

JULY 16, 2011 – LINE DRAWING INSTRUCTIONS, note taker: K. Kubas

Short hand for speakers -

GM: Commissioner Galambos Malloy

DG: Commissioner DiGuilio

FW: Commissioner Filkins Webber

NB: Nicole Boyle

T: Tamina Alon

J: Jaime Clark

K: Karin Mac Donald

IDENTIFIER	DESCRIPTION	NOTES/QUESTIONS	FINAL DIRECTIONS
	<i>LA CDs</i>		
West LA districts – <i>DG</i> option discussed yesterday		<i>DG</i> – We tried this to deal with issues in the South Bay, but the Inglewood district is at 52 percent and it was my understanding that the African American community did not want a Section 2. <i>GM</i> – This blocks our ability to do a coastal district. Also we have unnecessarily locked in Dockweiler beach to the airport. We have not heard anything from the public about de-coupling them. Also, the black CVAP goes specifically against the interest of the African American community. <i>Parvenu</i> – There is a coastal community there. Wetlands, Santa Monica Mountains, issues along El Segundo, there is a commonality among the coast. Also, the ports are with the southern beach cities, which do not get the traffic or other problems from the port. <i>FW</i> – There is a difference in the beach communities. The COI in South Bay is different than Santa Monica. For coastal purposes this does reflect 2 congressional candidates that would be concerned about the coast. <i>DG</i> – I think this is a matter of COI trade-offs. The coastal in terms of the federal issues, Santa Monica Mountains and the bay. Our first option went too far inland I think, but the trade-off here is too much I think, the original is better.	Go back to original visualization
LA Option 1: Airport and ports; COMP, Long Beach district		<i>Parvenu</i> – I appreciate <i>FW</i> 's concern about Malibu and the South Bay cities. There is a treatment facility near Playa del Rey and also near El Segundo. CA Coastal Commission is involved across that entire stretch. You can ride your bike from Redondo Beach to Malibu. There is a recreational community that aligns that entire coastline. <i>GM</i> – The critique we got from the public earlier was about a long coastal district at the AD level. But at the CD level there is more of an argument for that. Also, we talked about splitting the airport, but the bulk of the airport goes out to Pershing, so we need to be aware of that so we can follow through on what we are saying. <i>Yao</i> – Splitting the airport would make it look better but it wouldn't	Airport with IGWSG (Inglewood) Working on visualization created during live line drawing; Clean up west Carson and Lomita. Split San Pedro along a neighborhood council line.

solve any problems. Inglewood feels like they have lost control of regulation or influence on the airport, we may have ignored COI expression about wanting the airport tied to Inglewood in order to make a prettier picture. *Parvenu* – We should move line to Pershing Sq. Where the office of airport admin is located is significant. Also, the harbor belongs with the N/S corridor for the same reasons. *Blanco* – I think we should include the entire airport. Usually when people are concerned about something like the Dockweiler Beach strip, they think you are bypassing a city to pick up a city further away. But in this case we are keeping two cities that are connected and putting a city with the airport COI. We are not bypassing anything.

Ancheta – IGWSG should include airport. *Parvenu* – Headquarters for LA ports is in San Pedro. It gives dual representation of the harbor, like in Long Beach. The more representation we get at those ports is better. I am in favor of connecting the ports to the N/S corridor. *DG* – We have talked about COMP linked to the ports and I also think there is an issue with San Pedro being split from the port. It is easier to put the port with San Pedro than San Pedro with the port due to population issues. *GM* – I agree with much of what *Parvenu* and *DG* have stated. I see San Pedro's desire to be with the port. Living near the West Oakland port, I understand needing that representation. *Forbes* – I think the port should go with the COMP district. Early on we heard testimony about the environmental impacts of the port and I think the people in COMP deal with those. *Barabba* – We need to start looking at the population to see if we can move these things around. *FW* – We cannot separate San Pedro from the port. *DG* – I echo that. Can we put San Pedro in with that corridor? I know it is a big population shift. I know there is pollution N/S but the port is in San Pedro's backyard. *NB* – Population that is out currently is 74k. *Parvenu* – The administration is in San Pedro. San Pedro itself is not homogenous. It would be dual representation. *GM* – We need to think about flexibility. This port has regional impact with congressional representation. *Blanco* – It is already separated from San Pedro so putting it with COMP isn't that different. We had said it was ok to have both ports together, but I have been concerned that both ports are with the Long Beach district. Because the most testimony we had connected ports N/S. *Ancheta* – First we have the airport move into IGWSG, which everyone is in agreement for. *Parvenu* – My suggestion is to leave line as it is and add port south of Wilmington into N/S alignment. *NB* – West Carson is inadvertently split here, we could clean that up to get more pop there. We could split San Pedro more and add more of San Pedro with Wilmington. *Ancheta* – Who supports this change? *GM* – I think that we should look at Torrance as place where we equalize population in this other district. *FW* – We could move part of pop. Of San Pedro into this neighborhood. We could put part of San Pedro into Wilmington/port area. We should do that instead of splitting Torrance. *NB* – If we move district down, we will have to rotate 8k people. *Yao* – San Pedro would want to be part of port. 110 community and 710 community are concerned about traffic coming out of the port. *DG* – It is not ok to take San Pedro away

from its port. *Parvenu* – We could also consider Los Alamitos. *Ancheta* – Extend COMP down to the south, which adds more to COMP, where do we subtract that population? *NB* – You could take it out of North Long Beach. *Barabba* – I no longer support the idea of moving it north, as much as they like it or not the traffic will exist N/S. I think that San Pedro has more decision about how the ships come in and out. *Ancheta* – Who supports current exchange? Moving COMP down to include port and some removal of pop from Long Beach district. Ok so that doesn't have enough votes.

