STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

REVIEW VISUALIZATIONS/
LINE DRAWER DIRECTION MEETING

Southern California

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2021

11:03 a.m.

Reported by:

Jacqueline Denlinger

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS
Isra Ahmad, Commissioner
Linda Akutagawa, Commissioner
Jane Andersen, Commissioner
Alicia Fernandez, Commissioner
Neal Fornaciari, Commissioner
J. Kennedy, Commissioner
Antonio Le Mons, Commissioner
Sara Sadhwani, Commissioner
Patricia Sinay, Commissioner
Derric Taylor, Commissioner
Pedro Toledo, Chair
Trena Turner, Commissioner
Angela Vazquez, Commissioner
Russell Yee, Commissioner

STAFF
Alvaro E. Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Freddy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Outreach Manager
Kimberly Briggs, Field Lead
Ashleigh Howick, Northern California Field Lead
Jose Eduardo Chavez, Central California Field Lead
Sulma Hernandez, Outreach Manager

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS
Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

LINE DRAWING TEAM
Karin MacDonald, Statewide Database
Kennedy Wilson
Jaime Clark
Sivan Tratt
Tamina Ramos Alon
Andrew Drechsler

VRA COUNSEL Strumwasser & Woocher
David Becker
Dale Larson
Fredric Woocher

ALSO PRESENT:

Public Comment
Danny Moreno
Mike
Tony Maldonado
Karen Roseberry
Diana
Foraz Teal
Mr. Adams
Graciela Ortiz
Will Martinez
Patricia
Unidentified Speakers

INDEX

	PAGE
Call to Order and Roll Call	5
VRA Region	7
Non-VRA Region	149
Public Comment	467

1 P R O C E D I N G S

2 Saturday, December 4, 2021 11:03 a.m.

3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. Welcome back to
4 the California Redistricting Commission. We have been on
5 a journey to finalize our maps, and we've been working
6 through this process for the last few weeks where we
7 started with visualizations, went into our draft maps,
8 and are now visual -- finalizing our maps through this
9 visualization exercise. And we're very excited about
10 working on the Southern California region today.
11 With that, I'm going to go to roll call. After roll
12 call, we will go through the run of show for today so
13 that the public is aware which regions we're going to be
14 speaking of and working through, and as well as
15 approximate times, but they are approximate. Depending
16 on conversation and discussion, we want to make sure we
17 have meaningful conversation around all of Southern
18 California and across the rest of the state.
19 So let's start with roll call. Ms. Kaplan?
20 MS. KAPLAN: Hi. Good morning Commissioners.
21 Commissioner Ahmad?
22 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.
23 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Akutagawa?
24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.
25 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Andersen?

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.
2 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Fernandez?
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.
4 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Fornaciari?
5 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.
6 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Kennedy?
7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.
8 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Le Mons?
9 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.
10 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Sadhwani?
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.
12 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Sinay?
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Aqui.
14 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Taylor?
15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I am here.
16 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Toledo?
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Present.
18 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Turner?
19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.
20 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Vazquez?
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.
22 MS. KAPLAN: Commissioner Yee?
23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
24 MS. KAPLAN: Chair, roll call is complete.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Marcy. And I have a

1 quorum.

2 Today, we'll be starting with the VRA region of

3 Southern California. Those regions include Orange

4 County, San Diego, Imperial, and the Imperial Valley --

5 and the Imperial Empire.

6 We will be, after that, at about 1:00, I anticipate

7 moving into and focusing on the non-VRA areas of San

8 Diego and Orange County.

9 We'll be having lunch at around 2:30 for our

10 30-minute break. We'll be doing a 30-minute lunch today.

11 Then coming back at 3:00 to continue on with San Diego

12 and Orange County. And I'm saying San Diego and Orange

13 County because it will be -- we'll be figuring out which

14 of those will be prioritized based on our review of the

15 VRA.

16 Then 3 to 4, continuing on San Diego and Orange

17 County. Then moving on to the Imperial Inland Empire to

18 6:00. And at that time we will assess and see if we will

19 be looking at some of the refinements we have been making

20 over the course of the last couple of days. And we have

21 about five maps that the line drawers have been working

22 on. If we have time, we'll do that. If not, we will do

23 that on Monday, or if we need to, whenever we need to, to

24 ensure that we have an appropriate discussion in the

25 Southern California, and also up in the regions where we

1 need to -- where we still have some resolutions and --
2 conflict resolutions to work through.
3 So Commissioner Yee?
4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. Yesterday there was
5 mentioned some possibility of meeting tomorrow, Sunday.
6 Is that still a possibility?
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Everything's a possibility, but
8 we'll -- hopefully, we'll be able to get through enough
9 that we will meet on Monday.
10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So the goal is to meet Monday
12 and to finalize. So the goal is to finish everything we
13 need to finish. I think it is possible. I've been
14 working with line -- our team, our staff team, and I
15 believe that it is possible to work through our issues
16 and be able to just focus on refinements of the -- the
17 last few refinements on Monday if we need to. But we
18 actually think we can even -- we might even be able to do
19 that and just -- and just go through -- and be able to
20 meet on Monday just to look through the map, if that's
21 necessary.
22 So with that, let's go to the VRA districts. We
23 have Sivan and we have Andrew here today with us to walk
24 us through them. We've had -- I don't believe we'll need
25 a closed session for this, but let's walk through them.

1 And if we need to go into closed session to clarify any
2 issue with Commissioners, we will.
3 Sivan, can you walk us through the VRA districts,
4 please?
5 MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Chair. Let me start with
6 where we left off on Tuesday, I believe, or Monday. I
7 can't even remember at this point when we were last
8 together. But we were discussing the MPH district. And
9 just as a reminder, the changes that we made in that
10 session were we first changed where we were splitting the
11 Coachella Valley in order to keep some more COIs, LGBTQ
12 COI together as well as native lands that had been split
13 because the line previously kind of went straight up the
14 center here. So we moved that line to go North,
15 splitting Indio Hills from Sky Valley.
16 That created some deviations which I'll talk about
17 how I addressed in a second. Then we were looking at MPH
18 and what we did -- and this Southwest Riverside district.
19 The first thing that we did was we removed the split that
20 had previously been in the Northern portion of Menifee.
21 And then, we also added this small unincorporated area
22 here.
23 We were discussing splitting East Hemet and the
24 Southern portion of the City of Hemet. And I was given
25 direction to explore several options offline in terms of

1 where to split Hemet, and also just kind of exploring
2 options in order to raise the Latino CVAP of MPH in order
3 to make it a higher likelihood of electing candidates of
4 choice for the Latino folks living in this district.
5 So what I came up with as what I thought was the
6 most efficient solution was splitting Hemet at the 74.
7 Removing all of East Hemet. This keeps the Valle Vista,
8 East Hemet, Hemet COI together. There were several
9 people who had discussed these three cities as having a
10 lot of connected interest. It does disrupt a request
11 from the African American community to keep Hemet, East
12 Hemet, San Jacinto and Moreno Valley together. So I just
13 wanted to point that out. However, there really wasn't
14 another way that I found in order to raise the Latino
15 CVAP. So that was a trade-off there that unfortunately
16 seemed like it might need to be made.
17 So again, I split Hemet at the 74. And then, in
18 order to rebalance population, I added the City of
19 Beaumont in, and that fixed two problems. That
20 maintained the Latino CVAP of MPH above 50 percent and it
21 also fixed the overpopulation of this district from the
22 addition of those Coachella Valley cities.
23 I can talk about the other situations that I tried,
24 based on Commissioner direction, but this was the best
25 solution in terms of accomplishing those goals that I

1 stated previously.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Sivan.

3 Let's take some questions about this district in

4 particular because I know this is an area that we have --

5 that we have been working on. Commissioner Sadhwani and

6 then, I also want to hear from our VRA Counsel as to --

7 as to the district -- just overview.

8 So Commissioner Sadhwani then Kennedy.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank so much for

10 this Sivan. I'm wondering, they had given the direction

11 when we last looked at this area to try Winchester, and

12 moving Winchester into SECA. And I'm just wondering if

13 that -- if you had attempted that rather than the East

14 Hemet.

15 When I had looked at it myself, it looked like

16 changing the Winchester and South Hemet into SECA would

17 have been enough to further balance the population and

18 increase Latino CVAP slightly higher in MPH. So I'm just

19 wondering if that had been explored.

20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I did add Winchester. I was

21 looking at the notes, and it's possible that I

22 misunderstood that direction, because I actually had

23 written that adding Winchester into Southwest Riverside,

24 not into SECA. I can do that really quickly just to see

25 what those impacts would be. When I did move Winchester

1 into Southwest Riverside, it didn't have a positive or
2 negative effect on Latino CVAP, so I just -- I don't
3 think there's very much population. But I'm happy to
4 just visualize that really quickly for you.
5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, can you visualize that very
7 quickly for us? In the meantime, let's hear from
8 Commissioner Kennedy, and then, also we'd like to -- we'd
9 also like to hear from Mr. Becker.
10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I was just
11 wondering about that small bit of the Northeastern corner
12 of San Jacinta when -- and why that was excluded from the
13 rest of the city? Thanks.
14 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. There is -- actually,
15 it's a little bit hard to see with the yellow overlay,
16 but this is a tribal area that actually includes part of
17 the City of San Jacinto. So that was prioritizing the
18 direction to keep tribal areas intact. I can also look
19 at including the rest of that tribal area within the MPH
20 district in order to not separate it that way and remove
21 that city split. Just one moment.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Sivan. Can you put up
23 the -- oh, yeah, that's what you're doing.
24 MS. TRATT: Yes. Yes.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

1 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. Let me just make this
2 bigger.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's take a look.
4 MS. TRATT: All right. So moving Winchester into
5 SECA from MPH would -- that would not, as you can see,
6 have a major impact on Latino CVAP of MPH. It would
7 maintain permissible deviations for both those districts.
8 And if you want me to continue visualizing this, I can
9 just quickly commit this change and then remove East
10 Hemet back into this other district to see if that would
11 make a difference, positive or negative.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let -- let's try it.
13 MS. TRATT: Okay.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: In the meantime, let's hear from
15 Mr. -- Ms. Sadhwani to see if she has anything else on
16 that. And if not, we'll hear from counsel.
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That had been my
18 thought. In our draft district, we worked -- we
19 continued to pair East Hemet with the Moreno Valley.
20 There had been communities of interest testimony from --
21 about keeping those two regions together. And based on
22 the draft district, my thought had been putting
23 Winchester with SECA and possibly that might mean having
24 to split in Hemet. Yet a different place in order to
25 balance the population, right. Perhaps further South

1 or -- I think, let's take a look and see what happens
2 when East Hemet goes back in, but.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, that's okay.
4 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. So adding East Hemet
5 back into MPH would actually have a really positive
6 increase in the -- oh, actually, excuse me.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
8 MS. TRATT: It would decrease to 49.99, so that's
9 below the 50 --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Threshold.
11 MS. TRATT: -- 50 percent we were looking for. And
12 it does maintain the deviation, but we would have to
13 play, again, with where we were splitting Hemet. The
14 other split that Commissioners had asked me to look at
15 was at Stinson, which I could add in just to visualize
16 that really quickly for you all.
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And just to be clear,
18 though, from the draft, you've also added Beaumont?
19 MS. TRATT: Yes.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: So --
21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I think, like, going back
22 to the draft and playing around with Winchester and East
23 Hemet actually and taking Beaumont back out would be my
24 preference at balancing them. Because I had looked at
25 this previously and it seemed like the Winchester split

1 with South Hemet going -- both of those going to SECA,
2 would have had the impact that we had wanted on the
3 draft. And I think that's what I was trying to say last
4 time.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's play it out. If there's
6 COI testimony to back that up. Commissioner Vazquez?
7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to
8 reinforce Commissioner Sadhwani's thinking on this.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I do think -- I think that's
11 hopefully going to be a better -- a better swap. And
12 Beau -- in communities of interest, Beaumont, Banding,
13 and Cherry Valley do make a lot of sense in terms of
14 being together.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And is Mr. Becker here to
16 give us a little bit of context over the VRA in this
17 area?
18 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I am. This is -- first of all,
19 could I ask the line drawers, could we get permanent
20 boundaries that are darker than the kind of yellow that
21 we have now so we can clearly see the -- on my screen
22 it's very hard to make out; it looks like the green. If
23 that stays, that's great. But I think that's just to
24 select. Something dark. Yeah, thank you.
25 So -- and can I just confirm the -- maybe scroll

1 over so I can see the label a little bit, the MPH Black
2 percentage. Is that 14.83?
3 MS. TRATT: It is.
4 MR. BECKER: Okay. Thanks. I think this is a --
5 this is a challenging area. This is definitely on the
6 low end with regard to Latino CVAP. But given the Black
7 cohesion, we're seeing there's significant Black
8 populations there. I think this likely is -- satisfies
9 the requirement of the Voting Rights Act for this area.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
11 MS. TRATT: All right. So just finishing up making
12 those swaps as recommended by Commissioner Sadhwani. I
13 put Beaumont back into the High Desert-based district.
14 Then we took a look at moving Winchester from MPH into
15 SECA. I moved the split in Hemet South to Stinson and
16 then, put Hemet back int MPH as well. This would have a
17 Latino CVAP of 50.47 for MPH, and it would make the
18 deviation of SECA below the permissible range of five
19 percent.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen?
21 And Sivan, can you also put the Latino CVAP -- the
22 Latino heat map on so we can take a look at it.
23 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. One moment, please.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: In the meantime, we'll hear from
25 Commissioner Andersen.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I -- Sivan, I -- does
2 this include, like -- I thought that the numbers went
3 much higher. It was in the 51 when you went -- just did
4 the first, exactly what Commissioner Sadhwani said. I'm
5 not sure about this -- the area that's red right now.
6 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It was at 51 but remember that
7 the -- we were still moving things around. So the
8 deviation was at negative 6.57. So that wouldn't be a
9 legally compliant district because it's above five
10 percent deviation.
11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, does -- was that when
12 you took Hemet -- Beaumont out?
13 MS. TRATT: Yes.
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Because I thought --
15 MS. TRATT: It's getting --
16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- I thought at that point I
17 was looking at -- I see. So wait, so you had to -- you
18 needed to add more population back in? And this is when
19 you're grabbing (indiscernible) --
20 MS. TRATT: More population from Hemet, exactly.
21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And -- yeah, I think it'd be
22 helpful if we could see the Latino heat map.
23 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I was just looking at that.
24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Originally -- yeah, our
25 original draft, we had -- we had cut into the City of

1 Menifee slightly. And I think that had been adding to
2 the population. When we had changed that, that was when
3 I think you started pulling from some of those other COIs
4 from Beaumont and elsewhere.
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So this is where the previous
6 split in Menifee was. That's at the 74 as well. So I
7 can definitely look at adding that back in as part of
8 this selection to visualize that. Give me just one
9 moment, please. So that would still leave the MPH
10 deviation at around 50 -- or excuse me, the Latino CVAP
11 for MPH at 50.68. And we're still looking at a high
12 negative deviation for SECA.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Sivan. Let's hear from
14 Commissioner Kennedy, then Vazquez.
15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just a
16 reminder that you were going to look at moving the tribal
17 lands as well as that small portion of San Jacinto into
18 MPH as a possibility. Thank you.
19 MS. TRATT: Would you like me to do that now as well
20 as part of this rearrange?
21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would.
22 MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. Give me just --
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks.
24 MS. TRATT: -- one moment, please.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: And then, Commissioner Vazquez?

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was just thinking
2 not knowing how much actual population is in that March
3 Air Force base portion to the East of -- that's the 215?
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: There's little portions --
6 there's that big portion and one right up above. I'd say
7 using the 215 as a boundary may help us both population
8 and Latino CVAP.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Well, we can try it. And
10 then, I'm just making sure that we -- we're -- we have
11 COIs as a part of all of this. I don't, I mean -- this
12 is a VRA district so improving the CVAP is the priority.
13 But if you have CVAP that's community input, that's even
14 better.
15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Does anyone know, what is
16 that small portion of -- it looks like Eastern Riverside,
17 East of the 215 that's kind of hanging out there?
18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. That's what I was also
19 referencing.
20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That might have -- yeah.
22 That might work too.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, that right there. Is there a
24 reason why we excluded it last time because it looks like
25 it went around, Sivan?

1 MS. TRATT: That's because it's part of the City of
2 Riverside. So that would introduce a split into the
3 city. Is that what you mean?
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Yes, that's --
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- so that would be a split in
7 Riverside.
8 MS. TRATT: Yes.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And we're saying we're
10 comfortable with that because of VRA? Okay.
11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I also feel like, just
12 generally, in these regions and probably throughout
13 California, freeways tend to be a fairly good boundary
14 instead of, you know, maybe slightly more random streets.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure.
16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I feel pretty comfortable
17 using freeways as boundaries for this portion of the map.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
19 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Vazquez, does that --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Because I would do --
21 MS. TRATT: -- mean that you would like me to remove
22 this selection and move the split in Hemet back to the
23 74, because right now, this is at Stinson, which as I
24 understand is a community-defined kind of boundary and a
25 major road. But I'm happy to move it back to the 74 if

1 you would feel --

2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No.

3 MS. TRATT: -- more comfortable.

4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No, I think especially if we

5 have -- I think it's just an absence of strong community

6 of interest testimony using a freeway is more -- probably

7 better. Thanks -- but thanks for asking.

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: I just want to make sure that

9 everyone is comfortable with all of these changes in the

10 VRA district. Our priority here is getting a CVAP that

11 is -- that allows a protected class to be able to elect

12 people of -- candidates of their choice. But I just want

13 to make sure everyone here is comfortable with all of

14 these changes. I see a consensus on moving forward with

15 all of these.

16 Sivan, can you please try to incorporate these and

17 see if -- how it -- how it affects our CVAP and our

18 deviations?

19 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. So just kind of

20 highlighting those changes. We're adding the Northern

21 portion of Menifee back to where it was in the draft

22 version of this district. We're also moving the split in

23 Hemet South to Stinson. Adding in the small portion of

24 San Jacinto that had previously been cut and adding the

25 tribal lands that are on the outskirts of San Jacinto to

1 keep that intact.

2 Adding the portion of the Air Force base that is

3 East of the 215, as well as a small portion of Riverside

4 East of the 215. Those changes would make the Latino

5 CVAP with MPH 50.58. And as you can see, would have no,

6 like, major impact on the other districts that it's

7 pulling from. Although I would still point out that SECA

8 still has a high deviation -- or a high negative

9 deviation. But I'm happy to commit this change and then

10 we can look at balancing that out later. I just wanted

11 to point it out so it doesn't go unnoticed.

12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That would be the -- the

13 SECA would have -- we're balanced in MPH, right? And

14 then -- so all of these changes actually left us with a

15 lower CVAP than we started with, if I'm -- if I remember

16 correctly. But are we saying, is it -- is it -- because

17 I'm seeing a 50.58. Am I seeing this correctly, Sivan?

18 MS. TRATT: Yes. It would 50.58. And again, that

19 was removing Beaumont which had previously raised it just

20 slightly higher. But keeping that COI intact.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: So the reasoning for these changes

22 would be to keep communities of interest together? So

23 let's talk about these. Let's make sure that these

24 changes make sense.

