JULY 15, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, note taker: K. Kubas

Short hand for speakers -
GM: Commissioner Galambos Malloy
DG: Commissioner DiGuilio
FW: Commissioner Filkins Webber
AW: Alex Woods
NB: Nicole Boyle
K: Karin Mac Donald

IDENTIFIER	DESCRIPTION	NOTES/QUESTIONS	FINAL DIRECTIONS
	SO CAL CDs	*****OPTION 3*****	
IMSAN		*Ontai* – It is hard to respond to API interest and keep Chula Vista together. I think this is the best we can do. *Raya* – I think we heard that the 805 was a good dividing line. We aren't breaking up a community; we are dividing along an appropriate line.	ok
CHNCS		*Ontai* – Does a reasonably good attempt to put API COI together and LGBT COI. Puts together most of City Heights which is where African American community is. *Raya* – Reflects testimony concerning ethnic COIs and economic interests related to the groups; access to services related to language issues, medical issues, etc. We also accommodated LGBT. We have brought in a lot of COIs. *Ancheta* – There is a loop over on the top of the district but that is to preserve the COIs. *Raya* – Yes and that is to because of the border district.	ok
MMRHB		*Ontai* – Reasonably good map, ties in the water front area. *Raya* – This also addresses Claremont together, and the relationship of Claremont going E/W to other communities. AW – University City is also included with La Jolla and La Jolla Village here. *Dai* – Yes Fairbanks Ranch and Rancho Santa Fe are in a separate district from this which is consistent with COI.	ok
NESAN		*Ontai* – Does a good job keeping East county cities together and follows the hwy corridor. *Raya* – The testimony we had expresses that these communities identify as rural, independent. We had to go into Temecula for population reasons.	ok
			Make Coto de Caza whole and

| CSTSN | Includes San Onofre | *Ontai* – This also captures the small beach community cities and goes to Camp Pendleton; it covers an area with a lot in common. *Raya* – I know *FW* is concerned about going into OC but this was a difficulty with population. It was difficult to find the population. *Ancheta* – In terms of this visualization, can it be either option? *AW* – Yes. In order to keep Laguna Nigel intact I went east to Ladera Ranch and split Coto de Caza, which is a census place not a city. *FW* – Ladera Ranch and Coto de Caza have no connection to coast of San Diego county. *Blanco* – I do want to point out that the county of San Diego has grown by10 percent in the last 10 years. There are serious population issues in this area. *DG* – Is it possible to split Laguna Nigel for Coto de Caza? Is splitting Laguna Nigel the better of the not ideal options? *Ward* – There is no further population being taken from OC? *Ontai* - I think problem is that 300k people need to go out of San Diego county. *AW* – Ladera Ranch is 22k and Las Flores is 6k, and both are currently intact. *DG* – I think that Ward is outlining that we will have to split somewhere so where should it be. I would like to propose that we split Laguna Nigel. *Ancheta* – Is there support to explore the Laguna Nigel split? Yes. *FW* – Splitting Coto de Caza is basically a gated community in many areas a neighborhood. Laguna Niguel could be split N/S putting closer to coast areas with Dana Point, in this district. Ward – Getting some of this further data, at first glance that made more sense to me, but keeping Ladera Ranch and Las Flores whole, that seems to fit the criteria better. That seems to make more sense than splitting Laguna Nigel. *Raya* – We need to be careful to explain that mappers are not making suggestions, they are taking direction. *Ancheta* – Ward it sounds like you like this the way it is and other commissioners want Laguna Nigel to be split. *FW* – I do not recommend splitting Coto de Caza, though I recognize it is not a city. Although I recognize our priority to keep cities whole more than census places, I was trying to maintain integrity of that neighborhood and allowing Laguna Nigel to be split because it is a larger city. Ward – Ladera Ranch and Las Flores would be separated from Coto de Caza either way. *Raya* – But we will be putting Ladera Ranch and Las Flores with Coto de Caza. *Yao* – But we would be splitting Laguna Nigel in half. For 30k people about. *Dai* – Ok so I would not support splitting Laguna Nigel because we got testimony from them wanting to be with the other Lagunas. *DG* – If we put part of Laguna Nigel into this district, we would have to drop Coto de Caza line down to pick up Ladera Ranch/Las Flores, and then what will OCCST get to replace pop? *AW* – More of Orange would be in SNORN and more pop would be exchanged between SNORN and | to do that, take pop out of Mission Viejo. |