GM – I want to bring us further north on this district. We have a very high LCVAP in the middle district. If we move South Gate north, we could until COMP with port then add San Pedro back in. It will change LCVAPs north and in COMP. *Raya* – Raising the CVAP that is now at 74? *GM* – Looking at district north and refining it and a district or two around it. It would still be a high LCVAP north but we'd be able to include the port with COMP. *Raya* – It might help our issue in SGV also. *Dai* – I am interested in exploring San Pedro with the port and doing a rotation between multiple districts here and help the coastal district get rid of the arm that goes into downtown. I think there can be adjustments into northern Long Beach like *NB* has said. Rotation among 4 districts would be required. I don't support what *GM* said because COMP is at 50 and if you change it then we are going to lose it. *Barabba* – Reducing COMP N/S and including San Pedro would change the north but it might have the great benefits. *DG* – One option is to move line E to get port with San Pedro (8k) or you have to put the line W, which is a 70k shift.

Ist draft map lines:

Yao – The rotation we want can be seen on this map. LA port with Carson and downtown is slightly different but I think CVAP would be different. *Dai* – There are so many problems with the first draft here, we can't go back there. We have to move line left or right, I would be interested in trying to reduce arm into downtown. Moving the line for 8k seems easier.

Forbes – I think the smaller shift is the one that I would explore. *Dai* - WLADT is the coastal district that goes too far into downtown, I know 8k helps only a little. *GM* – We should not lean back on what is easy. We need to fix either COMP or San Pedro to the ports.

Dai – My priority is putting San Pedro with the port and with COMP if we can do it without losing our 50 LCVAP district. *NB* - LADT 70k north into COMP, pick up in Torrance, make it up and remove pop from north part of COMP. *NB* – It might slightly decrease BCVAP number but we could maintain the majority/minority districts. (live line drawing) LADT is now balanced, and we need to reduce pop from COMP and add it to IGW district to west. Removing part of LA port neighborhood we are still 30k under. Are we willing to add parts

west of COMP to add to the district? *NB* – West Palms Cove. I'm at the border of Watts am still short 16k. We could split Carson; we could take out Santa Dominguez. We could split Carson. We could split Florence Firestone. *GM* – I wonder to what extent we could look at rotation. Shave off N. Long Beach and doing counter clockwise rotation. *Parvenu* – We could use Florence Firestone. *Dai* – The LCVAP has fallen to 48, where could we pick it up. *NB* – Drawing more north and removing more of Long Beach I can get the BCVAP and LCVAP up but I don't think I can get the BCVAP as high as it was before. To raise BCVAP we can take more of Long Beach out and draw it north to try to get LCVAP up and move Walnut Park south. LCVAP is at 50 percent again. We need to complete rotation. *GM* – I am starting to have some concerns, BCVAP around 27-28 is ok but if we are looking at an iteration like this, I want to make sure the black North Long Beach community is included. *Parvenu* – The further we go in this direction it skews the statistics. *Dai* – You could add that part of North Long Beach back again and go further into SE cities. *NB* – What about Paramount with Downtown or DWTR? *Parvenu* – There is a relationship of Paramount and Downey. *NB* – Latino CVAP of 48 percent. BVAP at 27 percent. *GM* – We are all having to give a little in this district. We've been able to accomplish some important goals here re: communities near port. It isn't my first choice but it is a good compromise. *Parvenu* – I agree, the 710, 110, 605 are most affected by the heavy freight. I still see 1500k that need to be adjusted for. *Dai* – I am only willing to do this if we maintain it as a 50 percent district. *NB* – Splitting Carson? Taking some out from the sides. *FW* – I wish Brown was here. I am concerned about the manner that this line drawing has occurred, especially if it was a district we liked before. *Dai* – I don't support this unless we maintain a 50 percent district here. It is hard to overcome the benefit of this district because the number is off by a percent. *NB* – Would look at splitting Harbor City neighborhood of San Pedro? *Parvenu* – West Carson has close ties to Carson. *GM* – What about West Carson with Inglewood and take pop. Out of Torrance? I would also want to look at neighborhood councils in San Pedro to boost LCVAP. *Parvenu* – West Torrance is more oriented toward beach communities. So a split there is possible. *Blanco* – Given what we know about the unreliability of LCVAP, that number is fine with me. *Dai* – I think that Lomita is seen as more of port city also, and I think that Torrance has a beach cities part. *Ancheta* – If goal is to raise LCVAP in COMP to over 50 percent how long will it take with this rotation? *NB* – 15 or 20 minutes? *DG* – Can we let her move forward with those directions? *Yao* – At the beginning of this week we agreed not to leave with just a visualization of the map. So we have to schedule more time for next week or we have to work through it this session. *DG* – Maybe at lunch she would have time to do it? *Raya* – I am also ok with the CVAP in both cases not being as high as it was before. We are working hard to adjust San Pedro and in the meantime we are ignoring Lomita and West Carson. In my mind, the pollution doesn't have a hard line where it stops. I think we are sacrificing other people