25 Commissioner Vazquez, Kennedy, Turner and Sadhwani.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: In consideration of
2 increasing the Latino CVAP, I'm also wondering if we can
3 sort of go into -- I'm not sure what that is. Again,
4 keeping the 215 as a border, there's a little piece --
5 you can't see where I'm pointing -- up North where your
6 pointer is, Sivan --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: And do you want to also -- before we
8 move on -- sorry, Commissioner Vazquez. I didn't mean to
9 interrupt.
10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: I do want -- I did want to ask a
12 question for counsel. This is an area where we have
13 African American, I believe, and Latino -- high Latino
14 and African American CVAPs, and I'm curious if we have
15 crossover cohesion in voting for those two groups?
16 MR. BECKER: Yeah. We generally do see cohesion
17 here between Latinos and Blacks. That -- that's one of
18 the reasons I made the statement about the district in
19 the kind of the mid-50.5 to low 51.-something percentage
20 range. But I think that's likely compliant with the
21 Voting Rights Act.
22 Now, I want to be careful. It's not -- that's not
23 to say that cohesion means 100 precent cohesion all the
24 time and equal turnout. So there is -- we should be a
25 little bit careful about that. But with these

1 percentages I think -- and especially given -- it's
2 clearly not possible to get them significantly higher.
3 So I think this is a representation of what -- of a
4 really good faith attempt to get them to the point they
5 are and likely -- very likely to satisfy Voting Rights
6 Act considerations.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it, Commissioner -- or
8 Director -- or Mr. Becker. And let's go back to
9 Commissioner Vazquez. I'm sorry to interrupt. I just
10 wanted to make the observation that this is an area that
11 has both high Latino CVAP and African American CVAP. And
12 we certainly received a lot of African American and
13 Latino testimony around it -- around the COIs.
14 Vazquez?
15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it. I -- so going a
16 little bit more North of what we're currently looking at,
17 I was just, again, trying to think if we could get some
18 of that -- go a little bit more West of where the current
19 boundary is. Right -- yeah, right up there. Again, just
20 given the observations we've had about Latino CVAP, this
21 may or may not be a worthwhile change. But --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: It may be.
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I'm thinking probably
24 not -- probably just more of that -- the portions that
25 look like they have higher Latino concentration. So not

1 going South of the 215. Yep, that. That's what I was
2 looking at.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. I'm just looking at the
4 testimony that I'm getting from other Commissioners. It
5 looks Hemet, San Jacinto, East Hemet, Valle Vista, and
6 Homeland are communities of interest that requested to be
7 kept together. And just -- we're just looking through
8 our COI testimony.
9 Commissioner Vazquez, anything else here?
10 MS. TRATT: So I just wanted to -- just quickly,
11 this portion of -- is actually unincorporated, Riverside,
12 that's on the other side of the 215. Do you still want
13 me to maintain everything? I'm happy to clip it to
14 the -- to the 215. I just wanted to point out that this
15 is not technically in the City of Riverside, so I can --
16 I can either snap it to the border of the City of
17 Riverside or continue along the 215.
18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Let's continue along the
19 215 --
20 MS. TRATT: Okay
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- just for consistency sake.
22 And then, also I just wanted to note that that Southern
23 portion got cut out in your --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah.
25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And then I -- I'm done.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, of course. This is great. While
2 Sivan is working on these changes, we'll hear from
3 Commissioner Kennedy.
4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Two
5 things. One, I am not recalling any input -- and I may
6 have just overlooked something -- but I'm not recalling
7 input wanting to split Menifee. So I would -- I would
8 back out the split of Menifee and instead include Valle
9 Vista in this district. Thank you.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. So
11 let's look at our deviation. Deviations are looking --
12 it's also negative. All right. So let's -- Valle
13 Vista --
14 MS. TRATT: So that -- that -- it looks like that
15 didn't actually have an impact on the Latino CVAP. It
16 remains at 50.58.
17 MR. DRECHSLER: And Sivan, I think Commissioner
18 Vazquez -- the East -- the Riverside part East of 215 --
19 yes, that --
20 MS. TRATT: Well, right here. Yes.
21 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.
22 MS. TRATT: Sorry.
23 MR. DRECHSLER: No problem.
24 MS. TRATT: Yep, you're right. One small --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, that piece right there.

1 MS. TRATT: Thank you.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: And then we'll go to Valle Vista
3 after this.
4 MS. TRATT: All right. So I just grabbed that
5 little portion of Riverside on the other side of the 215.
6 And now I will move Valle Vista. And Chair, would you
7 like me to remove this addition in Northern Menifee or
8 keep this and Valle Vista?
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Commissioner
10 Sadhwani.
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can we just take a quick
12 look. So what are we dealing with -- in the deviations
13 at this point? What's in the box?
14 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I would -- I mean, I would
15 just caution against moving a --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- difficult population about SECA
18 without maybe looking. I can zoom out and we can take a
19 look at options to move population back into SECA. Just
20 because removing another city is going to push it even
21 past negative six percent.
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That was my concern, and I
23 was actually going to suggest -- I understand the desire
24 to keep San Jacinto whole, but my sense is if we maintain
25 that break, right, if San Jacinto stays -- that red

1 portion that we have highlighted now, stays in SECA, it
2 might improve our -- the balance between those two
3 districts in terms of population deviation and maintain
4 the Menifee cut.
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah, I'm not sure how many people are
6 here, but let me look at --
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't know either.
8 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me just remove it and we can
9 see what that looks like.
10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we did also receive quite a bit of
12 Spanish-speaking testimony if you would speak to that.
13 We have conflicting testimony in this area. The Spanish-
14 speaking community did not want to include East Hemet.
15 And Hemet in an R -- in a VRA area -- and as they were
16 concerned about the CVAP. The -- while -- but we also
17 received much testimony wanting to be in this area as
18 well. So we received conflicting -- and I'm sure you all
19 remember that.
20 MS. TRATT: So Commissioner Sadhwani, that does look
21 like it slightly improves the Latino CVAP to 50.64 from
22 50.58.
23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, but it doesn't improve
24 the deviations between SECA and MPH.
25 MS. TRATT: It does not.

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, not much.
3 MS. TRATT: Or not in a meaningful way, yeah.
4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. And Commissioner
5 Toledo, I know you just mentioned the East Hemet issue.
6 I mean, was there -- was it more specific than that? I
7 don't recall. I mean, either way, East Hemet's going to
8 be in one of these two districts.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: It wasn't -- it wasn't so much
10 that -- no, they just didn't want to be in the VRA. They
11 didn't -- the feedback that we got was that they didn't
12 want this region in the VRA area, but it doesn't look
13 like there's any way to exclude it from the VRA area too
14 because they also have significant population.
15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I mean it looks like
16 we need to pick up population somewhere for SECA to get
17 it under five.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, it does.
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you have any suggestions for that,
21 Commissioner Sadhwani or Sivan? You've looked at this
22 quite a bit. Any suggestions on where we could add
23 population without reducing the CVAPs. We're hopefully
24 improving it, right?
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. Well, what is --

1 what is that unincorporated area right next to Menifee?
2 Could that go into SECA? Yeah, right there. That's
3 currently in the Southwest area.
4 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Maybe more just in terms of,
5 like, making a bigger impact population-wise. This MBCV
6 district is overpopulated from adding these cities in
7 from the Coachella Valley at 13.02. So --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
9 MS. TRATT: -- I would recommend before going kind
10 of inland -- or towards the Inland Empire districts which
11 are already kind of, like, at an okay standing it seems
12 like, that it might be more efficient to do a swap just
13 between two districts to kind of minimize that ripple
14 effect. And that initially was the thinking behind
15 adding Beaumont was it was kind of the easiest swap just
16 in terms of number of steps and disruption to the area.
17 So -- but we can definitely look at doing something else
18 there instead.
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No, thank you for
20 pointing that out. I didn't realize we were so far over
21 deviation in this next district over.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Commissioner Fernandez.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No -- I, Sivan just
24 mentioned one -- I can't even pronounce today.
25 Beaumont -- Beaumont.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Beaumont.
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But that's not the district
3 that's under, right? SECA's the one that we have to
4 find?
5 MS. TRATT: So SECA as is, is balanced.
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No --
7 MS. TRATT: It would become negative -- it would
8 become negative six if --
9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.
10 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible) in red were
11 committed, yes.
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So we have to find
13 population for SECA, correct?
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
15 MS. TRATT: Yes.
16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay. Thank you. I
17 just wanted to confirm.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Would the La Quinta -- is it La
19 Quinta (Keen-ta) -- Quinta (Keen-ta) area?
20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: La Quinta (Keen-ta).
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Would that be a good -- I don't know
22 about -- I don't remember --
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- the COIs in that area. It doesn't
25 sound like --

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- it's a good move. I think that --
3 if I remember correctly, the COIs, they were with Palm
4 Springs but. And this is a VRA area and we do need to
5 make cuts, right? And we do need to make the -- get
6 population in, and we do need to make sure that the VRA
7 districts are sound. So let's -- we need to figure this
8 out.
9 Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy, and Vazquez.
10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I was just wondering if
11 some of that unincorporated area could be brought in. I
12 don't know what the numbers are. I don't know if they --
13 I don't know if you'll get to -- what are you going to
14 need, at least 5,000 or something like that, to bring it
15 down?
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: What's the population number that
17 we're looking for?
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, it's at negative --
19 it's at negative -- Sivan, if you can move it up.
20 Negative 6.12. So that would be --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: About 5-, 6,000.
22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- like a 5,500 to 6,000.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's what I said.
24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And I was trying
25 think instead of moving an entire community, maybe we can

1 look at some of that unincorporated.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or a piece of the community --
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Above the -- above and
4 below. Right.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: If there's -- if there's a good split
6 in the community. I'm not as familiar with this area.
7 Commissioner Kennedy, might you have some
8 suggestions on how to resolve the population?
9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If we -- if we remove the
10 area in Hemet that is currently proposed to be added,
11 what does that do to our numbers?
12 MS. TRATT: One moment, please. Also apologies, I'm
13 going to be putting myself on mute. I have someone leaf
14 blowing right outside my window and vacuuming in the
15 hallway of my apartment, so I'm just going to be making
16 those changes, but I might not respond right away, just
17 while those background noises are going on. So just one
18 moment, please. Thank you.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy,
20 Commissioner Vazquez, does either of you have additional
21 potential changes or places to add population into these
22 areas that are surrounding and wouldn't impact Latino
23 CVAP or would actually improve it? At this point, that's
24 what we're looking for. Any suggestions?
25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I think what we -- what

1 we just saw is the CVAP go up, and that's a fairly dense
2 population in that part of Hemet.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: And it looks like the CVAPs have gone
4 on the right direction too.
5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: CVAPs have gone in the right
6 direction. It leaves MPH still slightly underpopulated
7 but less so than what we started with. Although, you
8 know, I also still believe that getting that bit of
9 Menifee out is important. So we may need to look at
10 other options.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The -- another option might
13 be that we find a midpoint between 74 and Stinson for a
14 split in Hemet and see what that does. Thank you.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. And Commissioner
16 Vazquez?
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was -- maybe
18 someone, maybe Commissioner Kennedy, can you remind me
19 sort of where -- what the issue with Menifee is? Because
20 I was going to propose actually bringing that line
21 further South to improve the population in MPH.
22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You know, my sense is that
23 Menifee sees itself more as part of that 215 corridor
24 going down to Temecula and very much part of the
25 Southwest Riverside community.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That makes sense, although,
2 just given the population distribution, I'm wondering
3 if -- I'm wondering how much if it -- like, in terms of
4 communities of interest, even the Latinos in Menifee may
5 feel some -- some affinity with MPH folks. Again,
6 feeling like freeways make pretty -- make for pretty
7 distinct geographical and community boundaries. So
8 that's my suggestion is to bring that line actually South
9 using the 215 as a Western border, and maybe bring it
10 just about to Winchester. And including -- yeah,
11 including that little piece.
12 MS. TRATT: Would Commissioners like me to try that
13 now?
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't see any opposition. Let's
15 try it. Let's see how it -- what it -- how it impacts
16 the CVAP and deviations.
17 Commissioner Fernandez.
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It -- no, yeah. I'm just
19 wondering, like, the -- that unincorporated area to the
20 North, I mean, is there no population there? I -- you
21 know, I almost would prefer to do that versus cut up a
22 city of -- if we have enough population. But it -- there
23 may be -- there may be minimal.
24 MS. TRATT: So just stopping here before I go too
25 far because now the Southwest Riverside is negative. I

1 could look at, you know, readding these red portions that
2 are in the same districts to see if that would put the
3 deviation back in a permissible range.
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, we're also having problems with
6 our Latino CVAP. It keeps falling as we add this area
7 too. So that's in consideration as well.
8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Well -- and that's
9 my -- that's I think, generally, what I've been trying to
10 solve for is that the surrounding areas of all of these
11 districts have very low concentrations of Latinos, if at
12 all. And so I'm -- I feel like we don't have -- really
13 have a choice except to grab pop -- you know, surrounding
14 population from other cities that have some Latino
15 residents to maintain our Latino CVAP.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I think we have to go back to our
17 priorities. Number one is population and we're trying to
18 attain that. And number two is VRA and then -- and then
19 keeping communities whole, not splitting them is number
20 four, right. We -- we're trying very hard not to split,
21 but if we could do minimal splits, that may be an option.
22 So Commissioner Vazquez, do you have a suggestion
23 for a cut in one of the more -- we never like to cut
24 communities, especially ones that have -- that are in
25 COIs, but in some cases like this, we may have to,

1 especially when there's legal requirements to do so.
2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. So it seems like
3 there is quite a bit of dense population in Menifee. So
4 Sivan, I'm wondering if, first, if you could just bring
5 that Southern line up to be more even with Winchester.
6 So even, like, right where the Latino concentration
7 population ends. If we could -- if we could start by
8 just, like, bringing that line North a little bit.
9 There we go. That gave us a couple of percent.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's back up to where we started,
11 but we still have our deviation issue.
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Right. But it -- in
13 our deviation, it gave us a couple of more percent. So I
14 just -- I feel like in -- for this district, we're going
15 to have to break up cities even more because that's where
16 the Latino populations are. And if we are trying to
17 maintain our Latino CVAP, we're going to have to grab
18 Latino populations from different cities.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's right. And so, I think one of
20 the -- so if we zoom out, I think the options are -- and
21 I think Sivan can help us, maybe Mr. Becker as well. If
22 we zoom out and we look at the Latino CVAP, I - it's
23 pretty -- at this point, we're -- the only places we're
24 seeing it is in some of these -- you know, La Quinta.
25 It's one of these communities, right, in this area that

1 could potentially populate or in the other side of the --
2 of the SECA area. Oh, and but that would underpopulate.
3 But it -- so it's one of these, Palm Springs, La Quinta
4 areas.
5 If there's any good -- let's -- that could
6 potentially get us the population from those areas.
7 Potentially Sky Valley would be another place.
8 Sivan, do you have any suggestions on where we could
9 move population into SECA that could potentially then
10 feed into -- allow us to go into SECA feed -- and move
11 population up into MPH?
12 MS. TRATT: So the issue, actually now, with just
13 these changes are only pulling from Southwest Riverside.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
15 MS. TRATT: So it still remains balanced at negative
16 .96 deviation. So SECA actually is fine. What would
17 need to happen would be that population would need to
18 move into Southwest RIV because if these changes in red
19 were committed, that deviation would become negative
20 8.24. So we would be looking at surrounding districts
21 potentially from SECA moving into Southwest Riverside.
22 But MPH would be fine so we wouldn't have to move
23 anything else into MPH.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we would get -- we are --
25 we'd be fine with MPH, and we'd need to move population

1 into this other area.
2 Any suggestions from Mr. Becker or from the floor?
3 MR. BECKER: Sivan, can you -- can you show me -- I
4 forget what the district is named to the North of SECA
5 right now. The one that isn't a VRA district.
6 MS. TRATT: Yes.
7 MR. BECKER: And can you show me what the deviation
8 is there?
9 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
10 MR. BECKER: So it's significantly overpopulated
11 right now. So I think the way to look at this -- so
12 first of all, it's admirable that we're trying to
13 accommodate that Voting Rights Act covered area as much
14 as we are. And I think that's -- I think this effort has
15 been very worthwhile. I think it's very clear that we're
16 going to be in the maybe the mid-50 percent to, maybe at
17 most, the mid-51 percent range. There's probably not
18 much more than can be done given the population there.
19 My guidance there is that in that range, as long as
20 the Black population remains roughly where it is, given
21 the cohesion that we're seeing, we likely see a district
22 that will comply with the Voting Rights Act. So I'll
23 just say that to begin with.
24 I'd probably start with focusing on the number one
25 criteria right now, which is population and the easiest

way to address that issue is by shifting population from MBCV into MPH. That's going to -- depending on what that population is, we don't want population that is going to reduce the Latino CVAP too much there, but if it goes down a slight amount and gets us -- starts getting us within deviations, I think that's probably where I would focus. Not having the Latino -- well, I get -- I guess that -- is that the Latino CVAP map that is on, but it's a little bit hard to see I think. But that might be where I'd start first rather than starting from the Western edge of MPH. Just because of the population disparities, you don't want to create too much of a ripple effect.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it.

MR. BECKER: And I'm happy then -- that might create some questions marks around the MPH districts and the Latino CVAP. I'm happy to come back to those as we get to them --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: -- as we get to them see what we can do with them.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So with that advice in mind, any suggestions on what population to shift, Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. My suggestion was

1 going to be Palm Springs. Maybe take that unincorporated
2 area to the West and then down -- and then the Southern
3 portion of it -- of Palm Springs until we get to the
4 desired amount. It was either Palm Springs or La Quinta.
5 So I would like to see the Palm Springs.
6 MS. TRATT: So Chair, I'm happy to look at that. I
7 will need to commit these changes in red in order to add
8 population to a different district.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concerns with adding those?
10 Commissioner Fernandez, I see your hand. Commissioner
11 Kennedy, I see your hand.
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I would -- I would
13 not want to do the Menifee because if we're going to pull
14 population from the M -- MBCV, then we need to not pull
15 it from Menifee.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So there's not a consensus on
17 that portion. Any other portion that we don't have
18 consensus on? No. So let's -- everything except for
19 that piece we have consensus on -- or general consensus
20 rather.
21 MS. TRATT: So should I remove the portion of
22 Menifee that's -- that I'm circling with the hand?
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: At this point, yes.
24 MS. TRATT: Okay.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Of course everything is still --

we're still -- everything's on the table, but for now.

MS. TRATT: Would you like me to commit those changes so we can look at pulling in population from other --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. We have general consensus, yes.

MS. TRATT: Okay. All right. So the next thing that you wanted to look at was adding all of Palm Springs into SECA?

CHAIR TOLEDO: No.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not all of Palm Springs, just -- you see that unincorporated area to -- right there, yes. And then, South. Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: So I've --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then, kind of like move South up.

MS. TRATT: Oh, excuse me. Sorry. I believe this portion is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Tribal lands.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

MS. TRATT: A little bit easier to see. So these are tribal lands, and then it's also a U.S. landmark area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from Commissioner Kennedy and just see if he has any suggestions on where to bring population in.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.
2 Sivan, if you could zoom back out a little bit.
3 What I'm seeing is that the -- so JRC is 2.09 precent
4 overpopulated. And it might be possible to shift a small
5 portion of the City of Riverside, which is already split
6 from JRC into MPH. And I think that would be more likely
7 to resolve our deviation issue without making our CVAP
8 situation worse.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
10 Commissioner Sinay?
11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So on that Southern boundary of
12 the SECA, we have split Ante Borrego, Desert Park, so
13 Borrego Springs is kind of where the population is
14 separate from the state park. I don't know if it makes
15 sense to move it North or South but it would be good to
16 have it whole. And I don't know if that would help with
17 some of the issues that we're having right now. So it's
18 on the other -- the other border. But I just wanted to
19 put that out there.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Sivan, any thoughts on any of
21 those two suggestions and whether they might help with
22 our deviations?
23 MS. TRATT: I would just caution the Commission
24 about removing any more of the City of Riverside from the
25 JRC district as this is another potential VRA and you

1 know, it's at 51.58.