		OC coast. *DG* – We'd have to split Aliso Viejo too to replace population in Coastal district. We'd have to split more. Ward – What if we carved the 2k out of Mission Viejo. *FW* – Would best place to do the swap be Mission Viejo? *Barabba* – The bottom part of that is a college. *Dai* – We will still have to do at least a three way rotation. *FW* – Based on Ward's suggestion: We'd keep Coto de Caza whole, keep Las Flores and Ladera Ranch whole where they are, with small swap to keep Coto de Caza whole and get the pop from Mission Viejo. *DG* – I support that because the split out of Coto de Caza is more detrimental.	
SNORN	Most of Santa Ana, part of Orange, part of Anaheim, part of Garden Grove, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor	*Ward* – I have significant concerns about this district. It somewhat addresses COI from Santa Ana to be linked with Anaheim. Split of Anaheim is more central in this and it connects as far west as Cypress and Los Alamitos. We have heard significant COI from Rossmoor wanting to be with Seal Beach and coastal communities. Maybe we can rotate Rossmoor, Los Alamitos into Seal Beach coastal area and then maybe adding Westminster… *FW* – The only direction was that it is not Section 2 and to keep Dana Point whole. So we have not given much input to AW and she has not presented this to us before, but she took that into account in this iteration. *AW* – A lot of this has been driven by LA district configuration. Some of the direction I received was keeping Irvine whole with Tustin and No. Tustin. Also feedback about not putting Little Saigon with Santa Ana/Anaheim. Also trying to keep Brea, Fullerton, Placentia COI with Chino Hills. *Aguirre* – I have a problem with this option, it seems like Option 2 seemed to follow COI better given that Santa Ana is with Anaheim flats and it keeps Orange whole. Understanding the push from LA is responsible, but I prefer other option much more. *Blanco* – I have a lot of problems with Option 3. We got another letter from the mayor of Orange saying she didn't want Orange to be paired with Santa Ana. I am concerned that Santa Ana and Anaheim together is not a section 2 here but in the AD it is a section 2. Nowhere else have we taken a section 2 AD and not kept it intact at CD level. *GM* – I also have concerns about this. Regardless if this is a Section 2 at the CD, I don't find a strong argument about why this should be overturned at the CD level. Anaheim flats are in the COI with Santa Ana, we should not split them. *DG* – I don't want us to all of sudden respond to the last comment in. Are we going to go back to option 2? *AW* – We are looking at what we would do with this option if you select this option from Nicole's LA district. *DG* – How do you want to decide first? We need to find a process that addresses this better. *FW* – Mayor of Orange did not say she didn't want to be	

		with Santa Ana. *Blanco* – No, it says Orange is mistakenly put with Santa Ana, and that Orange is more aligned with Tustin and Anaheim Hills. Areas west of 57 are appropriate. *FW* – Garden Grove and Stanton in coastal and Santa Ana is with Villa Park; these are problems. I think there are a number of problems with both options. *Ward* – I appreciate *FW*'s comments. OC is the 6th biggest county in the nation and it has been an afterthought to LA. We have freedom to address COI at large, which this option does; we need to examine that closely. *Ancheta* – There are a lot of intersecting, moving pieces here and it makes sense to lock in the ones that can't move. *K* – There are a couple of critical decisions in LA that drove these options. We are talking about OC/LA border hand-offs. Maybe it makes sense to go through LA VRA district cluster quickly to figure out what decisions will change what can happen here. We need to move to LA so that *NB* can explain the district that caused these border issues; it will be an interactive process.	
	LA OVERVIEW CDs	*Ward* – I think that we should start in OC and go to LA because OC has always had to deal with what happens in LA	
	CD Option 3	*NB* - 5 districts with LCVAP over 50 percent.5th district is drawn independent of Compton/Carson COI. Option 1 and 2 draw over that COI. *GM* – Option 2 in LA works with Option 2 in OC. *NB* – Option 3 is independent but 1 and 2 might be able to switch between the two. *FW* – As I understand it, in all three options, we are going back to slivers on the coast in Manhattan Beach, El Segundo. I see push from WLADT into OC. It looks like district on coast is causing encroachment into OC. *NB* – OC Border is held at coast and population is picked up on OC line further inland. Buena Park is with LA. New district above IGWSG. *Barabba* – Long Beach is split more here. *GM* – I would like to start with this one as our baseline. What I see reflected in this visualization is much of the rationalization we used in discussing ADs yesterday but with a larger geographical framework. I felt uncomfortable with LCVAP concentration in prior visualization. I think preserving LCVAP around 50 but keeping those areas competitive with historical African American population. *Parvenu* – I think that I would like to start here also. San Pedro is tied to port and Palos Verdes which there was testimony for. Buena Park is more connected with Cerritos.	