		<p>for San Pedro. I would rather see a workable split in San Pedro. <i>Yao</i> – COI testimony exclusively ties San Pedro to port. <i>Parvenu</i> – We have a huge ripple effect for this. San Pedro has 3 distinct neighborhood councils. <i>Ancheta</i> – We could break it up along neighborhood lines. <i>Dai</i> – I think if we get VAP numbers higher. <i>Raya</i>, what district should Lomita and West Carson be in? <i>Raya</i> – Weren't they in COMP before we started all of this? Looking at the Option 1 map. <i>NB</i> – No, they were with Inglewood before. We could shift them out of coastal. <i>Direction</i> - Clean up West Carson and Lomita. <i>GM</i> – Want to see a comprehensive visualization of airport with Inglewood. <i>Parvenu</i> – Moving West Carson will create finger? <i>NB</i> – It will fix the finger that we have now.</p>	
SGVP		<p><i>Raya</i> – We are not satisfied with this. We recognize the Covina district. Is there a way to go across the foothills like we did in AD? <i>GM</i> – Some of the considerations are strong COI linking immigrant populations with more suburban foothills in the east. We can still respect LCVAP majority/minority district. <i>Raya</i> – Pasadena is split here. <i>GM</i> – Pasadena is a hub for foothill communities. There is a rationale for splitting off Burbank and Glendale. <i>Barabba</i> – We heard that the officials of those places wanted to be together but the citizens didn't care as much. <i>Yao</i> – There is a 710 freeway conflict and having those communities together in the same CD might be problematic. <i>GM</i> – What if we had a northern foothills district? To respect API community on west side. <i>NB</i> – Glendora, Duarte, and Azusa north to be connected with Pasadena. Maintain Claremont, Upland in district? <i>GM</i> – Can we while maintaining the others? <i>DG</i> – What would it take to do first part of proposal? And maintain the LCVAP. <i>GM</i> – When you look at W and E end of this district, they are disparate. Neither one is going to be perfect of these options, which is better? <i>Barabba</i> – Take Pasadena, Altadena line move it east. Remove Covina district on West... <i>Raya</i> – If we could see specific numbers and take a few minutes. <i>Barabba</i> – If we take 100k out of Covina and combine there, would we have a district? <i>Raya</i> – If you were to split along 210 and keep going east, shave off bottom. <i>Dai</i> – Didn't we just do that in first draft? <i>Raya</i> – We are trying to balance and make something a little more reflective of a foothill area. <i>Yao</i> – In defense of the first draft map, the community along foothill is different than those below them. The housing density is different. It looks like it stretches a long way but that is what the foothill area is like. <i>Ancheta</i> – This is not inconsistent with what <i>Raya</i> was saying. <i>DG</i> – I support what <i>Raya</i> and <i>GM</i> are trying to do. Keeping cities whole at 210 and not splitting. As long as numbers are ok in Covina, the switch will be minimizing the harm that was going on before. <i>Blanco</i> – We got some positive feedback about some foothills communities being treated as such but the criticism was it split cities and was too long.</p> <p><i>Raya</i> – Some adjustments at southern end. Some pop have been moved to district below it</p>	Use new iteration <i>NB</i> worked on with <i>Raya</i> and <i>GM</i> during break. Clean up.

		and to the COVINA district. On Westside of SGVP we have preserved that COI. Kept Pasadena and its COI together. Across foothills is a cleaner line. Lavern and Claremont are split, Glendora is whole. <i>Yao</i> supports those splits as being reflective of the community. <i>Forbes</i> – Nice job. <i>Ancheta</i> – NB will equalize population and do clean up.	
SGMFH		<i>GM</i> – Pasadena is split but part of it is tied to Burbank. <i>DG</i> – Los Feliz is a strong COI. <i>GM</i> – Silver Lake is rejoined with Echo Park here. Thai Town is connected to east. Strong COIs in many places. <i>Blanco</i> – I am not sure that Echo Park belongs here. It is more Downtown and ELA district as far as history and population. I just want to point out that it isn't quite in this district, even though it has been sort of gentrified (hip-ified).	ok
WEST LA		<i>DG</i> – It looks like a finger there... <i>FW</i> – In that finger, there is Hancock Park, etc. It runs from Larchmont and those communities in that finger are connected and run west to Beverly Hills.	<i>Raya</i> – look at street level direction from Wilshire Historical society (?) who sent an email
SFVET		<i>GM</i> – I have some street level refinements here. USC campus concern; some of its campus has moved past the freeway. Needs to be looked at on street level.	USC campus concern; some of its campus has grown and moved past the freeway. Needs to be looked at on street level.
SFVWC	Granada Hills, Bell Canyon, Hidden Hills, Sherman Oaks, Studio City	<i>Parvenu</i> – Honors testimony from Latino community re: E vs. W and keeps Northridge and Reseda whole. Looked at VICA maps and other COIs.	ok
AVSCV	Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita, stops at LA border. Includes Palmdale, Lake LA, Acton, Elizabeth, Santa Clarita, Castaic, Simi Valley (is split)	<i>Barabba</i> – Lancaster has COI with Palmdale. <i>Parvenu</i> – It does bother me that Lancaster is not with Palmdale. But with population I don't know how we can do it. <i>FW</i> – Simi Valley sent a handout drawing attention to a possible split in Santa Clarita.	Make sure Santa Clarita is whole.
	LA SDs	(OVERVIEW): <i>K</i> – There is an odd number of ADs here in LA. The options for LA are if you want to nest with Orange or Victor Valley. For this configuration we nested with Victor Valley. Yesterday we looked at So Cal SDs that helped us. SFV is whole, Santa Clarita Valley whole, Antelope Valley whole, Victor Valley whole, E Ventura has to be with SFV, not Santa Clarita. Malibu and Pacific Palisades and Santa Monica are removed from that district. We have tried pretty much every way at this point. <i>FW</i> – I appreciate what has been done with Victor Valley, I think it respects both districts. I think this is a good choice rather than OC. <i>DG</i> – I agree that Lancaster/Victory Valley connection is good. We have taken care of connection from Malibu to E. Ventura. I also need to state that we have given directions	