2 But Mr. Becker, you're welcome to correct me if I'm

3 wrong, but I wouldn't necessarily encourage lowering that

4 any further, which I think removing Riverside would,

5 potentially.

6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So --

7 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I'd just say again, I would -- I

8 would see what can happen on the Eastern side of MPH and

9 not the Western side because it is -- the 51.45 percent

10 in SCCHR, the 51.58 percent in JRC are all at the lower

11 levels. As in MPH you'd be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

12 It doesn't -- it doesn't work.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm going to make a suggestion.

14 Let's see what happens with the CVAP. I'm worried about

15 the CVAP. But can we look at potentially Beaumont -- a

16 piece of Beaumont. It is populated. It's on the -- I

17 mean, the deviation is our number one criteria. Let's

18 hope that the CVAP doesn't go down too much. But it

19 looks like we need -- there should be enough population

20 there. I'm not sure what the COIs are. I'm doing this

21 just for population purposes. If there's strong

22 opinions, let us know. But enough population --

23 Let's hear from Commissioner Sadhwani.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Before we explore

25 Beaumont, is there a population in this piece above

1 Moreno Valley and bringing it all the way up to the
2 county line or no< This is -- this is mountainous, I
3 think.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think it's mountainous.
5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's mountainous and that's
6 where we have the Moreno Valley burros living.
7 Chair, if I may?
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure.
9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You know, I believe that we
10 can take a very small piece of Riverside from JRC to MPH
11 without damaging ourselves in JRC. So I would -- I would
12 ask that we explore that.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's -- let's explore it quickly.
14 So let's see. What little piece would you be interested
15 in taking?
16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, along the line of --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Hopefully it works.
18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- along the lines of
19 Commissioner Vazquez's --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah, that's a good idea.
21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- earlier statement. Let --
22 let's try that piece of Riverside that is North of the 60
23 right there. Yep.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll test it out. So --
25 MS. TRATT: Do I -- for continuity issues, that

1 would potentially isolate High Grove and Grand Terrace,
2 which are part of JRC. I believe it could -- there would
3 be a less small potion that would maintain it intact, but
4 it would definitely make it less contiguous than it is
5 now.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, I see that.
7 MS. TRATT: Do you want me to work with adding Grand
8 Terrace and High Grove as well as that portion of the
9 City of Riverside? Or I can -- let me just add the
10 portion of Riverside and see what that does and how it
11 looks. One moment, please.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Vazquez.
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I'm -- I mean, please,
14 Mr. Becker, interrupt me, but I mean, Voting Rights
15 trumps contiguity. So is that a serious contiguity
16 concern?
17 MR. BECKER: So that -- that to me -- let me just
18 see. Wait, just that -- that totally separated part
19 without a part that's attached?
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Well, I think -- sorry, I
21 think Sivan is actually taking more than what we were
22 looking at.
23 MR. BECKER: Yeah.
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think there was the
25 Southwest Riverside, just right there. I think

1 Commissioner Kennedy was asking for what looks like Mount
2 Vernon Park and UCR Botanic -- Botanic something or
3 other.
4 MS. TRATT: Well --
5 MR. BECKER: So to be clear, and I want to make
6 sure. So contiguity and compactness are two different
7 things. Contiguity literally means that there's not some
8 separate part that's unconnected. And I don't know if
9 that's been a problem yet. Compactness is a separate
10 issue and it's lower down on the -- on the criteria.
11 Again, criteria, equal population, Voting Rights Act,
12 contiguity -- hope I'm getting this right because it's a
13 Saturday, and who knows if I'm getting this right -- and
14 then, the city boundaries, county boundaries, COIs, other
15 topographical and political boundary considerations come
16 forth.
17 So I'll -- right now, I'm not seeing a compactness
18 issue. If there were a compactness issue, I'll let you
19 know for sure. I'm definitely not seeing a configure --
20 contiguity issue, but I might have not heard the full
21 issue. In the either case, I would not advise bypassing
22 contiguity, by the way, for VRA. Even though it's below
23 it, theoretically, contiguity is an important
24 consideration.
25 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Kennedy, I just wanted to

1 confirm that you were instructing me to move this portion
2 of the City of Riverside from JRC and not the portion
3 from Southwest RIV that Commissioner Vazquez was
4 mentioning; that I got that instruction right?
5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I think we could go
6 there next perhaps. But if we -- if we can look at
7 that -- it says, what, Hunter Park? Yeah, that part. So
8 not High Grove, not Grand Terrace.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So Commissioner Sinay,
10 Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Fernandez, while Sivan
11 is working through these. Commissioner Fernandez.
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I -- I'm sorry, Chair. I
13 think I missed it. In the beginning we -- the very first
14 move we had contemplated was, I believe, to dip into
15 Hemet, and then that was removed and I don't remember
16 know why that was removed as a potential.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe it was for population
18 purposes, deviation, the SECA and the -- it made the
19 deviations not --
20 Commissioner Sadhwani, was that for deviations?
21 Commissioner Sadhwani, that was a couple of moves back.
22 It feels like a chess game.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Right. But it just
24 seems that the MBCV district -- that has a -- it's a high
25 deviation, and that would seem like the appropriate place

1 to try to balance everything out instead of going --
2 trying to balance it from one VRA district to another.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's just my concern
5 right now. And that's what we're doing right now. And
6 it just seems counter to what we should be doing.
7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. But it looks like we've
8 achieved what we wanted to achieve.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: So at this point, we have compliant
10 deviations and CVAPs that are better than when we
11 started. So let's hear from Commissioner Sadhwani and
12 others.
13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. We have achieved it,
14 but we've now created this odd neck right -- right
15 through here.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: There's contiguity, but it is an odd
17 neck, yes.
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And it is an odd neck. I'm
19 with Commissioner Fernandez on this one. I feel like we
20 were going in a better direction by trying -- because we
21 have all this overpopulation in that MBCV, right, out
22 further East. So rather than -- what is the saying --
23 robbing Peter to pay Paul -- I don't know, whatever that
24 saying is. Like, we're trying to shift between these VRA
25 districts when we have a massively overpopulated district

1 right next to it. So you know, taking that piece from
2 Hemet, which is already cut anyway, it's a city that's
3 already cut and populating MPH, had -- I believe, I can't
4 remember, there were so many changes, had left SECA
5 underpopulated. But then SECA can be populated by MBCV.
6 So I --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- think that would be my
9 preference rather than creating this tiny little neck
10 here which looks a little odd.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let -- let's hear from Mr. Becker
12 about the neck and then, also hear from Turner --
13 Commissioner Turner. So first, Commissioner Turner, then
14 from Mr. Becker about the neck.
15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I
16 just wanted to say that when we initially made the
17 adjustment, I think it lowered the Latino CVAP to an area
18 that maybe we weren't comfortable with. However, our VRA
19 attorney, and he'll speak to it in a minute, suggested
20 that with the way that the African American voting
21 occurred, that it was less of an issue or problem for
22 him --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- but we still continued
25 through that path. And so I think that's how we got

where we are. That does create the neck. I would be in favor of going -- you know, kind of just reversing a bit to see if there was a way that we can accomplish what we initially started out.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

And then, Mr. Becker, comments on the neck?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, that's okay. I did not expect to hear the sentence, Mr. Becker, comments on the neck today. But -- so I think, if maybe Sivan can tell me, is the current shaded area, is that consistent with the boundaries of Highgrove?

MS. TRATT: Yes. Highgrove boundary is -- the City of Highgrove is excluded from this selection.

MR. BECKER: That's correct. So that is not split. That narrow portion along -- and I'm sorry, the screen is very small, I don't know what that freeway is -- is it 215?

MS. TRATT: Yes.

MR. BECKER: Okay. So that narrow portion around the 215, that -- that's because that's part of Highgrove, correct?

MS. TRATT: Exactly.

MR. BECKER: So --

MS. TRATT: And then that would also cut Grand Terrace off, which is -- that was the contiguity issue

1 that I was worried about.
2 MR. BECKER: Yeah.
3 MS. TRATT: But --
4 MR. BECKER: Yep.
5 MS. TRATT: -- the City of Highgrove would protect
6 the contiguity.
7 MR. BECKER: So I -- it's -- this -- the current
8 configuration from a compactness perspective -- excuse
9 me -- is better with the shaded area included in -- is
10 that the JRC district?
11 MS. TRATT: Yes.
12 MR. BECKER: It's better with it included. I don't
13 know that it raises huge compactness concerns given that
14 you've managed to keep certain cities together and not
15 significantly bypass nearby populations, which is the
16 legal standard. You know, I think it doesn't appear to
17 me that the exclusion or inclusion of this particular
18 shaded area has a major impact on the Latino CVAP,
19 correct?
20 MS. TRATT: Actually, it has a positive -- it -- I
21 would say --
22 MR. BECKER: It's fifth.
23 MS. TRATT: -- this is the highest we've seen at
24 51.14 for MPH. It also raises JRC from 51.58 to 51.63.
25 So not, you know, like a huge shift, but an actual --

1 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I'd say --
2 MS. TRATT: -- small shift.
3 MR. BECKER: -- I'd say that was a fairly modest
4 shift. I think -- I don't think that this portion -- let
5 me just say this. I think this portion is not
6 necessarily required for VRA purposes. You still have an
7 underpopulation problem; you're trying to deal with an
8 MPH. This has the advantage of creating a -- of not
9 changing the Latino CVAP and MPH significantly while
10 getting it under deviation. So I think -- I think
11 there's not a ton of compactness risk here is probably
12 the main -- if this were -- if this section were added to
13 MPH --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yep.
15 MR. BECKER: -- as I'm interpreting this way.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I'll ask the question. Do you see
17 a continuity problem? I think there's a path through --
18 MR. BECKER: There's no contiguity problem.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- so there's no continuity problem.
20 So there's no continuity problem.
21 MR. BECKER: this is a compactness issue, if there
22 is one. And I think it's a relatively minimal
23 compactness issue given that there is a very significant
24 effort to keep communities together. As well, I think
25 there's some significant justification for it. Again,

1 I'm not saying this is necessarily where you want to end
2 up or not; that's ultimately your decision. But I don't
3 think --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure.
5 MR. BECKER: -- this configuration necessarily
6 raises legal concerns.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's hear from the floor,
8 Sinay and Andersen.
9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I'm not quite sure why
10 my hand keeps raising, I swear.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: No worries. Let's hear from
12 Commissioner Andersen.
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You're just -- you're just
14 ready, Commissioner Sinay.
15 Now, maybe I missed it, but I believe this is the
16 only population shift that create -- takes care of the
17 deviation problem and MPH that doesn't lower the CVAP. I
18 mean, significantly. This does lower it by .05, but
19 every other one has dropped it into the 50 or 49. So is
20 that correct? I mean, was there one other version that
21 increased --
22 MS. TRATT: The version that I -- we started out
23 with, which I'll just pull up again, was looking at
24 swapping from MBCV and taking in Beaumont. And that did
25 fix the deviation and have the Latino CVAP above 50. But

1 in the direction that the Commission has been moving this
2 morning, yes, this is the option that raises it the most.
3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. So which case, I
4 would go for that. I know it's kind a bit like it is
5 robbing Peter to pay Paul, but it solves our issues and
6 keeps the LCBP 51.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it does -- there is an issue in
8 population in the MBCV district.
9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, correct. Correct.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- can we zoom out and see
11 how would we -- er would resolve that? And what are the
12 options for resolving that?
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. But I -- as I said --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Given this VRA district that would --
15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- I would -- I would do
16 this because every edition we've sort of seen --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- from the other side
19 lowers it by more than .5 as opposed to this is a .05.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we would have options around
21 the -- I mean, are -- to fix that in other areas as well.
22 I'm just trying to see if there's other non-VRA areas we
23 could push population into.
24 Sivan, what are you suggestions on fixing the
25 population deviation problem we have in -- with --

1 because we have a very overpopulated district at this
2 point.
3 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I would definitely agree with
4 Mr. Becker that the probably most efficient way to go
5 about solving this problem would be to look Easter --
6 Eastward in terms of just kind of making some swaps on
7 this side. You could look at returning to the
8 configuration of the Coachella Valley potentially or
9 even -- let's see. You could even, I guess, remove more
10 of these cities and put them into MBCV, into SECA.
11 Otherwise, I mean --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: You're suggesting we use --
13 MS. TRATT: -- otherwise I would say Beaumont. But
14 I -- the Commission didn't like that suggestion. So I'm
15 not really sure what direction you'd like to move in from
16 here.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we could potentially go into the
18 Palm Springs/La Quinta area. I mean that's the -- that's
19 one place where we can -- we can eventually draw
20 population. There's also the district above, I believe
21 that is underpopulated at the Big Bear City. I'm not
22 from this area so I don't know this area as well. So I'm
23 looking -- I'm going to ask Commissioner Kennedy and
24 others who are more familiar than I am.
25 I've seen the community of -- test -- community of

1 input testimony but I -- at this point we're not really
2 looking at that. We're looking at trying to balance
3 population. So other than trying to reduce the splits.
4 Commission Kennedy, and Fernandez, Andersen, and
5 then we'll also hear from others who --
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: What about --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- may have ideas.
8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- okay. Thank you.
9 Sivan, what about right under Redlands in the SBCHR, that
10 section right there, if we move that into the SBCHR,
11 because that one's underpopulated and MBCV is
12 overpopulated.
13 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can definitely look at doing
14 that. If I remember correctly, that lowered the Latino
15 CVAP of SBCHR by adding that population, but I'm happy to
16 visualize that. Again, because I'll be moving population
17 into a different district, I will have to accept the
18 pending changes before we visualize any changes to other
19 districts. But I'm happy to take a look at that next.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And potentially, is there
21 any way to move a population to non-VRA districts so that
22 we don't impact them as much or no? Like, there I see
23 the VVHD population up there; they potentially could have
24 a bigger deviation.
25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, what you could do is

1 go from MBCV to VVHD and then all the way to 210.
2 Because that -- I mean, that's the other shift you could
3 do because the 210 is under. But then, you're talking
4 about crossing quite a few boundaries, so.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's keep hearing from
6 folks in terms of rotating population. Commissioner
7 Andersen or Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner
8 Vazquez.
9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you, Chair. One
10 thing I -- we need to consider is that since MBCV is 13
11 percent, we've got to move, like, 40,000 people.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And because it's an eight
14 percent difference, you can't just do it in one district.
15 We have to do it in multiple districts. So would you --
16 Sivan, would you please back out just a little bit
17 so we can see what is touching this district?
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's see all of the
19 districts. Let's zoom out as much as we can --
20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think that helps.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- while also being able to see this
22 area.
23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And I think that
24 would really help us come up with ideas. Oh, good.
25 Yeah, so there's a couple of areas. No, I see. We also

1 have -- is that correct? The one above, we have
2 another -- what's the -- yeah, the one just a little
3 bit -- it has Barstow in it. What's -- what percentage
4 is that?
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: 1.36, we have some --
6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- some room to move population in
8 there.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, so that's -- yeah.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: But --
11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's the only one
12 attaching to this to the North. So there's just that
13 one, SECA, and then -- correct, that one right there.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: So the -- the only thing --
15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Those were our choices.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez's suggestion
17 of rotating population from MBCV to VVHD then to other
18 districts that are underpopulated and the other side
19 might -- you know, a possible, although complex exercise,
20 but it's a possible move forward. Others, Commissioner
21 Kennedy, Commissioner Vazquez? And there's --
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Chair.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- there's also the Beaumont
24 possibility. It does lower our CVAP but it can
25 potentially get us into compliance as well. We hate

1 reducing CVAP, but our number one criteria is population,
2 equal population. So the -- you know, yeah, we always
3 have to follow our criteria.
4 Commissioner Kennedy.
5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. You know, a rotation
6 does seem to be the best way to go here.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You know, I think that there
9 could certainly be some small changes such as moving
10 Homestead Valley into VVHD. You know, the next
11 possibility, given that there are other military
12 facilities in VVHD, would be taking Twentynine Palms and
13 the Marine Corps base and shifting those from the MBCV
14 into VVHD.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, can you tell us in terms of
16 the data, how people are we shifting because we see a
17 13.02, so we'd have to get it below 5? What -- what's
18 the population that we'd have to move?
19 MS. TRATT: That is a good question. I just asked
20 Andrew to look that up. In terms of moving population, I
21 believe -- was it Commissioner Andersen who said it was
22 around 40,000?
23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. It would be like --
24 more like 37-something rather, but yeah --
25 MS. TRATT: Yes, so looking at --

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- so consider it 40,000.
2 MS. TRATT: -- looking at some of the suggestions
3 that Commissioner Kennedy just mentioned, it looks like
4 Homestead Valley is only 3,000 people.
5 And then, Andrew, if could also look up Twentynine
6 Palms and the Marine base to see. But I do not think
7 that that would be sufficient population concentration.
8 Also the Morongo Valley cities do constitute a COI.
9 We have a lot of testimony asking for everything from
10 Morongo Valley to Twentynine Palms to be kept intact. It
11 looks like Twentynine Palms is 26 -- about 26,000. So it
12 would be a start in the right direction and I'm happy to
13 look at that. Again, I would need to commit the changes
14 first to the MPH district, but I can definitely do that
15 at the Chair's direction.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you repeat that, please?
17 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. I can look at moving
18 Homestead Valley, Twentynine Palms, and the Army base
19 that is above -- the Twentynine Palms Army base into VVHD
20 from MBCV; however, we still do have the pending changes
21 moving a portion of the City of Riverside from JRC into
22 MPH. So I would just need to lock that change in in
23 order to make a change to --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
25 MS. TRATT: -- the deviation district.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I'm going to turn to the
2 Commission and get -- see if we have a general -- a
3 consensus. I've looked and seeing a lot of yeses. I'm
4 just scrolling down because I don't have the luxury of
5 having the huge screen in the conference room. So yes,
6 we have consensus, do let's move forward with that. And
7 then, let's also highlight the area that we are speaking
8 of as well.
9 And then, we'll go to Commissioner Vazquez and
10 Fernandez.
11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think before we start
12 working up in this desert valley portion, I do think we
13 should zoom into higher population areas. I think you
14 can take -- other than going South and grabbing the
15 Southern portion of Redlands, I think if we start by
16 going East and taking the Northeast potion of Redlands
17 sort of right next to Ukiah -- or Mentone. Yeah. I
18 think if we could start with Mentone and then, maybe
19 portions of Highland. It might be more helpful now to
20 turn on the Latino heat map again just so that we make
21 sure -- maybe start with Mentone, moving that. That
22 should -- it won't get us all the way there, but
23 hopefully, it'll get some population that we can then
24 start working on the Desert Valley portions.
25 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Vazquez, you're asking to

1 move Mentone into VVHD or into --
2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No, sorry. Into SBCHR.
3 MS. TRATT: Oh, okay. Would you like me to
4 visualize that change now?
5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I would.
6 MS. TRATT: All right. Give me one moment while I
7 make that happen. So that looks like it would push the
8 deviation of MBCV to 11.08, so moving in the right
9 direction. It would make -- it would lower the Latino
10 CVAP of SBCHR to 51.11 percent.
11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That feels tolerable. Yeah.
12 I think at least we should start there because Mentone
13 just has so much population. That's probably going to be
14 the best we can get out of -- it looks like the West side
15 of MBCV.
16 MR. BECKER: Chair, would you like me to just
17 comment on that briefly?
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Of course. Yes.
19 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I think Commissioner Vazquez is
20 right. I think this is -- I think this is still -- I
21 would be careful about going much lower than that in
22 terms of Latino CVAP. But given the composition of the
23 rest of the district, I don't think this raises
24 significant Voting Right Act concerns.
25 MS. TRATT: Okay. So we --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: There's no issue with having this --
2 this is not a protected area?
3 MR. BECKER: The SBC -- the SBCHR area is a Voting
4 Rights Act area. This slightly lowers Latino CVAP. It's
5 a relatively small lower that -- the lowering of that
6 CVAP. The percent of the composition of the rest of the
7 district, I think, is consistent with Latinos being able
8 to continue to elect candidates of choice, given this
9 composition. So I think it's not a -- it's not a
10 significant concern if you were to choose to add it in.
11 That's obviously -- there might other considerations, but
12 from a Voting Rights Act perspective, this doesn't raise
13 red flags for me.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez,
15 Fernandez, I just want hear from everybody and see what
16 you guys think.
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, sorry. I'm done. I'm
18 good with this.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Yeah, so my --
21 earlier, I had suggested underneath the Redlands, that
22 population, but then also, I'd like to go back to -- like
23 where Palm Springs is.
24 And Sivan, is there any way to, like, if you
25 highlight, like, La Quinta, can it show what the CVAP is

1 just in the La Quinta? Is there a way to do that?
2 MS. TRATT: Yes. I will need to just deselect this
3 quickly, but yes. One moment, please, while I --
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Because my thinking is if
5 we -- if it doesn't lower the CVAP and you move La Quinta
6 into the VRA, I think that fixes -- that fixes the
7 deviation because -- well, maybe not. Because that
8 goes -- it's actually lower than I thought it was.
9 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it looks like the change in
10 population would be --
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Now it's too high.
12 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it is the right amount of
13 people at 37,000 more or less. And it looks like the
14 change in Latino CVAP is about 8,000 people. Yeah.
15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I would -- that's okay.
16 I'd go back to maybe the Redlands, or if that doesn't
17 work, then we could do the Mentone that Commissioner
18 Vazquez -- I just didn't know what that was right
19 underneath Redlands.
20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me look at Redlands quickly
21 as well.
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can I just comment that I --
23 I think adding Southside Redlands is going to lower the
24 CVAP in SBCHR too much.
25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And it did. Okay. Thank

1 you.