		FW – Quite a lot of COI is being sacrificed here; Hawthorne not with South Bay. Dana Point is split maybe? Buena Park has never been with LA. Florence Graham all the way to Seal Beach. Malibu to Palos Verdes. There are a lot of problems here. *Blanco* – Concern I have with this district is where we minimize LCVAP in COMP. Our counsel has told us not to do this. If we minimize, we are very close to violating Section 2. *GM* – What if we look at Option 3 and increase LCVAP in the COMP district?	
	CD Option 2	*NB* – COMP is the 5th Latino CVAP over 50 percent in this option. *Parvenu* – Coast is not a sliver here. *Yao* – The missing reference point is the airport is no longer in the E/W districts. We have never seen this before. Both options have same scenario. *DG* – We gave direction last time that airport could be removed and we had to keep all options available. We heard that Inglewood wanted to be with airport and coast also wanted to be linked with airport. We gave direction that airport was not a locked piece. *NB* – I recall direction about splitting the airport. I was asked to look at creating a third African American district. *Yao* – I voted for the option but it seems like the baseline has disappeared. *Parvenu* – I didn't specify an African American seat but I wanted to explore an additional district in the core of LA. The focus is not African American but more representation for core of LA. *NB* – San Pedro is split here.	
	CD Option 1	*NB* – COMP is the 5th Latino CVAP over 50 percent in this option. *Parvenu* – Option 1 is not my preferred option because of 74 percent concentration of LCVAP downtown. *Blanco* – How many Section 2s are there here? *NB* – 5 here. *Blanco* – I think it depends about what other people are thinking about CDs that are around it, about accommodating COI. We are looking at 2 more options and I don't know which one has the most testimony reflected. *NB* – This is the most compact, which leads to a high concentration in that area. *Dai* – This is better for compactness, keeps other COIs together better. Keeps SE cities together, has most of Compton/Carson COI, is better on OC line. The better we can support COI. *Barabba* – I would think you could switch Latino CVAPs around to deal with	

		the concentrations and it is more compact. *Forbes* – I think what *Barabba* says is correct, but the high concentration is problematic. *DG* – The long coastal district is trying to work around Section 2 issues and to keep from isolating northern part, you link it with coastal. We have long coastal districts in other parts of the state. This preserves Santa Monica Mountains and Santa Monica Bay which we have heard a lot about. *GM* – My concern around using this as a starting point is that compactness comes far down our list of criteria. We have to meet 5 criteria that come above compactness. It is a lesser consideration. Ward – We should consider OC first! Making decisions in LA makes OC an afterthought. The coastal district is an issue, we are not trying to meet COI, and we are trying to respect them. Rowland Hills has nothing to do with Malibu. Maybe that respects some COIs but they are not connected. *Yao* – I think option 1 is the best place to start; these affect the Asian districts least.	
	OC OVERVIEW CDs	*AW* – Long Beach is joined with OC in options 1 and 2.	
	OC - Option 1 - LBPRT		
	OC - Option 2 - LBPRT		
	OC - Option 3 - OCCST	*AW* – Hard border between LA and OC. Will split Laguna Nigel, splits Garden Grove (what was looked at before lunch). *GM* – Are there shifts farther north on OC line.	
	OC – Option 3	*AW* - La Habra, Buena Park go into LA. Brea, Fullerton and Diamond Bar go with Chino Hills and Anaheim. *DG* – The push is around LA/OC boundary in North. Ward – This iteration does a lot more to respect input from OC. *DG* – Second issue is VRA, COMP is at risk. *GM* – I take a different perspective. There is evidence of racially polarized voting in LA but counsel has given us some flexibility. If we provide an equal number of Latino districts, then what are the other tradeoffs when you look at our criteria? We were not told that we have to draw a Section 2 Latino district in COMP. *Blanco* – This brings the COMP LCVAP is lower, and if we go with one that is substantially lower and create that dilution, it is problematic. I'm not saying that we go to 50 percent but not down to 34. *GM* – We have some flexibility to revisit that number. I would still work toward option 3, but option 1 as a starting point is okay too.	
	OC – Option 1	*Dai* – I think if you look at Option 1, with exception of Long Beach district, it is better for everyone else. Brown would have to look at the concentration of LCVAP but all the SE cities would be together.	