		and they have been implemented. <i>Parvenu</i> – Linking LA to the east to desert makes more sense, there is an arterial that goes E/W linking Apple Valley to Antelope Valley and this supports Ward's desire to not use OC as an afterthought. This solves the Malibu problem that we heard a lot about.	
LAVV	Victor Valley to Santa Clarita, splits Santa Clarita (majority is in this district)	<i>Parvenu</i> – There is an E/W transit link. <i>FW</i> – I am concerned about this 34k split in Santa Clarita, where would the pop have to shift? <i>NB</i> – Moving some from Victor Valley and move it through, give back more of Upland. <i>K</i> is worried that doing much over hear will mess up AW's districts. <i>GM</i> – Sending it west with E. Ventura? <i>NB</i> – Removing Santa Clarita to E. Ventura? <i>FW</i> – If you take it out of Victory Valley and you'd have to pick it up in neighboring district (AW's). <i>NB</i> – Upland is not split here. <i>Yao</i> – We have split Rancho Cucamonga many time and we should not split them here. <i>Barabba</i> – Total pop of Santa Clarita? <i>DG</i> – We have respected Santa Clarita a lot of places but here it may have to split a little bit but the consequences of going East are significant. <i>NB</i> – 170k people. So about 130-40k people would have to shift. <i>Raya</i> – I cannot support that change. The part that is split is in an area that is suitable for it. <i>FW</i> – And they are with E. Ventura, which is not dissimilar. <i>Dai</i> – And the rest of Santa Clarita is with its COI. <i>Parvenu</i> – I want to make sure parts of Santa Clarita aren't split from themselves. <i>Ancheta</i> – We can look at that next week.	ok
LASFE			ok
LASGF	Griffith Park, Shadow Hills, Altadena, South Pasadena, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, San Pasqual, San Dimas, Upland, San Antonio Heights	<i>NB</i> – San Marino is in the district, East Pasadena is not. <i>GM</i> – We have to think about moving Los Feliz area as a unit or 2 portions because it is a lot of pop. If Silver Lake and Echo Park are together I am fine with this. <i>FW</i> – Griffith Park area has similar concerns. <i>Parvenu</i> – We honor Thai Town to go east.	
LACVN	Covina AD and WSGV AD and blended as per direction.	<i>Raya</i> – We lament the jump over... We did not split Glendora in CD, so if there is some minor adjustment we can make to make it more reflective of the foothills, I don't know what you would have to pull in elsewhere. You would have to split Glendora. <i>Ancheta</i> – If we are asserting a local COI than we can split a city but are you? <i>Raya</i> – In context of foothills idea. <i>Dai</i> – Swap with Arcadia? <i>Ancheta</i> – I am raising the idea of criteria just so this follows the correct order. <i>Dai</i> – Isn't Arcadia with Rosemead in the AD?	Swap Arcadia for Glendora. Described by <i>NB</i> : Remove Glendora in LACVN and add Arcadia.
LAPRW	Montebello, Pico Rivera, La Habra, Downey, Norwalk, Hawaiian Gardens, Bell Flower	<i>Blanco</i> – A lot of testimony from La Habra about being in OC. <i>DG</i> – In CD option one they are with OC. <i>FW</i> – In AD they are with Chino Hills in Diamond Bar district. They have not been in a full OC district in AD. <i>Dai</i> – We have had conflicting testimony here. <i>Yao</i> – La Palma is only county swap b/w OC and LA? <i>Dai</i> – And also La Habra. <i>NB</i> – La Palma is not with LA. La Habra is only OC city with LA. And Long Beach. <i>Dai</i> – Hacienda Heights is	Include La Habra, swap for Buena Park and split Buena Park. Put Buena Park with Artesia and Cerritos, if it doesn't affect LCVAP.

		<p>also here, something to think about. <i>FW</i> – Option one? <i>Ancheta</i> – Yes. <i>DG</i> – Other than La Habra are there other issues? <i>Dai</i> – Hacienda Heights. <i>Blanco</i> – It is not quite a nest but it has traditional areas together; Whittier, La Morada, South Whittier, Montebello. Norwalk with Downey and Bell Flower. I think this combines a lot of traditional neighborhoods and cities. I think it is cohesive and represents communities that are tied together. <i>FW</i> – Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights are together on CD level. <i>Ward</i> – Buena Park is whole here? <i>NB</i> – Yes. <i>DG</i> – On west side, issue going back to airport. Since Inglewood area is split, the Del Reyes want to be with Westchester. In the AD and CD they are broken away so maybe they can be untied here.</p> <p><i>Ward</i> – Considering testimony from La Habra, maybe we can try to put Buena Park with Artesia and Cerritos. Buena Park would be split. <i>NB</i> – Include La Habra, swap for Buena Park and split Buena Park. Put Buena Park with Artesia and Cerritos, if it doesn't affect LCVAP.</p>	
	Vermont Central, Vernon, Commerce, majority of Long Beach and Long Beach port	<p><i>Blanco</i> – I think this district does a good job combining considerations of SE cities and connection to port. <i>Dai</i> – Split in Long Beach? <i>NB</i> – Eastern LB with OC. Wrigley Park, etc. said they were ok being split from Eastern LB. <i>Yao</i> – Is Long Beach only split into two SD or 3? <i>NB</i> – I believe it is two but I will confirm. It is split between 3 but the 11k with COMP has strong COI. <i>Parvenu</i> – It is based on COI testimony so I think it is tolerable.</p>	
LAWBC	<p>Split of Winchester to prevent Dockweiler Beach split. Inglewood is also split. Bel Air. Part of Torrance (NE part). Harbor Gateway, Carson, West Carson, all of San Pedro.</p>	<p><i>Blanco</i> – This combines a lot of COI testimony. Carson with W. Carson. Districts going N/S. Inglewood split (but we keep it whole in all other districts) means we have a lot of other communities that were split in AD are together. <i>Yao</i> – Am concerned about splitting Torrance might split Japanese American community there and in Gardena. <i>Blanco</i> – We would try to keep Gardena's COI. <i>Parvenu</i> – I think we do honor Japanese community. This district is relatively compact. Hawthorne is there but it is located in an area where there are certain similarities on a N/S access and to move it would make that area not compact. This district has many different ethnic groups, respects N/S; a strong case for transportation funding could be made here. Lomita is more of a suburban bedroom community closer to Rowland Hills and identifies with N/S corridor. I think it fits better where it is. <i>Yao</i> – What if we keep LAX whole and tie it in with Inglewood. <i>GM</i> – I like this configuration. In this iteration we have allowed Torrance to be with many coastal cities that it wanted to be with. The same flight patterns apply when you look at airport here, but I am also acknowledging that the airport is a regional issue so there is some flexibility there. <i>Ancheta</i> – Recommendation is to move LAX into LAWBC. <i>DG</i> – I would like to leave airport in Western coastal district LAPVB, and make Westchester whole. <i>NB</i> – Westchester is currently split. <i>Ancheta</i> – Options: 1) Move whole airport in here 2) rest of Westchester into LAPVB, majority of pop is LAWBC currently. We could pick pop back up through Torrance. <i>GM</i> - 3) Connect Westchester to</p>	See below