2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That's where my parents live.

3 That's where I grew up.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's say -- where are

5 we with deviations at this point?

6 MS. TRATT: So moving back is -- it looks like

7 Southern Redlands is out as is adding La Quinta. So

8 we're back at looking at Mentone. And that would, again,

9 make the Latino CVAP 51.11 and the deviation negative

10 2.7.

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we still have 11 percent

12 deviation in the MBCV, right? So it brought it down

13 slightly to 11 percent?

14 MS. TRATT: Yes.

15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay?

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did raise my hand this time.

17 I almost forgot why I raised my hand. Originally, I

18 raised my hand just to say -- just to remind us that this

19 is one of the few areas that the community collaborative

20 were really excited that we got right. So I just -- I

21 just wanted to remind us of that -- of that fact. And

22 obviously, we need to make some of these tweaks, but just

23 to keep in mind that those who live there, you know -- we

24 haven't received unanimous support in most areas.

25 I don't -- have we -- we have one split to Coachella

Valley or do we have two?

MS. TRATT: Coachella Valley is split once. Oops, excuse me. Just turn off the heat map for a moment to make things go faster. The Coachella Valley is split right here where the hand is moving.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. So I guess where I was looking at, when you had the heat lamp on, there was a little corner by Palm Springs and Cathedral City that -- yeah, that. And I was wondering if there was a way to go into Palm Springs that grab that piece and the tribals' communities. But I don't know if that's possible, but I was just -- I just wanted to explore because I have a feeling -- well, the heat map doesn't show it anyway. But that was just a thought. If --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Very populated.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. It's very populated there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. It's very dense, but I'm not sure how dense the Latino community would be, and maybe there's some neighborhoods or something.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, when the heat lamp's on there, that little, little corner, but I don't know.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're getting to it. Commissioner Andersen, and then I'm going to return again -- Commissioner Kennedy, do you have any suggestions in this

area? I think you had some -- I think between you and Fernandez, you guys had some ideas (audio interference) (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That was one concept, the other concept still on the table is Beaumont. We are trying to meet the first requirement which is equal population. Even though it is a VRA area, the equal population trumps VRA. Let's go to Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I think -- believe we should do the Mentone because -- remember I was saying the -- you know, we have eight percentage points we have to move. That can't be done in one district unless it's a pass through, like Commissioner Fernandez was saying. Say like, take some from MBCV -- all lock -- all eight, throw it to VVHD and spread it out from there. But otherwise, I suggest we do this. That'll help a little bit. And if we do another area and then, also the -- what Commissioner Kennedy said. I would do what Commissioner Kennedy said next because we have to take from there as well, so. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy, is there any --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yep.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- suggestions on possible areas,
2 possible splits, possible communities --
3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yep.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that can be moved?
5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So yeah. I'd be interested
6 in hearing from Commissioner Vazquez if we're going to
7 move Mentone into SBCHR. If we then moved Highland into
8 VVHD, again, you know, the next one after that might be
9 to move Homestead Valley into VVHD. And as a final step,
10 again, cut between Joshua Tree and Twentynine Palms and
11 move Twentynine Palms and the Marine base.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Joshua Tree sounds familiar.
13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Joshua Tree is where the EY
14 of Yucca Valley falls.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Right. So let's take that one step
16 at a time. Sivan, what is the first step you need from
17 us to go through this?
18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Mentone.
19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I would just point out to
20 Commissioners that based on the changes that were made to
21 the Antelope Valley district --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
23 MS. TRATT: -- that had raised the VVHD deviation,
24 and the way that we fixed that was actually moving
25 Highland out as Highland previously was already in VVHD.

She -- Highland is about 55,000 people so we would need to split it. And that would be -- it would be like an either/or. If you wanted to move Highland out or the Twentynine Palms, Marine base, Homestead Valley. I would say that's one option, and then, Highland is the other option if you wanted to move in this direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So preference for one or the other, Commissioner Kennedy, so we can ask the Commission?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My sense is that Highland probably makes more sense. I mean, that -- that's kind of where you get on the road to go up to Big Bear and Lake Arrowhead. But no, I don't have as strong a feeling on that as I have had on some of these others things that we've been discussing.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So how about we -- because we're going to break for a lunch in a sec -- or not lunch but for our 15-minute break. I thought we'd give general direction to the line drawer to explore some of these things during the break. Let's see, what is the general -- so can you give your general direction of what you're thinking of so she that she can work through it over the break and see if helps us with our deviations?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. So I would -- I would proceed with the Mentone shift. I would explore the

1 Highland shift into VVHD and looking at the possibility
2 of, you know, whether there are opportunities to shift
3 any excess population from VVHD into, you know, 210 or
4 the, I guess -- that VVHD reaches around the Antelope
5 district. So it could go -- see what the options are for
6 the Santa Clarita district. I mean, do we move Agua
7 Dulce and Acton into the Santa Clarita district, for
8 example, because I believe we've had some call to do
9 that.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So Sivan, can -- if you would,
11 during the break, explore that possibility and work to
12 get us to deviations that are in the appropriate balance.
13 Commissioner Andersen, we have to go to break. Do
14 you have a quick?
15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yes, I do. Thank you,
16 Chair. In addition to -- I agree with Commissioner
17 Kennedy with the one caveat, I'd rather not cut Highland
18 up. It's sort of all or nothing. And then -- but then,
19 try all the other things that he was suggesting.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So Sivan, if during the break,
21 if you could go through and implement those things and
22 see if -- explore -- implement by exploring, you can
23 always reverse it if it doesn't work out, but if you
24 could try that. In the meantime, we are on the 15-minute
25 break for our staff and consultants. Thank you, and

1 Commissioners.

2 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:32 p.m.

3 until 12:46 p.m.)

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California's

5 Citizens Redistricting Commissions Visualization session.

6 We are working on our maps for the Empire -- take a look

7 where we are.

8 Can you go through, Sivan, some of the exploration

9 you did over the break to get us to appropriate

10 deviations?

11 MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Chair. So I have gone ahead

12 and made snapshots of two different options that would

13 put the MBCV deviation back into permissible range. The

14 first one would be taking a portion of Highland and

15 moving that into VVHD. And then, per a recommendation

16 earlier from Commissioner Fernandez looking at La Quinta

17 and adding a portion of La Quinta into SECA.

18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

19 MS. TRATT: So let me just pull up that snapshot so

20 you can see what that would look like.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you so much for the two

22 options.

23 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. I will just say that this

24 swap definitely is going to have -- this swap fixes all

25 of the deviations. The other swap, which I will talk

about next, does leave VVHD overpopulated. So then you would be looking at making changes into the LA County districts. But let me just look at this one first. So let me make this bigger so you all can read it. So for -- well, actually I guess we don't need this because these changes were -- excuse me. Okay.

So we moved this Southern portion of La Quinta --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: -- into SECA from MBCV. SECA is now at 3.29 percent deviation and Latino CVAP is still in --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Comfortable.

MS. TRATT: -- yeah, comfortable range at 56.46. Then we went up to Highland, right here. And you can see that that line shifted slightly to incorporate this portion of the City of Highland into VVHD. And VVHD is now at 4.01 and MBCV is at 4.19 percent deviation. So that's option 1.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And this fixes all of our deviation problems?

MS. TRATT: It does.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So this is one option and --

MS. TRATT: Option two would be looking at Twentynine Palms and Homestead Valley as recommended by Commissioner Kennedy. One moment while the plan restores. So as you can see, the Marine base, City of

1 Twentynine Palms, and Homestead Valley -- and I'm happy
2 to move this line down to the freeway or make
3 adjustments. Just kind of as a rough visualization of
4 what this move would look like. It would correct the
5 deviation of MBCV to the permissible 4.69 percent
6 deviation.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
8 MS. TRATT: However, then you run into the issue
9 where VVHD is again overpopulated at 7.76.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
11 MS. TRATT: And then we'd need to look at moving
12 population out, potentially into one of the LA County
13 districts or into one of the VRA districts we have in the
14 Inland Empire. Commissioners, any preference on these.
15 We do have -- I'm going to go to Commissioner -- to Mr.
16 Becker first, then we're -- and as you're thinking about
17 those, think about your priorities and also the
18 deviations. Mr. Becker.
19 MR. BECKER: Yeah. Just a piece of advice if you
20 want to go down this path. You might want to look at
21 those areas on either side of Twentynine Palms which are
22 probably very low population and unincorporated that
23 might be included for visual compactness reasons. I --
24 this is not a concern for legal compactness reasons
25 because there's not populations there. I see

1 Commissioner Kennedy nodding his head. And I think it
2 would be advisable to try to include those if possible.
3 Unlike --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
5 MR. BECKER: (Indiscernible).
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So we have the two
7 options. One is the La Quinta option, including portions
8 of La Quinta. This was proposed by Commissioner
9 Fernandez. And this is the second option.
10 Commissioner Kennedy? You're on mute, Commissioner
11 Kennedy -- Commissioner Kennedy.
12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. I think the second
13 option's far better than the first. I guess I'm a little
14 bit confused. If we -- if we do Highland -- are we
15 talking about doing Highland and -- or part of Highland
16 and one or the other of these? And again, I go back to
17 VVHD already wraps around into Northwestern LA County.
18 And so I would -- I would see us being able to shed some
19 population there, as I've said possibly moving Acton and
20 Agua Dulce into the -- into the Santa Clarita district
21 because I think --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- I think we had some
24 feedback in that sense. But if -- but if you could
25 clarify for me first, this is moving part of Highland and

1 Twentynine Palms and Homestead Valley?
2 MS. TRATT: Well --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan?
4 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible) that clarifying
5 question. Highland -- there's a glitch going on with
6 Maptitude. I've already contacted Pal (ph.) for tech
7 support about it. You can see it's happening over here
8 with La Habra as well. Just something weird is happening
9 with the software where previous selections remain
10 highlighted. But this is not actually part of the
11 selection. Unfortunately, according to tech support,
12 there wasn't a way to fix it. So it's going to be like a
13 slight visual blunder. I'm really sorry about that.
14 But just to clarify, yes, the option was moving a
15 portion of Highland into VVHD. We could also look at
16 instead of moving La Quinta, just moving Homestead
17 Valley. And the intention behind moving La Quinta was to
18 keep the deviation issues kind of localized to this area.
19 But if you are okay with things spreading into LA, then
20 we can definitely look at just moving Highland or a
21 portion of Highland.
22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I think that's -- I
23 think that's far better. I mean, my preference would be
24 moving Highland or a portion of Highland, number one.
25 And number two, would be, you know, Homestead Valley,

1 Twentynine Palms, understanding that one or both of those
2 might involve rotating some population counterclockwise
3 into the Santa Clarita district from the -- from the far
4 Western part of VVHD. I -- the La Quinta idea is a
5 complete nonstarter for me.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's go to the San
7 Clarita area so we can see where we would rotate
8 population into potentially. And then, Commissioner
9 Sadhwani and Commission Vazquez as well -- or Vazquez and
10 then, Sadhwani.
11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I'm --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. I see it.
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. Actually, yeah.
14 Can -- Sivan, can you just play out what the LA County
15 changes would look like? I -- I'm feeling sensitive
16 already to the fact that we had to split up Lancaster and
17 Palmdale for VRA consideration. So I'm just -- I'm
18 feeling as protective as Commissioner Kennedy is feeling
19 about La Quinta, I'm feeling pretty protective of the
20 non-VRA portions of the Antelope Valley.
21 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. So just thinking
22 those through in order, we would be moving population
23 from MBCV until it was at a permissible range. So that
24 would potentially be a portion of Highland, a portion of
25 Homestead Valley or Twentynine Palms, depending on which

1 direction the Commission would like to go in.
2 That would then overpopulate VVHD. And so then,
3 from what I heard from Commissioner Kennedy, potentially
4 looking at moving Agua Dulce and -- or Dulce, excuse me,
5 and Acton into, I would guess, the 210 district, as this
6 is underpopulated and SCB is already at a high deviation.
7 But Commissioner Kennedy, if you had a different
8 idea that I'm not capturing, feel free to correct me.
9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. The idea was to move
10 it into the Santa Clarita Valley district. That might
11 allow you to put some of the San Fernando Valley back
12 with other San Fernando Valley portions and out of the
13 Santa Clarita Valley district. You know, my
14 understanding from community feedback is that there are
15 some strong ties between Santa Clarita Valley, Agua
16 Dulce, and Acton. You know, I would not touch Palmdale.
17 I would not touch anything else.
18 But I'm recalling input that would support moving
19 Agua Dulce and Acton into the Santa Clarita Valley
20 district. And then, we've of course heard from San
21 Fernando Valley that they, as much as possible, would
22 like to be self-contained. And I think this would
23 contribute to that. Thank you.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
25 Commissioner Vazquez, Sadhwani, did you have a response

to that? Vazquez, and then Sadhwani. No? Okay, Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No, I am -- I'm open to looking at what that would look like.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, it -- I'm not completely sold, but I'm open to it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. I think we're all open to other ideas.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner -- oh, go on.

MS. TRATT: (Indiscernible) labels of cities just in hopes that that might be helpful to our Commissioners. I can turn it off if it's distracting. But just in these conversations, I thought it might be helpful.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Say that again? I'm sorry.

MS. TRATT: Well, I just wanted to note that I turned on population for the labels of cities.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

MS. TRATT: So that's the number below the label. I can turn it off if it's distracting, but just because we're talking about moving relatively significant numbers of population around, I thought that might be helpful. But I can --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

1 MS. TRATT: -- turn it off.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. You can keep it on for
3 now. And Commissioner Sadhwani and then -- and I do
4 because I know Mr. Becker has to leave in a few minutes.
5 I do want to go through and just play out all this -- all
6 of the VRA districts, just make sure that we're --
7 that -- just so we're aware of any issues that there
8 might -- that we might have. And then come back to this
9 area.
10 Commissioner Sadhwani.
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm certainly open to this
12 exploration because I did hear the testimony last night
13 about Agua Dulce and Acton. But at the same time, I want
14 to hear more from Commissioner Kennedy about why La
15 Quinta is a nonstarter.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We are talking about VRA
18 districts and that is our second priority. So we have to
19 build those districts in such a way that they are going
20 to perform. La Quinta did decrease the LCVAP, but if not
21 La Quinta, then where, right. And I don't understand why
22 this is a nonstarter. We cannot continue to put
23 communities of interest over the needs or the number two
24 criteria over and over again. And I mean, we see this
25 often not only in VRA areas. But I feel like in many

1 places in the map, we end up putting lower income
2 communities at risk and at stake in order to maintain
3 some of these communities of interest or higher income
4 communities. And I just want to name that and point that
5 out because I'm not comfortable with it.
6 So I'd love to hear more about what makes La Quinta
7 so special. And if not La Quinta, I mean, we've also
8 received testimony to bring in parts of Palm Springs as
9 well into the VRA district. Let's explore that as well
10 as an option because I think we're at a point exploring
11 all of our options. But it makes me feel uncomfortable
12 that we're maintaining one COI and then sending off this
13 huge ripple throughout the rest of our map. Because I'm
14 really concerned about the longer term effects of that.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner
16 Sadhwani. All right. So that is -- I mean, at this
17 point we're dealing with number one criteria, number two
18 criteria. Number one criteria, even before VRA, is equal
19 population, so equal population, VRA second, and those
20 have to come way before communities of interest, which
21 are number four.
22 But in the meantime, while we all digest this and
23 think through, and Sivan thinks through some ideas,
24 let's -- and Commissioners as well and come up with a
25 specific direction, let's go through, Mr. Becker -- let's

1 just go through the VRA districts that we have still
2 remaining. In terms of just over any guidance that you
3 might have on any of them before you have to leave. So
4 if we can just go -- zoom out to our VRA districts. And
5 as we look through the central -- the Southern
6 California -- and of course, we received VRA guidance
7 throughout this whole process. There's not much change
8 in this area, but let's just make sure that we have that
9 in the record.
10 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I think most of the levels at
11 which the demographics of these districts are -- hold on.
12 I need to look at that. We didn't talk about the South
13 San Diego/San Ysidro district yet. Okay. I wanted to
14 say the labels were overlayed on top of each other. So
15 that's fine too. You can zoom back out. Thank you.
16 The -- I think the demographics of these districts
17 in the Voting Rights Act areas are likely to be compliant
18 with the Voting Rights Act considerations in those area.
19 The deviations are obviously of continued concern and you
20 are all working through that. I would just really
21 stress, and this echoes some of the points that have been
22 made recently. Number one is equal population, number
23 two is VRA. They stand above the rest in that order.
24 Everything else, even contiguity, which is a very,
25 very strong consideration, is below those two. I don't

1 advise breaching contiguity for any reason, and we can
2 discuss it if there's a reason that you absolutely have
3 to. But outside of that, the criteria for considerations
4 are well below equal population and Voting Rights Act.
5 And I think once that hierarchy is really pursued on
6 these, it will help answer some of the -- some of these
7 trickier areas where, you know, there are several
8 districts that although the levels of Latino CVAP are
9 high enough, I think, under -- with the Voting Right Act
10 considerations in districts like MPH and JRC as they
11 currently stand, you really don't want to get much lower.
12 So I think that's the advice that I would leave
13 with. Unfortunately, I have to run out at this point.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. Becker, as just guidance back to
15 the district that we're working on at this point. I
16 think the rest of the districts you said were pretty fine
17 and we've talked about it. But in terms of this area
18 here, your recommendations for -- we have two paths
19 forward either -- and if you could give guidance on which
20 would be preferrable from a legal standpoint in terms of
21 the compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Whether it
22 would be preferable to take in population from one of
23 these more populated areas or do a rotation in terms of
24 getting us through and meeting all of the requirements in
25 the most efficient manner.