		K – One big difference is that in two options Compton/Carson COI is used to create the VRA district and in one option that COI is independent. **Option 1 is chosen as a starting point**	
WESTCST (also discusses SNORN, LBPRT, STHOC)	Splits Laguna Niguel.	*Dai* – Keeps Little Saigon intact and has rest of the coast. *FW* – Respects Irvine not wanting to be with coast. *Ward* – Why can't you make that a coastal district and then go up to Garden Grove for the more inland district? Extend NW border of coastal district up the coast and go north from LBPRT to Garden Grove/Westminster. *Forbes* – I think a completely coastal district would be better. *DG* – How much into Long Beach would you have to go to get population? The coastal part of WSTCST that we would have to be replacing? I'm trying to find a home for the WESTCST bulb. WE could keep ports with Long Beach and with Garden Grove. *Ward* – Could we drop Villa Park out of SNORN (into STHOC) add some of WSTCST into SNORN. *Yao* – Divide WSTCST and LBRT on diagonal of coast. *FW* – If you cut at 57, you are separating communities. *Barabba* – Extending from Huntington Beach to Little Saigon I thought was ok. *Blanco* – I don't want to forget the COI testimony about Santa Ana with flatlands of Anaheim. I would urge us not to split a Section 2. *DG* – *AW*, can you tell us where the splits would go? If we split Garden Grove/Westminster with Huntington Beach? *AW* – If you move Garden Grove into LBPRT, you would have to move most of Huntington Beach into WSTCST and you'd have to split Westminster. *Barabba-* You could split Huntington Beach instead. Take part of Huntington Beach and include with WSTCST and take equal amount of Garden Grove and put it in LBPRT. *Forbes* – What about splitting Garden Grove? Then you could put all of Huntington Beach and Seal Beach in WSTCST. *FW* – I see the rotation, it might be good. *Yao* – We have to get things pinned down currently. *Raya* – What is going to happen to Stanton? *Blanco* – I don't want to leave SNORN as is. *Forbes* – Huntington Beach, Sunset Beach and Seal Beach into WESTCST. LBPRT pick up Westminster, Garden Grove and leave Little Saigon intact. *DG* – Can Garden Grove go into SNORN? *FW* – Yes. *DG* – If we put Villa Park and part of Orange into STHOC, then put Laguna Niguel into WSTCST, do what *Forbes* said, and repopulate SNORN with Garden Grove part. *Aguirre* – Santa Ana west of 57 needs to be kept together. *Dai* – Anaheim Hills could also be with district above (yellow). *AW* – Responsible split for orange is 57? *FW* – Yes but there is going to be a tiny sliver. If you have to take less population, split is 55 going to E. *AW* – If we add Orange to STHOC, where	Put Villa Park to 55 into STHOC, Laguna Nigel into WSTCST and additional pop. would be Anaheim Hills. Pick up Huntington and Seal Beach in LBPRT. Westminster and Stanton into LBPRT and Buena Park into LBPRT as well if needed. If Orange needs to be split see lower left for instructions.