	<p>LAVSQ, leaving Pershing on West to keep coastal corridor. Three district clockwise rotation.</p> <p><i>Blanco</i> – As we are doing this I want to point out the Unity map, it looks like our map. (4th option).</p> <p><i>Ancheta</i> – Is Unity map a viable alternative? <i>NB</i> – They pick up pop in SFV.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – We have gotten significant comment to put Westchester with Del Reyes and the coast and we have already split Torrance...</p> <p><i>Ancheta</i> – Three district clockwise rotation support?</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – <i>GM</i> proposes Westchester and Del Reyes go inland, and I propose they go coastal.</p> <p><i>GM</i> – My question on this idea is; what is the west side connector? Is it possible to use Dockweiler Beach?</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – Westchester and Del Reyes with coast is my suggestion.</p> <p>Westchester from LAWBC and Del Reyes from LAWSQ. We would put Torrance into LAWBC.</p> <p><i>FW</i> – I would recommend keeping Westchester whole with Plays del Rey and Playa ...</p> <p><i>NB</i> – We might create a high BCVAP which we were asked not to do.</p> <p><i>Yao</i> – Moving airport with Inglewood.</p> <p><i>DG</i> – It isn't as much about the airport as it is about the Westchester and Del Reyes COI. Just trying to balance. Any options to keep those together and not raise black CVAP?</p> <p><i>NB</i> – Hancock Park and Jewish COI with Inglewood, Crenshaw?</p> <p><i>FW</i> – That is problematic.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – Keep Westchester whole with Del Reyes in coastal district.</p> <p><i>FW</i> – I don't think that trying to avoid an over 50 percent BCVAP is not a COI.</p> <p><i>Blanco</i> – This whole area of El Segundo, Hawthorne, the South Bay beach coastal; we haven't really listened to them and I think that, in at least one iteration, we need to keep them together.</p> <p><i>GM</i> – Moving Hancock Park into Crenshaw area is not the direction we should be moving. When we put Torrance in with Compton what COI is that? I think we should start more at the beginning of the discussion.</p> <p><i>Raya</i> – Hawthorne is part of the South Bay COI and we have done a lot</p> <p><i>Parvenu</i> – The airport is about to go through a major expansion, the funding comes from federal level. I agree with split of airport as it exists. I am concerned about a ripple effect in the Baldwin Hills area.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – I am open to suggestions of how to adjust the mid-city.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – Honor public testimony re: Westchester being with Del Reyes, they are part of coast. Making an adjustment in the 2 adjoining districts. We could also put Hawthorne in that district.</p> <p>Lawndale and Torrance are already split. We could go south.</p> <p><i>Ancheta</i> – <i>Yao</i>'s proposal about putting all of airport into LAWBC. The population implications?</p> <p><i>NB</i> – District will be overpopulated 5-6k. You'd need to remove pop from one district and add to another. We could pick up through Torrance and populate through just two districts.</p> <p><i>DG</i> – I think it is unfair that we have not balanced the Westchester, Del Reyes COI. There is an opportunity to do it and I am disappointed that the CRC doesn't want to try.</p>	
	<i>LA CD cleanup from the morning</i>	

2011/07/15 CD LA - option 1.3	Splits San Pedro but along neighborhood lines.	<p><i>GM</i> – Would it make more sense for Lomita to oriented northward and adjust split in Torrance because we have conflicting COI that Torrance can oriented Northwards or to the coast. <i>Blanco</i> – I just feel uncomfortable with this whole area. Lomita is not going to make the difference. <i>Parvenu</i> – Lomita is 20k then we would shave 20 off eastern part of Torrance. <i>Dai</i> – Isn't Lomita more oriented toward Rowland Hills? <i>Ancheta</i> – New iteration support? Yes, there is enough to move it forward. Leave as is one. 1) Downtown district into DWWTR. <i>Yao</i> – I think we could unpack the Downtown district and move population between DWWTR at the current city split? <i>Blanco</i> – Overconcentration is when you are diluting in another district, which I don't think we have here. If we are only doing this re: overconcentration, then I don't think we need to. <i>GM</i> – It is along two lines; 1) economic and 2) casinos in the area. Both of those together make me think that linking SE cities is on CD level. <i>Yao</i> – Only reason I am making the proposal is that VRA counsel says we need to do something about this area. <i>Ancheta</i> – A conditional response; if Brown says we need to do something then we will and if there is no strong guidance then we can leave as is. <i>Forbes</i> – I would go SE not W. <i>NB</i> – One suggestion is to move ELA into DWTR and remove more of Bell Flower. Currently ELA is split. <i>Dai</i> – If anything, that is consistent with Brown's advice. The COI testimony supports it and we aren't changing anything around.</p>	Leave as is.
LAWBC / SD – <i>Dai</i> 's proposal / additional comment		<p><i>Dai</i> – Unite Del Reyes with Westchester, making it whole and moving it to the coast. Move it south going to Mid-city. Inglewood is already split, exploring Century Palms Cove area. Hawthorne might be too much population. And do a fix through the bottom district in Torrance. Do a clockwise rotation of population.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> clarification - Mar Vista and Del Rey plus rest of Westchester into LAPVB. Reunite Inglewood or Century Palms Cove in Compton/Carson, and I suggest moving pop. Through Torrance.</p> <p><i>NB</i> – Move Westchester into LAPVB and Del Rey and Mar Vista into LAPVB. Repopulate with Palms Cove or part of Inglewood. Repopulate, add more of Torrance to LAWBC.</p> <p><i>Dai</i> – Yes and try to respect Japanese COI in Gardena/Torrance.</p> <p><i>NB</i> - LAVSQ will go up in BCVAP. In general I think this will increase the BVAP in both.</p> <p><i>Blanco</i> – Before we go down that whole road. I don't think we are adding more of Torrance into LAWBC; those two areas don't go together. <i>Parvenu</i> – I agree. <i>Yao</i> – That is in opposition to previous direction to keep Japanese community in Gardena and Torrance whole. <i>GM</i> – We should go to Palms Cove first then Century City or Westwood. <i>DJ</i> – If you move</p>	<p>Keep this as is and make a second visualization: Westchester and Mar and Del Vistas out. Draw into Westwood, Century City or come down to Century Palms Cove or both. The pickup population in Torrance.</p> <p>For population swap start with the south, with Palms Cove, be careful going north to not disrupt COI.</p> <p>Top line at Culver City district is 10 blocks for Rodeo Dr. so be wary, watch boundaries of Miracle Mile and Beverley Hills.</p> <p>(see more direction clarification to left)</p>