1 MR. BECKER: I think either -- I think either is a
2 way of going about it. Time constraints are probably
3 going to deal with those more than any others. I would
4 really stress, though, this is -- we're at the point
5 probably where I think there is some time spent taking
6 population from lower populated -- underpopulated
7 districts and giving population to overpopulated
8 districts. I think in -- you know, in general at this
9 point if you're looking for way to kind of focus your
10 efforts, removing population from districts that are
11 overpopulated and not adding to it is a good plan.
12 So you know, I think the rotation idea, if you're --
13 and I think what you meant by that was the population
14 being added from VVHD to 210, and then, population being
15 added to VVHD from MBCV. That's a perfectly appropriate
16 way to go. It might be difficult to add population from
17 MBCV into MPH given the Latino CVAP and maintaining those
18 kinds of areas. So I certainly can understand that --
19 that approach.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: And the --
21 MS. TRATT: The direction --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- other approach as well, which is
23 the urban area? Either Beaumont or -- Beaumont would be
24 reducing the CVAP in MPH or either some of the Palm
25 Springs or La Quinta area?

1 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I don't recall -- I don't recall
2 what the -- what the Latino CVAP would be with Beaumont
3 added into MPH. If you want to show me that again, I can
4 take a quick look.
5 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I hate reducing Latino CVAP for
7 the record, but the number one criteria is equal
8 population. And so --
9 MR. BECKER: So I had advised before, I think, this
10 district as -- I think this is very close to the district
11 you were looking at before. It's probably not exactly
12 the same. But the levels -- or the demographic
13 characteristics are very similar. I believe this
14 district is likely sufficient given its demographic
15 composition to protect the rights of Latino voters in
16 this area.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: So -- and I hate adding -- reducing
18 CVAP, as everybody know, but -- in VRA areas, but a
19 number of -- we have to follow the criteria, so -- and
20 this is an option. I'm just leaving it out as an option.
21 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I mean I --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: And there's also options that are --
23 that would reduce the CVAP in the district below that
24 even less if we go through La Quinta, or Palm Springs, or
25 some other area. But -- and thank you so much, Mr.

1 Becker, for your guidance and support --
2 MR. BECKER: Okay. No problem. Have a -- good luck
3 the rest of the day.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- this morning, I know you're --
5 (indiscernible) to join us today.
6 MR. BECKER: No, no problem. I know Dale is on
7 right now as well.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we have Dale, thank you. All
9 right. Let's go, Ms. -- Sinay and then, let's -- to have
10 a discussion about which strategy we're going to take.
11 Commissioner Sinay.
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hi. I think my initial thought
13 about not taking La Quinta in was -- with in mind keeping
14 the VRA districts and how different La Quinta is from the
15 VRA district. But when looking at how not to disrupt --
16 you know, not to make as many disruptions and it is still
17 Coachella Valley. And it's -- so it's adding a little
18 bit more of Coachella -- you know, I'm okay with doing La
19 Quinta. But my initial reaction was well, La Quinta's so
20 different from East Coachella Valley. But I understand
21 where we are right now.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: These are difficult decisions putting
23 one COI over another. I appreciate your compromise.
24 Commissioner Kennedy?
25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm simply trying to propose

1 options that I feel are more natural.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You know, if colleagues are
4 going to insist on this, I'm one member. I'm just
5 telling you, given -- having lived in the area for the
6 last seventeen years, this is -- these options are the
7 ones that I think are most natural. And including La
8 Quinta falls last on my list.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And is it still a nonstarter?
10 Would you see a -- I'm just -- I have to ask the question
11 because it was posed by the Commission and that's my job.
12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I -- again, I believe
13 the other options are better options.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So you would be open to this
15 if the Commission -- if the rest of the Commission--
16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I -- I'm one voice, you know.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
18 Kennedy.
19 Vaz -- Commissioner Vazquez, you had your hand
20 raised? No? Okay.
21 So let's -- I just want to get a feeling from the
22 Commission on where we are. We have the two options, one
23 to continue to go through and rotate populations and the
24 other is to find a population center such as in the
25 option at the -- on the table right now is La Quinta;

1 Commissioner Fernandez proposed it.
2 It's visualized. We have the visualization. It's
3 already been played out. We -- that visualization
4 corrects all of our deviations. We could continue the
5 exploration as well. So -- and do both, it's up to the
6 Commission. I don't want to -- all right, so I just want
7 to hear -- I want to get a general sense of where we are
8 in terms of consensus. Do we have a consensus on what of
9 these two?
10 Commissioner -- Commissioner Vazquez and then, Mr.
11 Drechsler.
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Maybe we could hear from
13 Andrew first.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Andrew.
15 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just going to Sivan and
16 I explored -- so this was just an option that we explored
17 and just wanted to be clear. In the option that we
18 explored over break, we took part of La Quinta and we
19 took part of Highland and put it in to VVHD. By doing
20 these two changes, it did bring MBCV and the other
21 deviations within permissible. You can see that --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
23 MR. DRECHSLER: -- we have MB -- the VVHD and MBCV
24 are both below five percent. SECA went up a little bit,
25 but -- and as we noted the Latino CVAP went down from

1 50 -- just over 57 to 56. But we just heard Mr. Becker
2 say that that would okay. So I just wanted to clarify
3 that the La Quinta and Highland were sort of in
4 combination. And we could do one or the other, so I just
5 wanted to flag that Highland was something we also moved
6 as well. Thank you.
7 MS. TRATT: We could also --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, so much Andrew.
9 Commissioner --
10 MS. TRATT: -- yeah, we could also look at Homestead
11 Valley instead of Highland. I would say Highland is more
12 densely populated. But there's -- there -- the break was
13 only 15 minutes long so I couldn't try all of them, but
14 we can continue kind of moving blocks around if the
15 Commission would like to continue exploring.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's see if this is an option. I
17 want to see what the general consensus of the Commission,
18 Vazquez and then, we'll -- I'll look around and see if we
19 have consensus on -- and I'm going to ask specifically on
20 the La Quinta option. Commissioner Vazquez -- so think
21 about that. And we'll go to Commissioner Vazquez,
22 Commissioner Kennedy and then, we'll need to see if
23 there's consensus on this or if we move to another
24 option.
25 Commissioner Vazquez?

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I am -- I'd prefer
2 the -- this option that doesn't force us to rotate a
3 whole bunch of population right -- especially right now
4 because I think there are other places. I don't think
5 we're done with the Inland Empire. And I do think we
6 need to get South into San Diego, so I -- I'd prefer this
7 option right now. There may be -- as we're making
8 adjustments to other places of the Inland Empire, maybe
9 we have to go back and it will force the rotation of the
10 population. But right now I'd prefer the option that
11 gets us -- that moves us forward time-wise to be honest.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy and then
13 we'll take a -- then I'll look for a consensus.
14 Commissioner Kennedy.
15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Again, my number
16 one -- my preferred option would be Highland because
17 Highland is the gateway to Big Bear. And if we take all
18 of Highland and that resolves the overpopulation in MBCV,
19 if we need to rotate Acton and Agua Dulce from VVHD into
20 Santa Clarita Valley and put some of the San Fernando
21 Valley back with other San Fernando Valley communities, I
22 think that's the best solution.
23 You know, alternatively, you know, moving Homestead
24 Valley, we certainly heard from that area that they would
25 like to be with VVHD. I'm certainly happy with that. I

1 think the justification for moving Twentynine Palms and
2 the Marine base given that there are other military
3 facilities in VVHD, you know, that's the -- that's the
4 next most logical step to take. So that's where I am.
5 Thanks.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Difficult decisions. And the
7 worst -- it's a difficult decision because we're dealing
8 with communities of interest, and communities, and
9 keeping communities whole, and also our legal
10 requirements. And the number one legal requirement is --
11 and you know these -- you know where -- this order in
12 which they are at. So I want to look at the Commission
13 and see if -- and I'm going to pose this one at a time.
14 La Quinta -- if La Quinta is an acceptable option, please
15 just let me know.
16 Just say yes -- just say yes or no. I'm looking
17 around. I see no noes at this point. I don't see any
18 real yeses. It's like all of us are uncomfortable with
19 this movement and all of us know that this is the problem
20 is what I'm seeing. So I can see a consensus of maybe.
21 Commissioner Sadhwani and Vazquez, can you help us?
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Look I'll say this again,
23 for me it doesn't have to be La Quinta. I just feel like
24 what in the Central Valley could it be then -- or excuse
25 me, in the Coachella Valley, right. We haven't just

1 looked at all at moving this line that's in Desert Palms
2 here further in Sky Valley, Thousand Palms. I don't know
3 the nature of those places. Whatever this pink one is
4 next to Indian Wells. We haven't explored Palm Springs.
5 I'm just saying that there might be other options
6 that don't set off these massive changes throughout the
7 map. If we want to go the route of massive changes,
8 that's a -- to me, that's a take-home project because
9 that -- we don't have time to do that here, live, today
10 and that brings in Jaime's, you know, expertise for the
11 LA areas. And it -- you know, I just wanted to lift
12 again, right. Like, there is a disparity issue that's
13 going on. And it's not only here in this map, but you
14 know, it -- I think that we have to be -- to be cautious
15 about that as well.
16 I don't know the full profile of La Quinta. So I --
17 you know, but I do want that to be a consideration as
18 we're making these changes in particular to not break up
19 vulnerable populations wherever possible. Thank you.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez?
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I -- I'm just -- I'm
22 reluctant right now to not do La Quinta and do all of
23 Highland mostly because the -- I -- there are some
24 changes I'd like to look at in the San Bernadino, Rialto,
25 Fontana area. And that may -- that may have impacts. So

1 adding Highland to the SBCHR or the VVHD may -- we might
2 have to undo that.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's look for general
4 consensus. At this point, we're not looking for
5 perfection. We're just looking for, can we live with
6 this, and that's the question. Can we live with the La
7 Quinta option? I'm just looking for a nod. I don't see
8 Mr. Kennedy on my screen anymore. Everyone else is
9 saying yes. But I don't see Mr. Kennedy. Is he here?
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait, hold on. He ran out of
11 power.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: There he is. I see him and
13 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech).
14 (Pause)
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I see a general consensus --
16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Did you want to comment, too?
17 Here. Go ahead.
18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. I've commented.
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: So at this point, Commissioner
21 Kennedy, would you be opposed because I have general
22 consensus from the rest of the Commission?
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If you have consensus, go
24 ahead.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We have consensus --

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Did you hear --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we have general consensus to go
3 ahead.
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- Mr. Kennedy? Okay.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we know that this is -- this is
6 consensus, can we live with it. We know we don't like
7 this. I know we hate breaking communities, but we have
8 to meet our one and two criteria. Thank you.
9 So let's go ahead with this. And certainly, if --
10 let's make this move, Sivan. You have it already in your
11 snap file, so let's make --
12 MS. TRATT: Yes, Chair, the changes are already
13 represented on the map being displayed.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we've addressed all of our
15 deviations?
16 MS. TRATT: Yes.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: And you know, there's -- I am going
18 to -- okay. Let's move on to the next VRA district. I
19 won't even go there.
20 Commissioner Turner?
21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair, yeah. Just, can you
22 name that change out loud for Kim and those that are
23 doing the transcribing?
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you so much.
25 Sivan, can you go through the changes that were made

so that we can have our notetakers capture this correctly?

MS. TRATT: Yes. Absolutely. So the changes that were made to fix the high deviation MBCV was adding a Northern portion of Highland into VVHD from MBCV. And then also adding the Southern portion of La Quinta from MBCV into SECA. Those were the two changes that were made for population balance purposes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much.

And for the record, Kim, can you also just note that this was not something that was difficult for us and something we didn't want to do, but we're doing because it's the option that would move us forward at this time.

All right. So let's move on to the next portion of our VRA map.

Sivan, can you take us to the next map?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely.

I heard Commissioner Vazquez say that she wanted to talk about the Rialto, Fontana district. Is that already with you, Chair, if we move to that one next?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Certainly, especially if there's a specific direction in this district.

MS. TRATT: All right. I'm ready to make changes as directed.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Vazquez?

1 Commissioner Turner?
2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or others?
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: At least for me, we've
5 received some testimony about a large portion of Black
6 communities of interest that are right now currently
7 being separated between the two VRA districts. San
8 Bernardino, Rialto, and portions of Fontana. I think,
9 we've seen some proposals of swaps, so moving -- at least
10 let's just start with Fontana -- or sorry -- Rialto,
11 moving Rialto into SBCHR and moving, honestly, probably,
12 Loma Linda and maybe some of Redlands into probably that
13 JRC. I think that this might require some rotation, but
14 I just wanted to flag that, that pretty consistently, we
15 continue to get this input about Black populations being
16 split in the San Bernardino region.
17 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Vazquez, if it would be
18 helpful, I actually have the Black census and
19 redistricting hub Assembly draft. Let me pull that up so
20 you can see what their proposed districts were. And I'll
21 just turn off --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioner Turner, while we're
23 waiting on that?
24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was just going to
25 inquire of Sivan, like, we're attempting to be responsive

1 to the different community of interest testimony we're
2 receiving. They're doing the same. So in bringing up,
3 I'm wondering if it's the revised maps that they've sent
4 or some of the original ones.
5 MS. TRATT: This was the -- these were the plans
6 that were presented in October to the Commission. I
7 don't have -- if there was an updated plan, I do not have
8 access to that currently, but I would be happy to pull it
9 up if someone --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe there is new input from
11 them based on our current draft maps because we -- and so
12 I believe there's input that has come in via public
13 testimony as of, I believe, last night or even today,
14 with suggestions on how to improve this.
15 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Based on our maps that were in the
17 district viewer. So maybe if anybody has specific
18 direction around that. If you've seen it. And I will
19 ask Marcy to pull the information. It's in our database.
20 But if anyone has it and is able to provide direction if
21 that is the -- or provide recommendations on how to link
22 communities together or not. I mean, at this point,
23 communities of interest, again, are number 4. But when
24 we are able to do them, and we can do them, we try to.
25 Ms. Vazquez?

1 Commissioner Turner.
2 Commissioner Vazquez?
3 Commissioner Turner?
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. So the proposal that
5 the Black hub has sent has Rialto -- bring in Rialto and
6 portion of Fontana above Baseline. Then moving Redlands
7 and Loma Linda into the JRC district. Yeah. That's what
8 I remember. Into the JRC district first. So would you
9 like me to read all of their proposals in this area?
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, if they makes sense. So if the
11 proposal makes sense and you think it's viable with this
12 and we can do it without impacting too much of the other
13 districts.
14 Commissioner Turner?
15 We might be able to --
16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Thank --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- because we have a deviation of
18 1.69 here --
19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and a negative of (audio
21 interference), so we might be able to.
22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. And I think Commissioner
23 Vazquez can continue. I have the same COI testimony
24 input that she has. So I don't have a different --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: And you're in support of making these

1 changes?
2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm just going to ask the Commission
4 as a whole, anyone opposed or -- maybe opposed is --
5 anyone not wanting to go through this exploration?
6 I don't see anybody who's opposed, so let's
7 continue.
8 Commissioner Andersen?
9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, not opposed, but I
10 definitely want to have a look at it to see how it
11 affects our CVAPs everywhere and if it'd cause a whole
12 other population shift.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So --
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But I do agree with that --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- you're supportive of exploring
16 with the (indiscernible) --
17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. Supportive of --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- if it impacts our CVAPs or the
19 deviations that --
20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we may have to (indiscernible,
22 simultaneous speech). Okay.
23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm exploring with the
24 caveat of that.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we have to --

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But I do understand that
2 this is indeed what we've heard quite a bit.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So I like pursuing it.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we'll continue purposing
6 for -- and Commissioner Fernandez, Akutagawa. Akutagawa
7 first and then Fernandez, I think. You're on my screen
8 this way so Fernandez first and then -- actually
9 Akutagawa is no longer on the queue, so Fernandez --
10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. I just undid my hand.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry.
12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. I did the wrong
13 button first.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
15 And what's your feedback.
16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would just agree.
17 I think it's worth looking at. I know that the Black
18 community has grown quite a bit, and if there's a way to
19 maintain the Latino VRA district and also, you know,
20 really ensure that this COI can be kept together, I think
21 that that would be -- I think to Commissioner Sadhwani's
22 earlier points, I think we need to make sure that, you
23 know, communities that have been oftentimes marginalized
24 are one's that we should ensure that they have that
25 opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice as

1 well too. So I would agree.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
3 Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Turner.
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I -- excuse me -- I
5 agree with -- in pursuing, and I believe the direction,
6 correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner Vazquez, I think
7 they don't -- it stayed within the three or four
8 districts. So it wasn't major change --
9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think we're doing
10 some --
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- major impact to the --
12 right. Right. Thank you.
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. I think we're doing
14 some rotation within these VRA districts. And my read on
15 this is that it should preserve more or less our
16 obligations to the Latino community in this area while
17 also keeping Black communities of interest together.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
19 Commissioner Akutagawa, you're on the queue.
20 And then Commissioner Turner.
21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So as Sivan is doing
22 this -- I mean, would it help to read off some of the
23 other direction as well too?
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: From --
25 MS. TRATT: So I can only make changes into or out

1 of a single district at a time. So it would be helpful
2 to get a sense of how things are doing to move, but also
3 we won't be able to see those changes visualized and
4 their impact until we commit those changes, although we
5 can always revert back --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Undo it.
7 MS. TRATT: -- to the draft that we have. So it's
8 not, you know, permanent.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.
10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So if you're working on
11 this RCFR, there are some other directions that I can
12 provide for this one, too. Or are you working on the
13 other one next to, the SEC (indiscernible, simultaneous
14 speech) --
15 MS. TRATT: So currently, the area highlighted in
16 red was direction from Commissioner Turner and
17 Commissioner Vazquez to move Rialto and the portion of
18 Fontana North of Baseline Avenue. So that is the portion
19 of --
20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To the SBC -- yeah --
21 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech)
22 here in red that would move into SBCHR.
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
24 MS. TRATT: Would you like me to go ahead and get
25 this changed so we can --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Andrew first.
2 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. And I was just going to
3 clarify Commissioner Akutagawa's question. We're only
4 adding to SBCHR for right now. So thank you.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's focus on this district and
6 then we'll focus on the next. And then we'll ask
7 Commissioner Akutagawa to read it out after we do this.
8 All right. So let's see --
9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I have a comment.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: We have -- okay. Commissioner
11 Vazquez and -- I think Turner was first and then Vazquez
12 was second. So let's go with Turner and then Vazquez.
13 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And mine will be quick.
14 I just want to say that for this particular community of
15 interest testimony from this organization -- group of
16 organization, and some of the ones that we've received
17 before, I think they've all been very responsive to VRA
18 as a priority, and I think most of what I see always
19 refers to that first.
20 And so I just wanted to name that I don't think from
21 any of these coalition groups, I don't think any of them
22 are asking for something counter to VRA or counter --
23 something that does not respect the Latino CVAP because
24 we understand the population being one that being number
25 two.