		else can we get pop from besides Laguna Niguel. *DG* - Then we can add Anaheim into yellow and take Buena Park out. Then Irvine maybe? *DG* – Villa Park to 55 into STHOC, Laguna Nigel into WSTCST and additional pop would be Anaheim Hills. Pick up Huntington and Seal beach into LBPRT. Westminster and Stanton into LBPRT and Buena Park into LBPRT as well.	
LHBYL		*GM* – Preserve COI in a separate CD. We cross county lines but it equalizes power on both sides. *Dai* – This is the first time we have been able to put Hacienda Heights in.	ok
	SO CAL SDs	*K* – By putting Imperial with San Diego, we were able to hold San Diego/Riverside line.	
POMSB	Pomona Valley and Rialto/Fontana	*Dai* – 2 Section 2s that have been nested.	ok
SBBAN		*FW* – This is the resulting factor of nesting. It is difficult when we nest two ADs, but you can't really nest and blend completely. To remain consistent with nesting is how we got here. *Ancheta* – Nesting is a lower criterion so if we can adjust a split we should do that. *K* – These are first nested then blended so some clean up is possible. *Barabba* – Big Bear Lake is separated from the lake itself. *GM* – I think this is the best case scenario.	Big Bear Lake is separated from the lake itself, put lake in.
RIVMV		*FW* – Horseshoe aspect is consistent with COI testimony, the borders of what are involved and the mountains.	
CCHTM		*FW* – This keep Coachella Valley whole. *AW* – If you want to remove Menifee, you'd have to get pop from Coachella. *FW* – Menifee is with its COI with Hemet.	
ISAND	All of Chula Vista, Logan Heights, Barrio Logan, Sherman Heights and part of San Diego from AD.	*Ontai* – I have problems with this. It splits the API community. I like that it respects 50 LCVAP and the east cities together. *Dai* –Which API community has been split? *Ontai* – The CAPAFR map brings the API community from Chula Vista to Rancho Penasquitos (Tierrasanta). *K* – CAPAFR has Coachella split. *DG* – What way can we find a way to move forward? I hear *Ontai*'s concern here. What are some suggestions to address those concerns? We'd have to make some big rotations. *Ontai* – Using the CAPAFR map to make these districts. *GM* – I understand there is a desire on *Ontai*'s part to adopt that map wholesale but we have some important considerations looking at Coachella. Perhaps there is a way of adapting some of those areas without throwing out whole districts. *K* – If we took Imperial Beach and La Presa out that might allow us to go further north. *Ontai* – The current map bisects the communities, splits them E/W. *FW* – My recommendation is to maybe nest or	Constraint is to look within San Diego county and not go outside in the process of uniting API communities in N/S orientation as per Unity map. *Raya* and *Ontai* will work with Q2 to this end.

do a better blending N/S. Blending Poway from above into AD from below. *DG* – I feel that these API communities are too far apart and there is no way to connect them without slaughtering the COIs in between. If it is not a VRA issue, I think keeping them together but in their separate districts is ok. *Dai* – I agree with *DG*, CAPAFR made other decisions, their map cannot be completely adopted by our map. *Yao* – We are talking about less than 10 miles. *Ancheta* – If this community is not a contiguous community, if they are 2 populations… *Blanco* – If Chula Vista is united in this core area, and the SE Asian communities in north are united, then I think that is reflective. *Ontai* – I cannot support this SD, it does not tie the Asian community N/S as so many testified. *Forbes* – Can we connect them a different way than the CAPAFR? *Ancheta* – *Ontai* is open to some possibilities, but a district that needs to include these two communities. *K* – We could try a coastal district that puts API community together on the coast. An inverse district. *Raya* – Maybe *Ontai* and I could take some time this evening to explore. I know the odd numbers are hard here, which is why it has been difficult to balance out. *Yao* – If we try to use I-15 as adjustment, and include the bubble in top right into IMSAND. *DG* – It has to be more than the API community, I have a problem with changing everything around for one community. *GM* – I think that we are here to balance the whole state, and if one community is getting the short end of the stick, then I am open to fix that. I think as region leaders and with personal connections to areas, we should be able to talk through the issues that exist. *FW* – I agree with *DG* and *GM*, it should not impact all the other work we have done at other county borders. I am hesitant of other ripple effects. If the COI is together on some districts, then maybe it could be split on others. *K* – Using the 15 as a dividing line and we might be able to look at if we could do that. It would be a very long district that goes N/S and would split up the API and Latino communities. It would go to the border. *Aguirre* – My understanding is that *Ontai* would not accept this district. I heard a willingness on the part of the two leads to try to work it out. *Ancheta* – Should *Ontai* and *Raya* work with Q2 on alternative iterations? *Raya* – Can we support a change in compliance with all the standards we have set? *DG* – It sounds like CAPAFR now prefers the Unity map. *K* – Ok we just got the layer, we will put it up. *Blanco* – This plan also splits Coachella.