		<p>the line west, we are respecting the Japanese community better. <i>FW</i> – Going further north in that district will disrupt LAPVB. Going north is problematic, I would caution against moving too far. <i>NB</i> – Then do not add from north end, from south only? <i>FW</i> – That is what I think, I don't know about rest of commission. <i>GM</i> – Prioritize Palms Cove side. So maybe go slightly north. <i>NB</i> – Permission to move northern boundary slightly? <i>Ancheta</i> – Yes.</p> <p><i>FW</i> – Top line of Culver City is 10 blocks for Rodeo Dr. so be wary, watch boundaries of Miracle Mile and Beverley Hills. <i>Parvenu</i> – I agree.</p>	
	<i>NOR CAL SDs</i>		
SAC	Elk Grove, Vineyard and Florin. Sacramento and all of West Sac. North Highlands (census place) is split.	<i>Forbes</i> – Good district	ok
FTHL	Amador county, East Stanislaus, East Tulare, East Fresno with North part of Fresno city.	<i>Forbes</i> – Good. <i>JC</i> – Split in Rancho Cordova was to keep Elk Grove, Vineyard API COI intact.	ok
SNJOA	Intact county of San Joaquin. Lodi through Galt 99 corridor. Northern Modesto.	<i>DG</i> – Below it is a Section 5 which explains the Modesto split. San Joaquin was kept whole. <i>Blanco</i> – Modesto is split here? <i>JC</i> – I have not had a chance to map yet, but I have received your comments about neighborhoods. <i>Ancheta</i> – And we can address those next week. <i>DG</i> – In the AD level, Brown said the AVAP and BVAP numbers were not as necessary so we could split Modesto along neighborhood lines. <i>JC</i> – Split of Modesto is cleaner here than in AD.	Ok – will work on Modesto split next week during live line drawing
MERCED	Section 5. Addresses Eastern Monterey. Merced County intact. West of 99. 101 corridor from Salinas to Kings City.	<i>JC</i> – Unchanged since last time.	ok
KINGS			ok
TULKE	Tulare and Visalia. North Bakersfield. Much of San Bernardino county.	<i>DG</i> – Trying to repopulate southern part of the Valley has ripple effects.	ok
SBWV	All of Santa Barbara County. Most of Ventura, 126 corridor, Camarillo.	<i>DG</i> – Keeps integrity of E and W Ventura county. Even though they couldn't go with Santa Clarita, this is also good.	

SF	Treasure Island included.	<i>Dai</i> – Keeps SF whole and adds API communities that are similar. <i>GM</i> – Respects Bay and Golden Gate bridge.	ok
SNMAT	All of San Mateo county with exception of Colma and Brisbane.		ok
WMONT	Monterey County west of 101. Takes all of Santa Cruz county. Gilroy, San Martin, Morgan Hill and part of San Jose for LVAP reasons.	<i>T</i> – Unchanged. <i>Ancheta</i> – Section 5, takes part of Santa Clara county. <i>Barabba</i> – Given the restrictions, this handles it quite well.	ok
SJOSE	Evergreen/Little Saigon. Campbell, Las Gatos. San Jose is only city split. Comes to Alameda county line.	<i>Ancheta</i> – We might want to look at boundary between this district and the purple one. <i>GM</i> – There were refinements that need to be made that I will share with Q2 that we received in testimony.	<i>GM</i> will provide Q2 with the refinements about San Jose split to keep COIs intact.
FREOAK	Alum Rock and downtown, Berryessa, Tri Cities are together and majority of Eden (except for San Leandro)	<i>GM</i> – This is what we have been trying to do at the CD level. Several overlapping COIs here. Tri-Cities, San Jose, Eden area, is there a split of San Leandro here? <i>T</i> – Yes, about 7k. <i>GM</i> – We have looked at street level to make a responsible split but if we have flexibility we would like to make it whole. <i>Blanco</i> – We did get some feedback about aligning San Jose with Santa Clara instead of places north. <i>T</i> – Only part with Alameda county is this part. <i>GM</i> – None of the iterations are perfect but we have been able to respect the hills as a significant geographic boundary and the COIs I have previously named. <i>T</i> – If you want to push further south we are going to have to push northward over the bridge. <i>GM</i> – Our team has looked at crossing the bridge on all levels. Many of the Bay Area challenges are related to Section 5 and Golden Gate bridge and large COIs. <i>Dai</i> – <i>Blanco</i> has a good point, the other thing we are trying to do is protect Milpitas/Berryessa COI, and with Evergreen/Little Saigon and the other COIs. One thing we could do is a population exchange between SJOSE and this district. <i>Blanco</i> – San Jose is really a Santa Clara city and its downtown is now with an Alameda/East Bay. <i>Dai</i> – We could swap part of Santa Clara with Downtown San Jose? As an exchange. <i>T</i> – Move Santa Clara into FREOAK and move Downtown San Jose into SJOSE? You'd split downtown from East San Jose. <i>DG</i> – Take downtown San Jose and put it south, then you'd have to break link with East San Jose and you'd split Santa Clara. What is more worth it? <i>GM</i> – I would have concerns in a district of this size with breaking up East San Jose. <i>Forbes</i> – I concur. You could take Cupertino with Santa Clara going north then you could take San Jose going south. <i>Dai</i> – I think that Cupertino is a Santa Clara county city also. Burbank plus Santa Clara? <i>DG</i> – Could you shave off a little North of downtown? <i>Forbes</i> – SW of 680? K	Ok Try to make San Leandro whole but they understand that currently it is not possible.