1 So I just want to name that for most of the
2 requests, it's basically saying, with full respect to the
3 required CVAP, this is what we need to be able to also
4 have representation. So I just wanted us to be
5 comfortable in our exploration and knowing that we're not
6 trying to put one over the other.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think that we're trying to
9 ensure that they both are done. Thank you.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That was my
11 interpretation as well.
12 Commissioner Vazquez?
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yep. My interpretation as
14 well.
15 Just wanted to flag that I'm not sure how much of a
16 difference it will make, but maybe doing -- because I
17 don't have the new shapefiles, although I just sent them
18 to Marcy. There's this portion, this Northwest portion
19 above the 15 of Fontana that I'm not sure is always
20 included in visualizations we've seen. I think that I
21 heard someone reference this as like the black triangle,
22 so maybe let's start with not having that portion just
23 because it may make things easier when we're moving
24 population within our maps.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So one question for Sivan. And I'm

1 going to ask you because it may speed things up. If you
2 have shapefiles, Sivan, that we've received, would it be
3 quicker if you uploaded those shapefiles and then came
4 back, like, in five minutes and have them loaded up for
5 us to look at that? Or is it quicker to do it this way?
6 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It sounds like it would be
7 helpful for Commissioners. Obviously, we have the
8 written direction. But just to see those changes played
9 out on the map already seems like it would be helpful.
10 If you give me, like, 30 seconds to stop sharing my
11 screen so I can grab it from my email and upload it to
12 the map, I can do that right now.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
14 So let's take a five -- you only need 30 seconds, or
15 you need 5 minutes?
16 MS. TRATT: Let's say a minute or two minutes to be
17 close -- to be safe.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So in the meantime, if there's
19 any additional discussion in this area around any
20 additional direction that we want to do. I just want to
21 see any conversation or discussion for this area.
22 Sounds like we have had our discussion and this will
23 be -- we'll just be looking to integrate the feedback
24 we're getting from the community and maintain our VRA
25 districts.

1 It's a good time to go get some coffee so we can
2 keep up our energy, or some tea in the case of
3 Commissioner Andersen.
4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Already heading that way.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
6 MS. TRATT: So actually the shapefile that was
7 shared by Marcy is the same shapefile that I already have
8 loaded in for the Black census redistricting hub.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect.
10 MS. TRATT: So yeah, just wanted to -- so the lines
11 that I bring up -- let me share my screen again. So
12 these lines right here. This is the same -- this is the
13 shapefile that was shared by (indiscernible, simultaneous
14 speech) --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So it looks like this is the
16 portion of the area that they would like included.
17 MS. TRATT: Right. So should I change those lines
18 to match what they were in the --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- are the lines that are
20 shaded the ones that are asked, or can you --
21 MS. TRATT: Yes. Although --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- I'm unclear of what is
23 (indiscernible) lines --
24 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech)
25 lines. Let me --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

2 MS. TRATT: -- let me turn off the labels for. So
3 the black lines are the districts that were sent to me
4 from the Black census and redistricting hub. Everything
5 that is these lines in red and green are the current
6 districts. Actually, let me change the Black census
7 to -- I'll change it to purple. So hopefully, that'll be
8 easier to see the difference.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I guess the questions is, are we
10 taking out areas that are protected in doing this? I see
11 that there are some portions that are not included in the
12 district that wouldn't be in a VRA district potentially.
13 Or am I not looking at that correctly?

14 MS. TRATT: It looks --

15 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm looking at Loma Linda. I'm
16 looking at -- because there's some areas that potentially
17 might not be in the district if we move in this
18 direction, and that may be of a concern.

19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. You're absolutely right. So it
20 would be this portion of Colton, Loma Linda. It would
21 take out all of Redlands. And it looks like Highland
22 would also not be in the (indiscernible, simultaneous
23 speech) --

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. I don't want to create a
25 compliance problem before we -- so I just want to check

1 in with counsel whether Loma Linda -- whether the areas
2 that are in yellow that are South of the purple line,
3 whether those are in a protected VRA -- whether those
4 areas require protection from the VRA.
5 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I would be uncomfortable moving
6 those out of a VRA district.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So VRA counsel is advising us
8 not to move out of the areas that are shaded in yellow
9 from the VRA district.
10 Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Vazquez?
11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Let me --
12 I'm going to go back through the COI testimonies. I
13 don't think these are the latest lines that were sent
14 through. Or --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: It may not be. Yeah.
16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- it doesn't line up with
17 what I've seen. Anyway, let me spend some time -- let me
18 look for it. Give me a minute.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Chair Toledo, as far as I can
21 tell, the written instructions that were sent do match
22 the purple, but I could be -- that's just what I
23 downloaded from the Airtable and what was just forwarded
24 to (indiscernible) Marcy --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So at this point, according to the

email we received this morning -- or the public input that we received this morning from the group, it would not include some of our protected areas, is my understanding from the line drawers based on their interpretation of that email.

Commissioner Vazquez?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I'm curious, counsel, if there's maybe some nuance to your advice about some of these areas, given that, geographically, the Latino population in Loma Linda and Redlands in particular is not evenly distributed throughout those cities. And so I'm wondering if there's sort of a compromise that we can make about drawing a line that protects the populations in those cities that need protection while also helping us accomplish this particular goal of keeping a Black community of interest together.

MR. LARSON: I think that's a good suggestion. Could we see the CVAP overlay in this area?

MS. TRATT: One moment, please. Let me turn off the yellow just temporarily. Oops. Sorry. Actually, let me just --

MR. DRECHSLER: Sivan, do you want to just decommit that change for now?

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

1 MR. DRECHSLER: Okay. Then we can go back --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's probably a good idea.
3 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Thanks.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: There we go.
5 MS. TRATT: Hopefully that's a little easier for
6 Commissioners to see.
7 MR. LARSON: And the red is the Latino CVAP there?
8 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So the darker the red, the higher
9 the percentage concertation of Latino CVAP. I can --
10 yeah --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: It looks like it's a very dispersed
12 population that it's all throughout and not concentrated,
13 which makes it hard in this VRA area.
14 MR. LARSON: It is true though that Loma Linda has
15 fewer concerns in that regard.
16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. And, again, I think at
17 one point when we were visualizing, we did cut -- well,
18 even right now, the cut in Redlands feels good to me in
19 terms of, like, if you just look again at the Southside
20 of Redlands, there's not much concentration of Latinos on
21 the Southside of Redlands that's already cut in our
22 current visualization.
23 So I'm wondering -- we might not be able to follow
24 the Black hubs current visualizations perfectly, but if
25 maybe we can start with this Rialto and Fontana portion,

1 and then at least put Loma Linda and Grand Terrace in
2 with JRC and see where that leaves us.
3 MR. LARSON: So in light of Commissioner Vazquez's
4 comments, which have been very helpful, so my position
5 now is I would be comfortable with you all exploring a
6 visualization that moves Loma Linda out and Grand Terrace
7 with the caveat that we'll go back and look at if off-
8 line. But for exploration, I'm comfortable doing that
9 now.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm comfortable with exploration as
11 well if counsel is. Wouldn't it be just the Loma Linda
12 area, or are you comfortable with the whole area that's
13 under the purple.
14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Yeah. I think, it's
15 the -- it's actually part of Colton. So Grand Terrace is
16 already in JRC it looks like.
17 MR. LARSON: Yeah.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, got it.
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And so it would be Loma Linda
20 and that portion of Colton as well.
21 MR. LARSON: And that area of Redlands, the Northern
22 part of Redlands there?
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The Northern part of
24 Redlands --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Those we would keep?

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- yeah. I think that --
2 well, it depends on what counsel says. I mean --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: So counsel -- that's what I'm asking,
4 counsel. Can you comment on the areas outside of Loma
5 Linda? So under the purple but outside of Loma Linda.
6 It appears to have higher Latino CVAP. It's hard to see
7 on the screen, but it appears. Maybe if we -- can we get
8 just the Latino CVAP numbers for that particular area,
9 Sivan?
10 MS. TRATT: For Loma Linda?
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: For Loma Linda and then for this area
12 next to it.
13 MS. TRATT: Yes, one moment, please.
14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Chair? Chair, I also just
15 wanted to flag that we just received an email that is
16 stating that the lines currently up are not the most
17 recent submission from the Black census hub.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's what Commissioner Turner
19 and I were starting to feel like. So how about -- let's
20 go to another area and come back to this once we have the
21 correct shapefiles, and we can work through this later
22 because if we're working on inappropriate shapefiles, we
23 might want to wait until -- because I believe they had
24 already incorporated some of -- they're working through
25 our draft maps based on the emails that we're -- the

1 public input that we're getting, which are coming through
2 our main email.
3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just as a reminder, Chair,
4 that all of the emails that we receive get posted as
5 apart of (indiscernible) --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. And they're all coming
7 through our feed, so we're all reviewing them live. So
8 the more input we get, the better, especially from the
9 communities who are living in these areas that we're
10 working through.
11 So would it be helpful to wait --
12 MS. TRATT: So yeah. I'll just wait to receive that
13 from staff, if staff would be able to send that updated
14 file I can get that loaded in.
15 In the meantime, what area would you like to look
16 at, Chair?
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I'm just wondering if that's the
18 most efficient use of our time, is to just wait for the
19 latest shapefiles and move onto the other areas. Or do
20 you want to wait for the shapefiles and do it now?
21 What's most appropriate for you?
22 Andrew?
23 MR. DRECHSLER: If I may, Chair, suggest maybe we
24 can move to other areas. And then over lunch we can make
25 sure that we have the latest shapefiles loaded up and

1 revisit this area.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: And maybe work through some -- and I

3 think maybe the direction from the Commission, if the

4 Commission is comfortable, (indiscernible) take a look at

5 the shapefiles that we look at the impact and get the --

6 ensure that the CVAPs are appropriate. Bring it back so

7 that we can make sure of the deviations. And let's see

8 if we can make it work for this area.

9 So if we can take lunch to do that. And that would

10 be the surrounding areas.

11 MR. LARSON: Yeah.

12 CHAIR TOLEDO: So that's having the ability to work

13 through it. As long as the CVAPs and the deviations are

14 within range. And then bringing it back for us for

15 visualization and further refinement.

16 All right. So let's do that. And let's go onto

17 another area.

18 Next district, Sivan.

19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. We can move -- Was the --

20 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're doing the VRA districts, so

21 let's --

22 MS. TRATT: It seems like all of -- yeah. It seems

23 like all of these districts were the ones that were going

24 to be impacted, so I would suggest maybe we look at the

25 South Bay, San Diego VRA district next.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Are we done with this region?

MS. TRATT: I think the changes that were suggested we're going to kind of --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. So these are the -- These one, two, three districts are the ones that are left in this region?

MS. TRATT: One, two, three, four. I guess, I'm not sure. Was PCO included -- Did PCO have --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe that's in the Los Angeles grouping, so I think we've already looked at that.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But correct me if I'm wrong Commissioner Sadhwani and others.

Pomona, we looked at that yesterday. Chino Hills. That was part of our --

MS. TRATT: And you looked at Orange County --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No, not yet.

MS. TRATT: Oh, Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're moving on to Orange County and San Diego.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Would you like to do Orange County first or San Diego first?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's do --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Orange County.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's do Orange County and then will

1 go on to San Diego since were already in Orange County
2 and it looks like a very healthy Latino CVAP, so let's
3 take a look.
4 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So based on some of those changes
5 that looks like you made in collaboration with Jamie, the
6 current SAA configuration of this district is at a Latino
7 CVAP of 56.11 and a negative 1.79 percent deviation.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you zoom in so we can take a look
9 at it?
10 MS. TRATT: Absolutely.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioners, please, think --
12 if you have any direction for this area, let us know, any
13 comment or feedback. We are looking at the areas of
14 Santa Ana, Orange -- and this has been looked at various
15 times. This has been developed with counsel. And we
16 have looks like a very healthy grouping.
17 Commissioner Sadhwani?
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. I just wanted to note
19 that I think I've seen some testimony come in saying they
20 really like this district in this draft. So just wanted
21 to say it looks good to me.
22 I mean, are there refinements that could be made?
23 Sure. But I don't think that they're necessary at this
24 point in time, unless we're starting to shift in other
25 areas around it. So I think this is looking great.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any minor refinements you would like
2 to make at this point? Or moving on is your
3 recommendation?
4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would recommend moving on.
5 I will just note for everyone that I do have some
6 considerations further up in Los Angeles, in the Nela
7 sort of area, that would potentially have ripples down
8 into Orange County and beyond possibly. I don't think
9 it -- we need to go there now. I think we need to give
10 San Diego it's time. But I wanted to just note that I'd
11 love to hear more from my colleagues and try and get a
12 sense from others at some point about their priorities
13 for Los Angeles, but we don't need to do that right now.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So anything more on Orange
15 County, and specifically, this VRA district in Orange
16 County.
17 Commissioner Sinay?
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So just building on what
19 Commissioner Sadhwani said. I'm wondering if there's
20 going to be ripple effects, if it just doesn't make sense
21 to look at things and so the ripple -- you know, I mean
22 it just feels like we -- we figure something out, we
23 change it, There's ripple effects, and so if it's not
24 better, just to go right now to the changes seeking of
25 LA, since it'll have ripple effects, it sounds like, in

1 Orange County and maybe further.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: The only problem with that is, it may

3 keep us from getting to Southern California in a timely

4 manner because the changes that are -- that likely will

5 be proposed are going to be so -- and also, the line

6 drawers aren't ready for -- the Los Angeles line drawers

7 wouldn't be ready to help us until 3 o'clock. And even

8 if we wanted to do Los Angeles, that would be staffing

9 considerations at this point.

10 So let's go down to other VRA districts in the

11 Southern part. Let's go -- we can either go to San

12 Diego. We can go to the Imperial area -- Imperial

13 County. San Diego? Commissioner -- yeah. Let's go to

14 San Diego.

15 There's the VRA district. Also, a healthy CVAP.

16 Any -- Sivan can you just tell us a little bit about this

17 district and what's included, and then we'll hear from

18 Commissioner Sinay, if there's --

19 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. Apparently, this district

20 has the San Encino portion of San Diego City. It is has

21 Imperial Beach, National City, Bonita, and all of Chula

22 Vista included.

23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much.

24 Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Fornaciari.

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to share --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- we've been receiving
3 conflicting COI testimony around City Heights and the VRA
4 district. And so I just -- I'm not going to give my
5 thoughts on it, my opinions, but I wanted to lay it out
6 for you all so that you could understand where -- you
7 know, what -- why it's conflicting and how it's
8 conflicting.

9 We're hearing from predominantly Latinos in City
10 Heights that they would like to see City Heights, Barrio
11 Logan, Logan Heights, Sherman Heights as part of the VRA
12 district, which would mean cutting Chula Vista in half.
13 City Heights is traditionally a Latino community and
14 traditionally this has -- that's been kind of the
15 configuration to help Latinos have a stronger voice. And
16 it -- and a lot of it around environmental justice issues
17 in the Bay right there.

18 The other piece that we've been hearing from City
19 Heights is from the immigrants, the refugee, the Muslim,
20 Black, and Asian communities. Some of you may or may not
21 know, San Diego was the first to receive refugees from
22 Vietnam way back when because of Camp Pendleton. And
23 that's why San Diego has such a huge refugee community,
24 is that it's still -- you know, we had built the
25 infrastructure for receiving refugees. So we have a lot

1 of Chaldeans, which are Catholic Iraqis. We have Muslin.
2 You know, we've just got the -- a mix of a lot of
3 refugees.
4 And they have been moving to the East, and so that's
5 what we have heard, you know, going towards Lemon Grove,
6 La Mesa, Spring Valley. And then we have a Black
7 community in Southeastern San Diego that wants to partner
8 with that community. It is a smaller -- I mean, Latinos
9 is a majority in City Heights, but this community -- this
10 coalition of diverse communities has come together and
11 has a greater voice, so it's a new way of looking at how
12 to group these communities and give them a fair voice.
13 So I wanted to share that because we do have two
14 conflicting and either direction that we choose to go as
15 a Commission is a right direction. There is -- I don't
16 feel like there's a wrong direction.
17 The other piece I think is really important that
18 is -- we have heard from Chula Vista and National City
19 that they have asked to please be kept together. In the
20 past, they have been divided. National City is a lot of
21 Filipino and a lot of Latino and people, you know, split
22 it sometimes for that reason. These communities have
23 really been working really well together with San Ysidro,
24 as I shared before. It's amazing what they have done
25 regarding COVID, and they had some of the lowest rates

1 around them -- not lowest rates of -- highest rates of
2 vaccination, I should say. Some of the --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Go ahead.
4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- and development. So I just
5 wanted -- I just wanted to share that just so that people
6 understand all the different moving parts and to be able
7 to put those COIs into --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's helpful in terms of
9 contextualizing this. I think -- let's put it through
10 the legal end, so I'll ask Dale.
11 Number one, the criteria is population, number two,
12 and then I know there's deviation issues up here.
13 Although we're in a zero percent deviation here, so
14 there's room to increase population, so if we wanted to,
15 and then, of course, number two is VRA.
16 So Dale, in our jingles -- in our VRA analysis, were
17 there any other populations in this area that need
18 protection? So that are required to be protected under
19 Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. That is the legal
20 analysis. Can you --
21 MR. LARSON: So we can draw one -- we have -- we
22 will -- we are required to draw one VRA district in this
23 area. We're not going to be able to draw more than one.
24 You do have a little bit of leeway and discretion in how
25 you draw that one. So you know, I'll leave it at that.

1 You do -- this is not the only way to draw that district.
2 We have a little bit of flexibility.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: With regards to the areas that
4 Commissioner Sinay might raise, and I think they're in
5 the CVAP map, the heat map, correct me if I'm wrong,
6 Commissioner Sinay, but if we zoom out a little bit, it
7 looks like there's a strong Latino presence above -- to
8 the North of this district. Is that the area that they
9 are speaking of, Commissioner Sinay? That is Barrio
10 Logan -- Barrio Logan, I believe, is someplace else, but
11 that is asking to be united and being part of this
12 protected group?
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Part of it is Barrio Logan,
14 Logan Heights, and then City Heights. So it kind of
15 goes -- I can't show you because I don't have the map,
16 but it goes diagonally up.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, can you highlight those areas?
18 Is there is a way to highlight those areas?
19 In the meantime, let's hear from Commissioner
20 Fornaciari. But just to be respectful to the comments
21 that we're getting, and let's hear from Commissioner
22 Fornaciari. And then we will move on.
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I was just going to
24 add to what Commissioner Sinay said about Barrio Logan,
25 Logan Heights, I think Sherman Heights, too. I mean,

1 basically, it's Barrio Logan and then the area that kind
2 of triangle between, I guess, from Southern California.
3 So the 5, the 15, and the 94. And so that kind of little
4 triangle there with Barrio Logan is kind of South of the
5 bridge right here. This is Crosby Street. So bringing
6 that area down, in order to do that we'd have to probably
7 move and keep Chula Vista whole. We'd move Bonita North,
8 but we still have to make this decision on City
9 Heights --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So that's where we're at is
11 my --
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- but a lot of the input
13 we've been getting is about also including, you know,
14 Barrio Logan, Logan Heights, and Sherman Heights with the
15 South.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I just --
17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So it doesn't quite go
18 that far past the bridge. Yeah. You had it. I mean,
19 whoa, go back. Yeah. Yeah, that's probably good, and
20 then up into the triangle.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's Barrio Logan, correct?
22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. You want to go a
23 little past the bridge. Sorry.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's see.
25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So if we can get some

clarity on that.

MS. TRATT: Commissioner Fornaciari, does that look okay?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, I think the definition's a little -- grab the area by Logan.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And can we see the Latino CVAP, because that might help guide us?

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just to understand where this -- where the groupings are.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it doesn't look like anyone actually lives on this kind of coastal stretch right here. But moving towards the 5, I can grab population from right here if that would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'd more focus above in the triangle first and see where we wind up.

MS. TRATT: Above the --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: This whole triangle up there.