AW – This splits Chula Vista, and goes up to San Pasqual. *Dai* – I recommend that they do not affect line outside of San Diego. *Ancheta* – *Raya* and *Ontai*

		looking at changes and staying within San Diego county.	
CSAND		*Ontai* – Again my concern is that it splits the API communities	See above
NESAN		*Ontai* – It respects East county cities (but also splits API communities?)	
SANOC	Crosses into OC	*Ontai* – This covers the coast similar to AD, it's good. *Yao* – The bulk of the population is in OC. *AW* – It is pretty split because the southern part is an AD. *Ancheta* – This is a nested district. We have odd numbers in San Diego so we have to cross county lines. *FW* – We understand the testimony, but we have to put 900k people together. I think we can respect this. *DG* – We were able to respect OC county line in ADs.	
CSTIV	Splits Irvine.	*GM* – How much of Long Beach is split and which portions? *Yao* – Is Long Beach split into more than 2 SDs? *AW* – I believe it is 3. We are looking up splits. *Yao* – Can we reduce the split to 2? *GM* – Yes I agree with *Yao*. *K* – LA discussion is going to impact this area. Let's wait to talk to Nicole before we go too much into that. *FW* – Why are we crossing the LA line so much if the ADs don't? *AW* – I think this is driven by the LA districts. *FW* – Due to LA, we are encroaching on LA to get LA residents into Orange. *AW* – It is blended. *K* – Borders are still in flux so there is some room. *FW* – I have a lot of problems with DBLYA. I understand we have to move from San Diego into South OC, but we can make more compact districts, I cannot see Lake Forest to Walnut. *K* – There is a La Habra issue that went to LA which is also driving this. *FW* – I am looking at ADs where we respected the line. I can walk through it one more time: TUSTO with CSTOC, SNANA with WESTC, ANAFL blend or nest with DBRYL, then southern portion goes with San Diego. *Dai* – The reason why it isn't like this is because of the Riverside line. *DG* – I like *FW*'s idea as a starting point. Can we blend Seal Beach? Putting Seal Beach into top of SNANA is a stretch. *K* – LA still needs La Habra for section 2, which is one of the big differences here. Can I look at that with *NB* tonight? *Ward* – Is Laguna Niguel split in this iteration? *AW* – It does not look split. *Ward* – What city splits are there on the southern border? It looks like several, can we fix that? *AW* – I'm not aware of any splits. No split in Mission Viejo. *K* – We can do this nesting rotation. There is a Long Beach vs. La Habra tradeoff. This is going to be more of blending than a perfect nesting. *All* – Ok. *AW* – There is an additional district in San Bernardino that is going to be covered by Jaime tomorrow. *DG* – Maybe a population shift with Huntington Beach up with its northern neighbors and Costa Mesa over with the Irvine area. It would get rid of the tails and give OC access to the coast. Include Huntington Beach with Seal Beach. 2 access points to the beach. *AW* – In	**FW - TUSTO with CSTOC, SNANA with WESTC, ANAFL blend or nest with DBRYL, then southern portion goes with San Diego.** *DG* **-** Maybe a population shift with Huntington Beach up with its northern neighbors and Costa Mesa over with the Irvine area. It would get rid of the tails and give OC access to the coast. Include Huntington Beach with Seal Beach. 2 access points to the beach**.** OK to split Huntington Beach (*Ward* will have a suggestion as to where)