		<p>– Do you want to go through swap to see if it works?</p> <p><i>Ancheta</i> – In terms of similarities, Santa Clara might have more in common with southern Alameda county than downtown San Jose and Alum Rock. Burbank area is more industrial, a lot of light industries.</p>	
RAMON		<p><i>GM</i> - Sunol, East Bay hills integrity intact. Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, 580 corridor, 680 San Ramon, Danville, Lamorinda area, Concord, the 4 corridor; Bay Point, Pittsburgh, Antioch, etc. In this iteration Martinez is not connect to Contra Costa. <i>Forbes</i> – Mayor of Martinez was concerned they were in the district to the north, not this district. We could pick up Bethel Island, Oakley and put Martinez back in Contra Costa. <i>GM</i> – I would feel comfortable with that. <i>DG</i> – What is pop. exchange there? That area on Eastern side of Contra Costa is always broken off. It seems like this was our chance at keeping the 4 corridor together in one district. <i>FW</i> – I concur with <i>DG</i>. This is one opportunity where we can keep these whole (the 4 corridor). <i>Blanco</i> – I am troubled by the district with Martinez and Pleasanton up to Lake.</p>	ok
RCHMD Also discusses Martinez	San Leandro up 880/80 corridor to Richmond. Pinole, Hercules, ends in Rodeo.	<p><i>GM</i> – Northern and Southern ends are really different. To respect the hills and bridge, the only place to go is N/S. <i>Dai</i> – We are not happy about split in San Leandro. We had Ms. Alon look at keeping the Eden area whole. I think this is the lesser of the evils. I agree with the comment about allowing the 4 corridor to stay whole with Contra Costa in at least one incarnation of the map. <i>Blanco</i> – If Orinda and Lafayette went west and you took top of Richmond district and went over... I don't know. It seems strange to me to go into Pleasant Hill. <i>Dai</i> – The Lamorinda area doesn't have enough population. <i>T</i> – You'd have to split Pleasant Hill to get population back, to include San Leandro. <i>FW</i> – Very high deviation here. If in any of the solutions we can balance better, that would be best. <i>Dai</i> – If we lose Rodeo to the north... <i>T</i> – This is the best I can do with the other direction I have been given. <i>DG</i> – I am concerned about Martinez as the county seat not being included with Contra Costa. <i>GM</i> – And San Leandro is whole at AD and CD.</p>	ok
	BOE	<p><i>Yao</i> – Any county splits? <i>T</i> – Madera, Fresno, Kern, LA, Orange... <i>Yao</i> – City splits? <i>DG</i> – Don't split Altadena.</p>	Fix any city splits with possible exception of LA.
WEST	Del Norte to Ventura	<i>T</i> – Meets Benchmark	OVERVIEW: Don't split any small cities, don't split Altadena. Clean up small splits in Mission Viejo
EAST	Yuba into Northern LA county	<i>T</i> – Meets Benchmark	Follow 405 N/S to the 10 E/W as much as possible
LA	LA county and majority of OC	<i>FW</i> – You can pull it to the 405 and 10 and clean up that area. <i>K</i> – We can look at neighborhood layer with your direction and clean things up. <i>Yao</i> – That is my proposal. Let's	Clean up West Hollywood circle; Beverley Hills, Mid-Wilshire, take

		refrain from splitting cities unless it is necessary for benchmark. <i>Raya</i> – We got letters about wanting to be in LA from the Wilshire group, they are currently in East. <i>FW</i> – Testimony from Hancock Park and Beverley Hills.	line straight across at Mulholland and swap for population could be at Glendora or Sierra Madre.
ORSD	San Diego/Imperial, Inyo/Mono to NE.		
	<i>EXTRA CONCERNS RELATED TO OTHER AREAS</i>		
Yolo AD		<p><i>Forbes</i> – Lake does not identify East. The most important issue for Central Valley is water. Yolo and Colusa are the heart of that debate. To connect Yolo with Napa is a bad idea. This denies Yolo effective representation. <i>Ward</i> – I support keeping Yolo whole. Lake says they don't have connection to Yolo. <i>Forbes</i> – 2001 map has Vallejo with Napa. <i>Blanco</i> – I definitely don't support the 2001 maps. I feel strongly that in something as small as an AD, Vallejo should not be in same district as Clear Lake and other places with rural interests. I think that cities on the 4 have been the hardest hit with the foreclosures. Vallejo has a 510 area code. I think that it is a city beset with urban problems and will not be represented with a rural and agricultural place. <i>Dai</i> – I appreciate <i>Forbes'</i> concern, that Central Valley has different agriculture than Napa but we are talking about an urban vs. rural. The 2001 map is no justification. <i>Forbes</i> – I don't have specific recommendations. Yolo county must stay with Central Valley because of water issue. We could take that amount of people out of Solano. <i>JC</i> – After removing Vallejo and Benicia and making Fairfield whole, then the Napa district still needs 83k. After making Fairfield whole, if you wanted to add Vacaville, you'd have to split it. <i>Forbes</i> – I think splitting Vacaville is a small price to protect Nor Cal water interests. <i>Ancheta</i> – I'm not sure if water is a COI. <i>DG</i> – I am troubled that Yolo is split three ways, which is really only two ways because we have decided that West Sac goes with Sac. Being from the valley, Yolo is together in CD and SD. What is the trade off of pop.? <i>Forbes</i> – Water is the state issue so it is more important at AD and SD. Napa and Lake with rest of Solano. Yolo county would be whole and you'd pick up northern part of Solano and keep Vallejo apart where it is now.</p> <p><i>JC</i> – <i>Forbes</i> idea: So. Colusa, Yolo county except for West Sac and pick up pop going south and another district that is Lake, Napa, Rohnert Park? Put another way; Lake, Napa, Rohnert Park, southern boundary of Napa, and So. Part of Colusa, Yolo county and grab population in Delta. <i>FW</i> – I think this outline is similar to testimony we heard this morning (handout). It</p>	Split Fairfield; include all of Yolo county in district called NAPA.