MS. TRATT: This area that I'm circling?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And what are the neighbors, Commissioner Fornaciari? Can you -- because I'm not familiar.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So Barrio Logan is already
2 highlighted, Logan Heights, and then Sherman Heights --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
4 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- is up in the left.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's try to highlight those areas
6 and then see what the impact would be. We are in a -- we
7 do have a compliant district as of right now. We have a
8 district that meets the deviation requirements, the
9 population requirements, the VRA requirements. We're
10 looking to be responsive to the input from the community.
11 And so we'll see if it's possible to include in a VRA
12 district and see what the impacts would be to surrounding
13 districts as well. It may not be possible given the
14 amount of population.
15 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Fornaciari, should I just
16 continue adding blocks in this area?
17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'd just grab the whole
18 triangle.
19 MS. TRATT: Okay.
20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then move Bonita out,
21 would be my suggestion, but I've used up my whole minute
22 and then some.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, you're familiar
24 with this area as well and others, if you would chime in
25 in terms of if we're capturing the neighborhoods that

is -- are coming in.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I'm just concerned that we don't have all of Barrio Logan right now. That we stopped at Main Street instead of going all the way to the 5. And then I was -- I'm -- I was still trying to figure out -- I'll look on another map just to figure out the North boundary. But for right now, it looks good.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And this may be something also we could give direction to the line drawers to work through during lunch, if we know exactly what the neighborhood lines are. Because this seems like a -- we'll know pretty quickly whether this is something that's possible, if we can do some of it and not all of it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I believe the line drawers know these neighborhoods quite well --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- because they've worked in these neighborhoods, so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- but let me know, line drawers, if you need more.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Sivan, do you know these -- can you highlight the areas if you know them?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So Historic Barrio Logan, I believe this is the Northernmost border. It's at the

1 fairy terminal or the -- yeah. The Marina Park, I
2 believe was what most people defined kind of the Northern
3 border as. And then Commissioner Sinay, you're
4 absolutely right that the 5 is actually what divided the
5 Historic Barrio. So there are neighborhoods on both
6 sides of the 5.
7 I would be happy to accept this change and then see
8 if moving Bonita out would rebalance the population.
9 Right now, it doesn't look like this has a negative
10 impact on the Latino CVAP of SVSY. It would be at 55.89.
11 So -- but the deviation would be above five, so we would
12 need to move population out.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: And this includes all of the
14 neighborhoods, Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner
15 Fornaciari, that were named? City Heights --
16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Yeah.
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Besides City Heights. We're
19 not looking at the City Heights piece.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: No. Sorry. Not City Heights, but
21 the Barrio Logan is what I meant.
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I also wanted to confirm,
23 in National City, we're using the National City boundary,
24 we're not taking part of -- oh, shoot, what's it
25 called -- Paradise Hill?

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We had part of San Diego
2 in there on the left.
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. That's what I was -- not
4 on the left, on the right over by the --
5 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. The other left,
6 yes.
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: The 54 -- yeah.
8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Right there.
9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we might want to take that
10 out as well.
11 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would be happy to do that. I
12 would need to commit the change first, because it's
13 moving population in the opposite direction, so --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: I want to hear from Andrew and from
15 Ahmad, and then we will -- we'll look at a consensus.
16 Because if -- you know, if we have a -- we have a
17 compliant district, we're just trying to be responsive to
18 community input.
19 Commissioner -- or Mr. -- or Andrew and then --
20 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Commissioner Ahmad.
22 MR. DRECHSLER: Just real quick. I think the part
23 of San Diego that is in this next to National City, I
24 believe that was from COI testimony that wanted to be
25 together, but that's my recollection. But we're happy to

move that out. I don't know if any of The Commissioners recall that specifically. I think that's -- that's why we were adding that in, but happy to move that out and maybe make the swap between the Barrio Logan and Logan Heights.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to ask counsel if this move that is on -- proposed right now, if there are any considerations or risks of packing, given the COI testimony and the concentration of Latinos outside of the VRA district? Just wanted to clarify.

MR. LARSON: I think if it were done on a more extreme level, that could be a concern, but so far these changes are having a pretty minimal effect. So far so good from my perspective.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concern around compactness? It's not as -- I don't see any, but I'm just curious.

MR. LARSON: I think when you zoom in super close, things look less compact than when you zoom out back to a normal level.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's right.

MR. LARSON: So no.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. I figured we'd ask

1 while you're on the line.
2 All right. So consensus from the group to add this
3 in and to try to work -- pull out some population. This
4 is based on COI. This is actually competing COI, as
5 Commissioner Sinay so eloquently put it, there are
6 competing COIs here and we're -- we'd be prioritizing the
7 COIs from the -- from these neighborhoods, and as Andrew
8 was able to point out, deprioritizing some in the San
9 Diego area.
10 Commissioner Fornaciari?
11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I -- this move's
12 not really competing COI input. City Heights is really
13 the area that we have to kind of resolve --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it.
15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- amongst ourselves.
16 Because the Latino community wants City Heights to go
17 South and the other communities that Commissioner Sinay
18 was discussing wants City Heights to go East.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's outside of the area,
20 right?
21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: What's that?
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's outside of the area here?
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So right now, is there a
25 consensus to explore this a little bit longer, just --

1 and from there, go into the Imperial County?
2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it looks like we are okay with
4 exploring a little bit longer. And then the next step
5 here would be to take population out. It looks like the
6 suggestion from Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner
7 Sinay is to pull out from San Diego area; is that
8 correct, Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sinay?
9 Do you have specific direction which areas?
10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Well, Bonita --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- and I don't -- well, I
13 guess both. Do you think both? Yeah.
14 MS. TRATT: Well, the area that's highlighted, this
15 is just that portion of San Diego. Do you want me to
16 also -- or pull in Bonita first? Adding this, actually,
17 would put the deviation into a permissible range. So it
18 wouldn't be legally necessary to continue, but if for
19 other purposes you wanted me to continue pulling from
20 Bonita, I could definitely do that first.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari and
22 Commissioner Sinay? And it looks like the deviations are
23 correct. The CVAPs don't change much; is that correct?
24 My eyes are a little bit strange right now.
25 MS. TRATT: Yes. That is correct. It looks like

1 the Latino CVAP would actually slightly go up to 56.04,
2 and again, the deviation would be at 4.82 percent.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Which is what --
4 MS. TRATT: So -- yeah. So that's -- it was zero
5 before, so it's going to be more populated than it was
6 previously, but it'll, you know, satisfy that request
7 from the Historic --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we --
9 MS. TRATT: -- Barrios to be in a VRA protected
10 district.
11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: So this change would allow us to be
13 compliant? Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner
14 Sinay, from a deviation standpoint?
15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think -- I mean, from my
16 perspective this is good, because we've also gotten
17 testimony to include La Presa with Spring Valley. And so
18 you know, we would need to add -- that would be adding
19 population to El Mesa and SVAL. So I think if we just
20 made this move, I think it would be good because we want
21 to make another move that's going to add population in
22 it.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's look at the consensus
24 on the Commission. Commissioner Ahmad, and then we're
25 going to get a -- Salvador joined us. Then we'll hear

1 from Salvador as well.
2 Commissioner Ahmad?
3 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. I agree with committing
4 just this change. I do see that there's testimony
5 requesting Bonita to stay with Chula Vista, so this would
6 honor that COI as well, while keeping in mind that our
7 first two criteria are also being met.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's right. All right. So it
9 looks like have consensus. To do this, we would then
10 go -- we have a compliant district that meets the -- that
11 is responsive to the community input that we're
12 receiving -- we've been receiving. Let's see.
13 Anything else here, Commissioner Fornaciari and
14 Commissioner Sinay or others? It looks like a healthy
15 district.
16 Commissioner Turner?
17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Sorry. I had to get
18 coffee, so I missed part of it. Don't go back. So did
19 we move La Presa, or we did not?
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: We have not moved La Presa. La Presa
21 is still outside of a VRA protected area. It remains
22 where it was. We haven't been exploring La Presa yet. I
23 think Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned potentially in a
24 different map, but we have not explored that right now.
25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, yeah. I was just going
2 to plus one Commissioner Turner there as well as
3 Commissioner Fornaciari. I think to me that would be the
4 next move is bringing La Presa in with Spring Valley.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Since we are here and it
6 sounds like there is a lot of Commissioners interested in
7 that, Commissioner Sinay, do you want to discuss it?
8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I just --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Are you in agreement for it or --
10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. No. I'm in agreement on
11 that one. I just think that the City Heights question is
12 part of this VRA if we -- you know, because they would
13 like --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, let's discuss it, then.
15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- they would like to be in
16 this VRA district. And so that's why I don't want us to
17 walk --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- to start building the next
20 district without finishing up, you know, hearing what you
21 all are -- what we all are thinking.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So if there's a discussion --
23 there continues to be a discussion about VRA potentially
24 joining an additional area into VRA district, what is
25 that area, Commissioner Sinay? City Heights? And --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you highlight that area, Sivan, City Heights? And then we'll come back to La Presa.

MS. TRATT: And did --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Because I think that's a swap, right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And did -- the request from the City Heights, you know, has been to cut Chula Vista to be able to add City Heights. So that's how you would keep the numbers.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's take a look. Where is City Heights, Sivan?

MS. TRATT: So I do have COI shapefiles for City Heights. I don't have any loaded in currently, but my understanding is that it falls within the boundaries of these freeways over here, roughly by the 15 and --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I see it.

MS. TRATT: -- and the 4.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. I've been there. Okay. So Fornaciari, Sadhwani, your thoughts on this swap? This is a big swap.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: This is -- it might be too much of a swap.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's talk it through.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So the choice we
2 have to make is what are we, you know -- we've got to
3 choose between the input we've got. Whether -- if we
4 take City Heights South, major surgery on the Eastern
5 side of this district that we have in place. If we take
6 City Heights East, then I think -- then we don't have to
7 do any surgery to the VRA district. And -- except we
8 have to figure out what we're going to do with El Cajon.
9 Got a lot of input on El Cajon and so you know, we've got
10 some trade-offs and some, you know, decision points here
11 in San Diego that we've got to work through.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. It's the conversation,
13 Commissioner, that we've been wanting to have as a
14 Commission.
15 Commissioner Sadhwani for the South Bay/San Diego
16 area?
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I just want to better
18 understand. If City Heights came into the VRA district,
19 what comes out? And is that problematic, right? I mean,
20 it kind of is going to leave, I'm assuming, a Latino
21 community hanging out there by itself from somewhere.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That gives me pause for
24 sure. And while I understand that the VRA considerations
25 do not think about influence or other things like that,

1 certainly, from a scholarly perspective, the interesting
2 thing right now about this La Mesa district and you know,
3 I know we've -- I understand that we've received
4 conflicting testimony, and I appreciate Commissioner
5 Sinay kind of laying out the fact that there was this
6 conflict so that we can have this conversation.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: What I see is the
9 majority -- a district made up of many different
10 communities. That's generally interesting.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Very interesting.
12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I don't know the
13 specifics of the voting behavior of all of those
14 different groups in this area, but if our VRA requirement
15 is further South, I would just be concerned about cutting
16 out communities that --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- would then not be in a
19 district where they could elect the candidate of their
20 choice.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: I too would be uncomfortable if there
22 is areas that are required to have under -- that we're
23 required to have under protection.
24 So Mr. Larson, could you speak to that?
25 MR. LARSON: Well --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Which parts of this district are --
2 would -- Chula Vista, in particular. Because that's
3 really what we're talking about, Chula Vista or City
4 Heights and -- any feedback on that?
5 MR. LARSON: Sure. I mean, my concern would be --
6 what Commissioner Ahmad was asking about earlier, that if
7 we start moving too many of these communities --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.
9 MR. LARSON: -- in the VRA, then we do start to --
10 you know, there -- it might start to wave into an area of
11 raising some sort of packing concerns.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
13 MR. LARSON: So I would just flag that. And you
14 know, if it's going to be explored, we would need to keep
15 an eye on it.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That's very helpful, Mr.
17 Larson. So we certainly don't want to pack.
18 And so Commissioner Fornaciari?
19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just wanted to
20 respond to Commissioner Sadhwani's question about, what
21 would this look like if we did include City Heights.
22 We'd basically be cutting -- moving Bonita and half of --
23 the Eastern half of Chula Vista out somewhere. And you
24 know, then instead of -- probably instead of this La Mesa
25 SVAL kind of going East/West, we would really go

1 North/South.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: So any strong feelings about this?
3 Commissioner Fornaciari? I mean, we have a
4 protective class, we've protected them. So now we're
5 doing this for COI purposes. So what are the COIs in the
6 non-VRA areas at this point?
7 Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Fernandez, and
8 others who might want to speak to that?
9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think
10 Commissioner Sinay could better summarize what the COIs
11 are. I think she had a really good --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. She gave us a really good
13 overview, so maybe she has a little bit more that would
14 be helpful in helping us prioritize, because at this
15 point we're trying to prioritize but know we're going to
16 have to cut.
17 Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Sinay?
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Yeah. I appreciate
19 the background on this. But remind me, wasn't Chula
20 Vista the anchor for this VRA or did I forget?
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Chula Vista was the anchor for
22 this.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And so now we're
24 talking about potentially cutting it then?
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. And then the anchor at that

1 point would be City Heights. So it's a switch of our
2 anchor --
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- from City Heights to Chula Vista,
5 which is the -- I think what Commissioner Fornaciari and
6 Commissioner Sinay are pointing to.
7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it would be shifting our anchor.
9 Our anchor would be going North rather South. And of
10 course, there would be impact to the architecture here
11 too. And there's positives and negatives here. Any
12 strong feelings around this -- or feelings is the wrong
13 word. Any COIs or prioritization? Because this one,
14 we're prioritizing COIs. Any COIs that want to
15 prioritize over others and let's just be very honest
16 because that is hard --- because I don't understand them
17 so much.
18 So Sinay and Turner?
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: At one point you asked me to
20 clarify COIs or elaborate. What was the question?
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. The COIs that are here that
22 are conflicting, I think it's Chula Vista and City
23 Heights and then also --
24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. So --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- I think just in terms of our VRA

1 and if we could -- if there's a priority, any suggestion
2 or recommendation on prioritization of the COIs?
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would rather not be the one
4 prioritizing the COIs because I'm from the region and I
5 think --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- it's better to have a
8 neutral person. I mean, you all do it collaboratively.
9 I would like to just weigh in with everybody else and not
10 lead it.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: I appreciate that. Thank you for
12 that.
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So the COIs, again, it's --
14 it -- every -- all -- okay. So the -- there's the
15 Latino -- Chula Vista -- I mean, Chula Vista -- City
16 Heights is the most diverse group avail -- available.
17 The most diverse community we have is a low-income
18 community, and there's a lot of other low-income
19 communities on the West side, you know, of the VRA
20 district. The East side of the VRA district is
21 wealthier, but they are Latino and Filipino, and they all
22 work very closely together. They -- a lot of the folks
23 who work in the clinics and in the schools and whatnot
24 live in Chula Vista. Chula Vista is also known as -- is
25 a model city in the country for a lot of different

1 programs.

2 The other pieces that Chula Vista and National City

3 have been split in the past, and they've asked to be kept

4 together. And you know -- and in this case it is -- for

5 me, it's -- it's for good reasons. The split has not

6 helped in a lot of what they're building. City Heights

7 is a very diverse community and has usually been put --

8 you know, considered with Southeast San Diego and

9 National City and all that. But I think it's unique that

10 a -- there's a new voice in City Heights of the

11 immigrants and refugees and such that are looking and

12 saying we'd like to go East.

13 The other piece that was interesting about this is

14 that all the advocacy groups in their -- in their maps

15 drew it kind of going East, and the LGBT community

16 originally had said that they wanted to go with

17 downtown -- the state advocacy. And then the local LBGT

18 community said, no, we want to be with City Heights and

19 go towards the East as well. So those are just the

20 different COIs.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

22 Commissioner Turner, then I'll give a sense of what

23 my thoughts are -- Commissioner Ahmad -- just from

24 hearing from all of you. Commissioner Turner and Ahmad.

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

1 And it's very helpful just to have Commissioner Sinay
2 continue to talk about just her knowledge of the area.
3 I'm responding to input that's continuing to come in
4 that speaks about splits of COIs in the area. So I've
5 asked about La Presa -- La Presa --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- that particular area a
8 couple of different times, which basically, what it's
9 asking for is in this La Mesa area to bring in La Presa,
10 Mid-City, and Normal Heights into the district, as well
11 as the rest of Skyline, Paradise Hills, and a small
12 portion of the Southeastern San Diego by 94. So that
13 will make sense to her and she can probably talk about it
14 a little bit more. But it is a community of interest
15 that feels like it's being split for the La Mesa area.
16 And then in the CDSY (ph.) area to move Barrio Logan into
17 the VRAC, removing El Cajon, and moving that into central
18 South -- San Diego, rather. So I'll let that sit and
19 then she can talk about how it fits in with what's said.
20 But I want to make sure that those voices are at least
21 heard in this particular area.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for raising those voices
23 and vocalizing them.
24 Commissioner Ahmad. And then we'll --
25 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- go through the next steps.
2 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. So with this swap, where
3 my mind is at, is that if we are starting to cut into
4 Chula Vista, which is in a VRA district and bringing in
5 City Heights, it -- to me, it no longer is a matter of
6 prioritizing COIs. It bumps back up to VRA
7 considerations, because we don't know how that's going to
8 impact the VRA district.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I think I just need more
11 clarity on if that swap was to happen, are we then
12 putting ourselves in a place where we're not
13 completely -- or as much as possible compliant with the
14 VRA in this area.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I think that's very helpful,
16 Commissioner Ahmad. Thank you for raising that.
17 And for me, my thoughts here are, we have a
18 compliant district. Our counsel has told us we have a
19 compliant district. We -- we've refined it to be
20 responsive to some community input. Certainly, we
21 can -- I do see the potential of -- to connecting La
22 Presa with the communities that have been heard. But
23 I -- at this point, in terms of prioritization, we have a
24 compliant district. We've met our second requirement,
25 and if we want to do COI unification in -- outside of a

1 VRA district, we can.
2 And certainly, we've received the input and we can
3 certainly unite if the Commission so desires. And I did
4 hear a coup -- three -- at least three Commissioners
5 mention uniting La Presa -- La Presa with -- with Spring
6 Valley. That is a possibility. We could do it outside
7 of the VRA district and still -- it's a very strong
8 district; it's just not a VRA district. It's a strong
9 district for the diverse communit -- it's a very diverse
10 community, thirty-one percent -- very diverse in many
11 ways, and so I'm sure, economically and housing wise, and
12 all other ways.
13 So I'm just wondering from the Commission if we're
14 comfortable with this VRA district, prioritizing what we
15 have, because we have an anchor in Chula Vista,
16 continuing with Chula Vista as the anchor here, and then
17 maybe improving is the wrong word, but modifying the
18 district above it, so it -- to unify some of these COIs
19 that we're receiving in that district there. So I'm --
20 that's the question at -- on hand. And let's see what
21 people are thinking.
22 Commissioner Fer -- and then we do have to go to
23 lunch, because some of us are hungry.
24 Commissioner Fernandez?
25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'll be quick. You know,

