA)</b>		<i>Parvenu</i> – I see the reduction of a CD, what I see is a reduction of a CD serving central LA. Lots of problems (crime, lack of services, over-crowded schools), to reduce the core of this city to 2 CDs troubles me. If we can make that into 3 CDs, come up with a different configuration. <i>Blanco</i> – Have we reduced the number of CDs in LA? <i>Parvenu</i> – That is where the population is. <i>Blanco</i> – Are there fewer CDs in downtown? <i>Parvenu</i> – In central area; Inglewood, Compton, Downtown. That area geographically can support 3. <i>N</i> - We could shift up to the 10 and put in Gardena and Torrance. Shift NW of Inglewood district. <i>FW</i> – When we did this before we over-concentrated Latinos in center of LA. We are trying to balance some serious concerns here; we have had this discussion before. <i>Barabba</i> – I think the reality is that though	Look into drawing a third CD in the central LA area, mindful of overconcentration of Latinos in the core.

		the pop of LA of increased by 3, the Latino increased by 10 and the African American decreased by 8, and LA as a whole has decreased in compared to the state. <i>GM</i> – I am interested in exploring something along the lines that Nicole suggested and give her the idea of what borders could be used. We have to make sure that who we are linking up with on the east and Westside is a combination of COIs. I share some of the same concerns and we need to move forward on this now.	
	<b><i>Region 2: Riverside CDs</i></b>		
ONTM, RVMVN		<i>FW</i> -With Rubidoux and Mira Loma out, you can go south to pick up pop. Remove Highland, Loma Linda and Redlands and continue to pick up pop south, which pushes Perris into the district (consistent with COI), instead of splitting Corona. Then Temecula can go into PRS.	
	<b><i>Region 1: San Diego CDs</i></b>	Keep Barrio Logan whole.	
Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente		<i>Ward</i> – COI of San Clemente, Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano. My concern of the soft border of OC would be like the same issue with Marin. <i>N</i> – There is no place to move population; we’d have to bleed population into the 4 corners area. <i>Dai</i> – We know south OC wants to be with south OC, I think that the 4 corners could work but it is better to keep those cities together than splitting them off from each other. <i>FW</i> – There is flexibility in Chino. <i>Raya</i> – San Clemente has connection to Pendleton. <i>FW</i> – We are flowing down from districts where at other levels we are mixing things up. We are following a configuration at the assembly level that may not follow at the CD. <i>Dai</i> – Conflicting testimony of Chino with Chino Hills, I think that is flexible. Some city officials’ maps are in a San Diego district. <i>Ward</i> – We have been continuing to get COI from Orange of wanting to stay whole. Santa Ana and Anaheim are so big. <i>FW</i> – There is also testimony of Irvine from Laguna Woods, Laguna Niguel, there is a lot here that doesn’t need to be bound by Santa Ana/Anaheim on this level. <i>Dai</i> – I think that is right, trying to accommodate other COIs. <i>Blanco</i> – Little Saigon did not want to be with Santa Ana. We need to respect that as well. <i>Forbes</i> – There might be opportunity here to include greater Little Saigon. <i>Ward</i> – We haven’t heard as much from San Clemente, so if Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano need to be split from	COI testimony about putting Irvine with Tustin and North Tustin (look into it)  Not necessary to keep AD configuration with Santa Ana and Anaheim  Try to keep Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano with OC



		it that is okay.	
<b>LA CDs</b>		<p><i>Parvenu</i> – I see the reduction of a CD, what I see is a reduction of a CD serving central LA. Lots of problems (crime, lack of services, over-crowded schools), to reduce the core of this city to 2 CDs troubles me. If we can make that into 3 CDs, come up with a different configuration. <i>Blanco</i> – Have we reduced the number of CDs in LA? <i>Parvenu</i> – That is where the population is. <i>Blanco</i> – Are there fewer CDs in downtown? <i>Parvenu</i> – In central area; Inglewood, Compton, Downtown. That area geographically can support 3. N- We could shift up to the 10 and put in Gardena and Torrance. Shift NW of Inglewood district. <i>FW</i> – When we did this before we over-concentrated Latinos in center of LA. We are trying to balance some serious concerns here; we have had this discussion before. <i>Barabba</i> – I think the reality is that though the pop of LA of increased by 3, the Latino increased by 10 and the African American decreased by 8, and LA as a whole has decreased in compared to the state. <i>GM</i> – I am interested in exploring something along the lines that Nicole suggested and give her the idea of what borders could be used. We have to make sure that who we are linking up with on the east and Westside is a combination of COIs. I share some of the same concerns and we need to move forward on this now.</p>	Look into drawing a third CD in the central LA area, mindful of overconcentration of Latinos in the core.
	<b>SO CAL SDs</b>		
		<p><i>K</i> – Can we nest coastal San Diego and Coastal OC? <i>FW</i> – My only concern is that Riverside and San Diego was pretty set. <i>K</i> – Orange and San Diego or Orange to LA and I think OC/SD is the lesser of two evils. <i>FW</i> – I would think that at this point, look at COI, nest to the best of your ability, because there is significant amount of population here. Nesting into San Diego. <i>Dai</i> – I think we need to give Q2 as much flexibility as possible if we are going to have any sort of 2<sup>nd</sup> draft map. I think that is a reasonable alternative and I think we gave you a lot of flexibility. <i>Blanco</i> – Given the shape of OC, we can't keep all the SDs in there.</p>	Flexibility on OC/SD line.
		<p><i>Raya</i> – That seems to be a national security issue, but that would make it a good fit with Pendleton. <i>FW</i> – Mission Viejo has the interest with it more. <i>Blanco</i> – Border Patrol can go all the way up there, they do a lot of immigration control there.</p>	Nuclear Plant on So Border of San Clemente; San Onofre stays with San Clemente/Mission Viejo?
		<p><i>Ancheta</i> – What's going on with SD numbering? <i>K</i> – We will do an overlay of the old districts with the new ones and figure out how many people are being displaced. There are a few ways to number, geographically and I am not</p>	

		prepared to talk about it right now. <i>Raya</i> – It might be useful to have some coordination with Wilcox/Miller re: info posted to website for public to understand. <i>K</i> – Ok I will coordinate with the tech people.	
--	--	---	--