		<p>isn't just about water, those are the primary economic sources, and we're breaking them up here. <i>JC</i> – This map has Vallejo and Benicia with Napa. <i>FW</i> – I recognize that. <i>Yao</i> – The way we got to where we are, we had to push population up. Maybe we could split Vallejo to some extent. We have a lot of COI that has been presented from Woodland and not from Vallejo... splitting Vallejo and allowing Yolo to be whole could be better. <i>Parvenu</i> – Could we get a quick visualization of that before we leave? Following <i>Forbes</i>' recommendations. <i>Dai</i> – It sounds like <i>Forbes</i> is reverting back to the previous map, we wouldn't have to draw a new iteration. <i>JC</i> – Adding Colusa and Yolo would need all of or most of the population of... Yolo could take Brentwood, Oakley, Discovery Bay, Byron. Del Norte and half of Humboldt would be in MTCAP. <i>Blanco</i> – When I listened to <i>Forbes</i> describe the region's concern of water, it emphasizes my point that Vallejo's problems are urban, not about water. <i>GM</i> – We have not had a lot of testimony from Vallejo but we have had some emails more recently and I know Vallejo and it doesn't mean we can ignore their need for fair representation. I am open to a compromise on this. <i>DG</i> – I wish we could put Yolo together and balance serving Vallejo who is not in a district that serves its needs on any level. Option for <i>Forbes</i> where you have to go down and split Brentwood and Oakley COI and put them with Napa is not a viable option for me. <i>Forbes</i> – Lake and Napa don't care about water. That issue is for Yolo, Colusa and Solano.</p> <p><i>JC</i> – Split Napa? <i>Forbes</i> – Yolo is concerned about Davis. Putting Yolo back in one piece. <i>Raya</i> – Vacaville is too far away? You could swap part of Vacaville with putting Davis back. <i>DG</i> – Can Davis go into Yolo and go into Fairfield more? <i>JC</i> – Fairfield would still be split. <i>Barabba</i> – Come down to 80 or wherever to pick up Davis. Go down 505 pick up those cities and move them into Napa district and drop the Yolo county area down... <i>DG</i> – If Davis was in but Vacaville was left out. <i>Forbes</i> – If you put Davis into Yolo that is all you have to pick up. <i>K</i> – Fairfield in this visualization is not split currently. <i>Raya</i> – I would like to see if you could give us an idea of how Fairfield could be split to compensate for Davis. <i>JC</i> – Split could be near or W of 80. <i>Raya</i> – Is the west side of it less populated? <i>JC</i> – Yes. <i>Ancheta</i> – Dividing it along 80 works? <i>Forbes</i> – There are several streets you could pick, we looked at Pennsylvania last week. <i>Parvenu</i> – another idea for where to Fairfield split (?)</p>	
SAN DIEGO API ISSUE		<p><i>Ontai</i> – API community is split between lower portion and north. Instead of going with N/S access. I'm looking at taking Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Penasquitos, and others in the API COI; switch those from NESAND TO CSAND in a counter clockwise motion and make up pop in south by going counter clockwise, moving El Cajon, La Mesa, Spring Valley into CSAND (or whichever one they are not currently in). <i>Raya</i> – We recognize that these areas are spread out and there are not a lot of options. <i>Ontai</i> – Move API communities from NESAND into CSAND. <i>Ontai</i> – 2 district rotation. <i>Yao</i> – If we need to, we can accommodate</p>	<p>Work with original for merge map and use this as another option:</p> <p>Move from NESAN to CSAND the following communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mira Mesa Rancho Penasquitos

		<p>that kind of change.</p>	<p>Rancho Bernardo Miramar Sorrento Valley Carmel Valley Poway (if possible)</p> <p>Move from CSAND to NESAND the following communities: Spring Valley Lemon Grove La Mesa El Cajon</p> <p>The swap should be made based on achieving an equal population distribution between the two districts as much as possible. This should solve the major concern regarding the improbability of a north-south county-wide API senate district.</p>
EVENT AD		<p><i>DG</i> – Simi Valley, Moorpark and Thousand Oaks are split away from each other. We are hoping to put Moorpark with Thousand Oaks and split Oxnard. Aguirre feels that there is a responsible place to make that split. <i>JC</i> – Split would be at Gonzalez? <i>FW</i> – I think this an excellent balance.</p>	<p>Move Moorpark and Santa Rosa Valley into EVENT and swap pop in El Rio and Northern Oxnard. Aguirre will provide direction about Oxnard split.</p>
SAC AD		<p><i>Dai</i> – We heard from CAPAFR that by adding Vineyard it splits API COI more. <i>JC</i> – Last time, Vineyard was with ESAC and Antelope was in ESAC... <i>Forbes</i> – Do you want to use Sutterville or Florin road as split? <i>DG</i> – Their description is Elk Grove, Florin, Vineyard but it looks like we are doing that. <i>GM</i> – Need clarification from CAPAFR. We are trying to balance the API COI and the African American COI. <i>JC</i> – We could revert to the previous iteration. <i>FW</i> – I want us to look more at COI testimony, not just CAPAFR. <i>GM</i> – CAPAFR is a big network with many organizations and many individuals.</p>	
SAC CD			Add airport to SAC CD
		END OF NOTES – 5pm cut off, meeting continued.	