		doing that we would split Huntington Beach. *DG* – There are similarities between Huntington Beach and Seal Beach. *FW* – I agree with that. *Ward* was saying Costa Mesa wants to be with the coast. We haven't split Huntington Beach before.	
	LA CDs – OPTION 1		
		Ancheta – There is a concern about over-packing. *Parvenu* – I agree with *Blanco*'s concern about the high concentration of the LCVAP in that one district. I am ok with COMP being a Section 2. Since no one lives at the LA port, can we extend COMP to the port? *GM* – At a CD level does it make sense to split the port from San Pedro? If it has to be, then at least it could be connected N/S. I think we should look at connecting Westchester and Inglewood and thinking of Dockweiler Beach as being a connecter on Westside. *DG* – I agree with attempt to explore connected N/S district with ports or San Pedro with port. I have a hard time connecting via Dockweiler. It looked really problematic. *GM* – In AARC submissions and MALDEF submissions, they connect the airport with the Inglewood area. *Barabba* – LA airport affects Inglewood but it affects a lot of things and I don't know if the congressman would have as much influence as people think. I think Compton/Carson is acknowledged at every level. *FW* – If we put airport with Inglewood we could get Hawthorne where it wants. I am troubled by Rancho Palos Verdes connected to Larchmont. *Parvenu* – One approach is looking at the street level… *GM* – I am comfortable moving forward with these, the core is fairly solid because of the section 2 considerations.	
Coastal CD		*DG* – You could split longer coastal district that includes El Segundo, you would have to split into Culver City district too and then you would have to cross some districts to accommodate the south bay. *GM* – It seems like the testimony was more about South Bay and beach cities as being independent COIs of each other. Some sort of coastal district makes sense here but I'm not sure if it is this one. *DG* – One district that could be Santa Monica area, but we would be splitting up their other COI. *GM* – I see the coast as an environmental COI, especially on this level. *FW* – I have concerns here and African American community has said they don't want to be a Section 2. Giving Inglewood the airport, giving Hawthorne the South Bay would be good, and respecting what African American community wants. *Parvenu* – It is a long stretch of coast but as a result of those places being coastal, there is a transportation corridor there.	Only three districts; mid-city, coastal, Inglewood/Hawthorne. 1) South Bay that starts at bottom and goes up 2) Inglewood, airport district. But do not pull Santa Monica down. Start from the bottom, and put 702k up, then from that line you go 702k up and so on.

		Yao – Hawthorne wants to be part of Manhattan Beach, and the other places listed in the email. Then the government council suggests many more. *Dai* – Only three districts; mid-city, coastal, Inglewood/Hawthorne. 1) South Bay that starts at bottom and goes up 2) Inglewood, airport district, *GM* – The AARC presented something similar to this. Lines start in San Pedro and move up, Torrance is oriented toward south. *DG* – But do not pull Santa Monica down. Start from the bottom, and put 702k up, then from that line you go 702k up and so on. *Ancheta* – Brown says that we would need to look into adjusting the high LCVAP in that 70 percent district. *Dai* – It is very compact and supporting a strong COI. *FW* – And it is not decreasing numbers around it.	
	Last week's visualization	*NB* - I think this is similar to what *DG* suggests. *GM* – But it drastically splits the Compton/Carson COI. *Barabba* – I think if you when with *DG*'s suggestion, you would have less ripple effects. *DG* – You'd already have set boundaries on east. *Dai* – Part of this is in response to the mayor of Hawthorne's testimony. *NB* – Moving Hawthorne out of its COI with Inglewood breaks that COI. *DG* – I feel more comfortable if it went back to other map. I know the mayor of Hawthorne was here and wants to be part of the beach communities, but I'm not sure if you can go that high. I am concerned about breaking up coastal communities. *NB* – I could redraw this but it can't be ready tomorrow. *GM* – We are hemmed in on two sides by water and we are trying to balance COIs and ethnic groups. We need to keep an open mind about how we approach Dockweiler Beach, that it really connects the local communities. We need to be open to that. *NB* – I can draw it and publish the kmz files but I won't be able to make them available to the public immediately. *Barabba* – I think that would be ok. *Ancheta* – Yes, you could download it. *DG* – You can't isolate the top unless you do a three way E/W split.	