1 just quickly, maybe it's something we can give direction
2 to and some of us could work on it.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. During lunch?
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would be very open to
5 that. Yeah. I --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'd like to pursue it, so
8 thank you.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So you'd like to pursue, not
10 the VRA district, not changing the VRA district, just
11 modifying the district above it that has potentially some
12 VRA considerations, but it's not within the VRA district;
13 is that correct?
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I was thinking both,
15 but okay.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: No. I'm just curious. I want to get
17 the sense of the group, because I'm not the one making
18 decisions, you guys are. We're all doing it together.
19 Andrew?
20 MR. DRECHSLER: I was just going to say, just a
21 reminder, over lunch, we are going to look at those other
22 VRA districts and just wanted to be conscious of the --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yes.
24 MR. DRECHSLER: -- thirty minutes. So how long do
25 you think --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do that first -- do that first and
2 then -- and then --
3 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Okay. Yep.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and then if we --
5 MR. DRECHSLER: Perfect.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- if we can come back to this.
7 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Perfect. We might do this
8 live. Great.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. Can -- all right.
10 So anyone have strong feelings here, either way?
11 I -- my suggestion -- it's not really a recommendation,
12 but would be to maintain the VRA district as is and then
13 look to unify COI as above or around. But we can
14 certainly modify the VRA district if that's the choice of
15 The Commission, and the desire of The Commission at this
16 point.
17 Commissioner Fornaciari?
18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I support keeping the VRA
19 district as it is and then -- and then moving forward
20 with the -- moving La Presa in and -- and you know,
21 following up on the input from Commissioner Turner. I
22 think that was the direction that we were going to need
23 to be heading anyway. So --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. And I --
25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I would support it.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- I agree -- I would agree with
2 that. I think we have a compliant district as counsel
3 has said and we are -- our requirement is that we have a
4 VRA district. We have one that meets all the
5 requirements. And there, outside of those areas, we
6 could create a district that is responsive to the
7 community there outside of the VRA and outside of
8 consider -- more work -- working through our, you know,
9 keeping communities together, working class communities
10 together. Because that's what I'm hearing from what I --
11 from what Commissioner Sinay said, it was really about
12 working class people and keeping that -- those
13 communities and ensuring that we have all the working
14 class communities together and are -- they are able to
15 unify their voice, because outside of URA district, that
16 is -- those are the considerations we're looking at.
17 Commissioner Sinay?
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just -- just on that SV --
19 ASVAL (ph.), we -- you know, we will want to look to see
20 if we can also move towards the 5 and capture the LGBT
21 community that asked to be in that one. It might not
22 work, but I wanted to put that out there as well.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it. That's very helpful.
24 And so we will be at -- think about all of the direction
25 you want to give, everybody. So think about any specific

1 direction you would like to see in this district right
2 above a VRA district, but certainly, is important and we
3 want to be responsive, and when we come back, we can give
4 direction to it, try it out, and then move on to the next
5 area.
6 Thank you. And we'll be back in thirty minutes.
7 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:25 p.m.
8 until 3:00 p.m.)
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
10 Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are moving along
11 through San Diego, and we are -- at this point
12 considering some swaps in the La Mesa SVAL district. We
13 are at negative 2.6 deviation. We're exploring the
14 possibility of uniting La Presa with Spring Valley. And
15 I believe Commissioner Fornaciari and Sinay were -- and
16 Turner were -- had some suggestions in this area.
17 Commissioner Fornaciari?
18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think to start
19 with add La Presa to El Mesa SVAL, and then see where we
20 need to go from there.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we did receive community of
22 interest testimony wanting La Presa to be with Spring
23 Valley for socioeconomic, housing affordability reasons,
24 and other transportation concerns.
25 MS. TRATT: Chair, I have highlighted La Presa, and

1 the changes are reflected in this box right here. That
2 would make the deviation of La Mesa SVAL 4.52 percent.
3 So that could actually be left as is without swapping
4 population out, if that was desired by the Commission.
5 And SESDC would become negative eleven percent deviated.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: If you can scroll out so we can see
7 SEDC (ph.). Okay. So we need to add population to the
8 very large district to the East.
9 Andrew?
10 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just going to remind on
11 the top of the district, SESDC --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
13 MR. DRECHSLER: -- there was Rainbow, Fallbrook,
14 Bonsall, were some areas that they expressed kept
15 together possibly with this district. So just wanted to
16 remind folks of that. Thank you.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We certainly did get quite a
18 bit of testimony from that region that they would like to
19 be with the SE -- is it DC? My eyes are -- SCDSDC (sic)
20 region. Any suggestions or recommendations, Commissioner
21 Fornaciari or Commissioner Akutagawa?
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would like to make some
23 recommendations -- just kind of still trying to figure
24 out and make sure there's no adverse ripple effects to
25 San Diego, but there's going to be -- there's some

suggestions that I'd like to make in terms of the impacts to Orange County. So perhaps before we go there -- or do you want me to just start talking about Orange County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's look at the first change. I want to see --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- if there's consensus to unite the COIs of La Presa with Spring Valley. That was mentioned by Commissioner Sadhwani, Turner, and I believe, Fornaciari, Sinay. Any opposition to that? It does create deviation problems that we'd have to solve up in the SESDC region. Seeing none. Let's do and then let's figure out a way to reconcile population.

Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have recommendations on getting population into SESDC?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Hold on.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Hold on. Let me just get this all together, and I'll just try to make it as efficient as possible.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Fornaciari or Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I was just going to -- if we can -- Sivan, if we can go up to the Northern boundary of the -- yes. Thank you so much.

1 And then -- let's see.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: That -- that district, ESC --
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- has over -- is overpopulated by
5 4.41.
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Essentially, we could draw some
8 population from there. That would be an option. I don't
9 know if it's efficient to address the issue, but those
10 communities did request -- the communities of Fallbrook,
11 Rainbow, and --
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And Pala. Yeah.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and Pala. Thank you.
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. They requested --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: They asked to be together. I don't
16 know -- I'm not so familiar with this area, so I'm --
17 Commissioner -- Commissioners who are, please.
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But those areas --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the Fallbrook, Rainbow,
21 and Pala also asked to be with Temecula and Escondido, so
22 I was trying to figure all that. Okay. Thank you. I
23 just needed to look at it.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: So there's conflicting testimony
25 here.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Exactly.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: So there was testimony to add -- to
3 go East and to go North.
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum. Yeah.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari?
6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I think, you
7 know, we need to think about this as we have borders on
8 three sides of this --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- of this county, right?
11 So we've committed to Imperial County being a VRA
12 district.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have Mexico and we have
15 an ocean.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And so we've got to --
18 we've got -- I mean, the way I look at this is we have to
19 balance these districts -- I have to use my hands and you
20 have to see it, we have to balance these districts as we
21 go up.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then we've got an
24 interface with Orange County and Riverside to make the
25 population all come out, is the way I'm looking at it --

I mean --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- if you look at the yellow here, we're -- the -- San Diego's kind of surrounded, so I mean, the only way to balance it out is to go up and West.

MS. TRATT: So would you like me to take a look at adding some of those Northern San Diego County cities into SESDC?

CHAIR TOLEDO: That potentially would also bring down, because we could add Rainbow, Fallbrook --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well --

CHAIR TOLEDO: But then -- but I see what your point to -- there'd be -- I see a compilation of --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- if we go further South, I mean, I think we're over in -- so we're over 4.5 in La Mesa SVAL. You know, we're --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Negative.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- too -- I mean, we're over enough in these three districts to kind of balance that out if we want to go there, but we -- I mean, we'd have to take some of El Cajon, probably into SEDC, and then -- I mean, if we took some from, like -- some from La Mesa SVAL.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I see what you're saying.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Was there a testimony to take out El
3 Cajon from La Mesa or was it to include it with La Mesa,
4 and I remember that there was a testimony -- a COI
5 testimony to move El Cajon, but I can't remember if it
6 was -- where.
7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think it went both ways,
8 but I think Commissioner Turner had something.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from Fernandez and
10 Turner.
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. Actually,
12 that was going to be my recommendation to try to see how
13 much we can take to try to make El Cajon whole and the --
14 some of the communities of interest that I had reviewed
15 had El Cajon with Santee and Poway. So that might help.
16 So that would be my recommendation to bring -- bring more
17 of El Cajon in.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: So your recommendation is to take out
19 El Cajon out of the La Mesa SVAL district --
20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And to bring it into
21 the SESDC.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's hear from
23 Commissioner Turner.
24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I think it mirrored
25 that, taking El Cajon out of SESY -- SVSY, and move it to

central SV.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. I believe that that was -- I think the -- what's being discussed at this point, is moving El Cajon back to SESDC with the communities of Santee, Lakeside, (indiscernible) -- I'm sorry. I'm --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Take out that. Oh, okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it's different than -- so it's a different exploration.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: District. Uh-huh.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Different district.

MS. TRATT: Chair, do you mind if I address that quickly?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Please.

MS. TRATT: So this was a -- this was a change that was -- that was requested by the Commission. It's an intentional split of El Cajon that follows a community of interest boundaries. This Southern area of El Cajon had been identified as a lower income, minority area of the city that had explicitly asked to be apart from Santee, and then -- and that was the intention behind that split where it is, as well as being in separate districts intentionally.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That was --

MS. TRATT: And that was during live line drawing

1 previously. So I just wanted to make sure that we're not
2 unintentionally stepping on work that you've already
3 done.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's correct.
5 Commissioner Fernandez?
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I do remember that,
7 Sivan, but there was also testimony to keep it whole and
8 then also keep it with Santee and some of these other
9 communities. So again, it's a conflict that's
10 conflicting communities of interest.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. We have conflicts of
12 interest here -- or conflicting interest, not conflicts
13 of interest. Sorry.
14 Any other suggestions on where this might go? We do
15 have a recommendation on the table to move the
16 communities of Fallbrook and Rainbow and others on the
17 top. If there's other spaces where we might be able to
18 move other cities or communities.
19 Commissioner Sadhwani, any suggestions?
20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Given that
21 conflicting COI and that we have gone through this -- I
22 mean, I think this -- at minimum maintaining this split
23 would seem reasonable to me in El Cajon and then going
24 back up and thinking about Fallbrook and --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Rainbow.

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- Rainbow to help with the
2 population issues in SESDC.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't know if it gets us there, but
4 potentially --
5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- could help.
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Could you highlight those areas of
9 Rainbow, Fallbrook, Bonsall, and surrounding areas, and
10 see if -- there's also testimony that would push these
11 populations up as well, so -- but that wouldn't help us
12 with deviations to the -- to the East.
13 So we're talking about --
14 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it looks like that would fix
15 your deviation issue in the Southeast San Diego County,
16 SESDC. It would make it a deviation of negative 1.86 and
17 this Escondido, formerly Bonsall and Rainbow, but now
18 would just be mostly Escondido based would become
19 negative 4.83 percent deviation.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: So this would address our deviation
21 issues. Any concerns with this, Commissioners, where you
22 have a compliant district that is within deviation range?
23 Also, it unified the COIs that want to be unified. Any
24 opposition to adding this change?
25 Commissioner Sadhwani, Kennedy? I know Commissioner

1 Akutagawa is looking at options as well. I just want to
2 hear if everyone's comfortable with this change. This
3 would address our issues in this district. I'm
4 hearing -- I'm seeing nods of yes. It keep -- it also
5 keeps the community of El Cajon out -- with the
6 communities that -- lower-income communities that they
7 had requested to be with, or portions of them -- well,
8 not the whole city, but the portions that were
9 prioritized.
10 All right. So with that, we're going to accept this
11 change and we're going to move on to the next VRA
12 district or other VRAs. Great. It looks like a healthy
13 district.
14 We'll move on to -- and we have -- our line drawers
15 have been working on the changes to the Inland Empire
16 that we had requested in the VRA districts. They have
17 been trying to make these changes work and have -- at
18 this time, have not been able to reconcile it, but we
19 will be going through that and see if we can reconcile it
20 live line drawing.
21 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you so much, Chair.
22 So in purple are the lines. These are the lines
23 that were sent from the Los Angeles census and
24 redistricting hub from after the 11/30 line drawing. So
25 I would just note that some of the changes that have been

1 made, both today and after 11/30, are not reflected in
2 this, just to keep in mind. So we were mainly looking at
3 changes to this Rialto/Fontana district. And that is
4 what they had visualized.
5 I would just note that these are pretty major
6 restructuring changes to the note of, you know, about
7 twenty-five percent of a district, and would potentially
8 have larger issues or larger ripples throughout this area
9 and potentially into LA. The break was only thirty
10 minutes, so I wasn't able to visualize those yet for you,
11 but whichever direction the Commission would like to take
12 it in, I can do that now.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So it looks like this would
14 require significant architectural changes, but we are
15 exploring the possibility of --
16 Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Vazquez?
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: And can we look at where the VRA
19 districts are, because -- can you high -- yeah. Can
20 you -- yes. Thank you. Put the -- so that we all know
21 where they are.
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I just want to note, a
23 key change that I see here is actually that they
24 visualized what we're calling PCO, as picking up San
25 Dimas and La Verne in a VRA district. I could see that.

1 I don't know what advice from counsel might be on that,
2 but I could see that.
3 My bigger question though, then, if we were to move
4 in this direction, is what that would do to the 210
5 population deviation? Because that would set off a
6 number of changes in LA, which may or may not be a bad
7 thing. We are getting -- what I -- from what I can tell,
8 some interesting testimony in terms of the changes that
9 we made to the San Fernando Valley to try and consolidate
10 more of those, the working-class communities in that
11 region. And I almost wonder if moving in this direction
12 helps open up the San Fernando Valley all the way across
13 the 210 to make some of those changes. It's hard for me
14 to completely conceptualize what that would be, but
15 that's just initially where my mind went when I saw this,
16 is noting the San Dimas and La Verne, and I would be
17 really curious to hear others' thoughts on that.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'd be curious from the line drawers
19 what they believe the impact would be if we go down this
20 path, in terms of implications down the road and whether
21 it would achieve a pushing population -- well, just the
22 implications of it.
23 MS. TRATT: It is a little bit hard to say --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
25 MS. TRATT: -- without, you know, making some of

1 these changes. I --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: So --
3 MR. DRECHSLER: And if I could just jump in for a
4 second. San Dimas' population is about 34,000 and La
5 Verne is about 31,000, so together they -- you would be
6 correct, Commissioner Sadhwani, it would have a serious
7 impact on the 210, so just wanted to jump --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can -- can we have the heat map --
9 the Latina CVAP heat map over the whole map, and let's
10 take a look at the CVAP in that area. Does it
11 particular -- is there a way that -- for us to figure out
12 what the Latino population is in the San Dima -- because
13 we're -- we're dealing with VRA area in the San Dima --
14 and this is a question for counsel. Is San Dimas and --
15 I believe it's La Verne region protected in the VRA under
16 the -- under our analysis at this point?
17 MR. PEREZ: Good afternoon.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Would it be a regeneratory area? Oh,
19 good afternoon, Salvador.
20 MR. PEREZ: Yeah. This is Sal Perez from
21 Strumwasser & Woocher. This is a similar issue to the
22 one that you faced with Faria, Logan and the San Diego
23 district.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
25 MR. PEREZ: You had discretion here to shift the

1 populations of Latino voters as long as the existing VRA
2 draft districts stayed about where they are, so the
3 discretion is yours.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
5 Any areas that would lose protection that currently
6 have protection, Sivan?
7 MS. TRATT: Just to answer your previous question --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
9 MS. TRATT: -- it looks like the Latino population
10 would be about 15,000 people.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: And about fifty-four percent in that
12 area?
13 MS. TRATT: Yes.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
15 MS. TRATT: Would be the -- of the whole district
16 would be the --
17 MR. DRECHSLER: So if you added -- if you added
18 these to how PCO is now --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I see.
20 MR. DRECHSLER: (Indiscernible) from -- it's
21 currently 57.9.
22 MS. TRATT: It's fifty-seven.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: So Latino CVAP would go down to
24 fifty-four from fifty-seven?
25 MS. TRATT: Yes. That is correct.

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And does that include the
2 removing that component of Ontario that -- no?
3 MS. TRATT: It does not. It does not. I can't do
4 both at the same time, unfortunately. But I can commit
5 this to explore that, if you would like.
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Because you'd be
7 over by nine point -- you'd be at 9.74, so something,
8 obviously, has to come out.
9 MS. TRATT: Yes. And 210 would be under by eighteen
10 percent.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Because it looks here, from other
12 Commissioners -- and just thoughts and -- around this is
13 a big architectural change, having impact across the
14 region into potentially Los Angeles and beyond, so let's
15 have a conversation.
16 Commissioner Vazquez?
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Just a general
18 reflection, I would like to explore -- I would like to go
19 down this path. Just a general reflection to remind the
20 Commission that VRA doesn't protect cities, it protects
21 voting population --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: People.
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- and so I really want,
24 like, especially as we get into this very, you know,
25 densely populated, mostly suburban but somewhat in the

1 denser areas, somewhat urban-ish areas, to really think
2 critically about sort of where we are drawing population
3 from. And that splitting up, especially these large --
4 these are, comparatively, pretty large cities that we're
5 talking about in the Inland Empire and that I know I,
6 myself, am very comfortable breaking up some of these
7 cities, especially because demographically, with big
8 cities, we know that concentrations of low income and
9 people of color happen. You know, the populations that
10 are protected are not evenly distributed across a
11 particular city, or even a region. So looking -- I'm
12 looking for some creativity here, especially since it's
13 unlikely we'll be able to sort of directly map the --
14 these lines that are visualized on purple onto our own
15 maps; that we should think creatively about where we can
16 draw lines so that we protect populations but we're
17 not -- we don't need to protect cities.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Certainly, it's always about people,
19 not geographical space. Certainly, that's what we're
20 redistricting people, not space.
21 Andrew, and then Patricia -- Commissioner Sinay, I
22 meant. Okay. Commissioner Sinay?
23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Can you move the box a
24 little to the left, please? So we are being creative, I
25 believe, if we accept this because you've got Claremont,

Upland, and San Antonio Heights -- oh, I guess the forest -- I thought the forest was right there. But it is an interesting little dip there, and I just want us -- it is contiguous, because there is more land. I thought it was a forest, and I was like, that's really creative. But so I guess it's fine. That was -- sorry. And I agree exactly --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- with what Commissioner Vazquez is saying in that it's critical to think about it all the way through. Very rarely are all cities monolithic.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

So let's -- I also want to bring back the conversation to the redistricting criteria. One is population, two is VRA. We do have compliant VRA districts at this point. What we're saying is that we are going to be prioritizing some COIs at this point, which are important COIs, don't get me wrong. They're really important COIs, but as Chair, I just have to remind us, we're prioritizing COIs and -- and -- and completely redoing our map. And that may be okay, if that's the consensus where the Commission wants to go. I just am reminding COI is our number fourth criteria and VRA compliance is number two. We are compliant.

And I'm just -- it's -- and it's a time issue. Just like in the La Quinta area -- area we didn't pursue a big exploration because of time. Otherwise, we probably would have explored other options. That was my sense from the Commission, but we made an uncomfortable decision there.

I'm just bringing it back so that we can have a conversation. The -- and I guess, the question may be, could we -- is there a way to do some of this and not all of this and reduce the implications across the maps. And I don't know the answer to that, I'm just posing the question.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're all in different rooms, so I have no idea --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- can't see anybody, right?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. You just stole my thunder. That was going to be my recommendation is that, you know, we're not obligated to do all of this, but it seems like some -- like, Rialto -- moving Rialto, we -- we could start doing parts of it and try to minimize as much as we can, the effects on some of the surrounding districts.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: And it goes back to -- we have to --
2 we are -- have limited time. We want to be done with the
3 Assembly districts, preferably sooner rather than later,
4 no later than Monday, certainly. But time is not our
5 friend at this point, and -- but we certainly can make
6 some refinements and some swaps and -- but if it's the
7 will of the Commission to do a architectural change,
8 certainly, I -- you know, if that's the will, that's what
9 we'll do.
10 Commissioner Turner?
11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.
12 I just wanted to name that in -- it certainly -- I
13 just wanted to name that in some of these communities and
14 because it has gotten down to time, the greater, I guess,
15 issue of time, for me, would be the ten years that these
16 communities would be stuck in areas that they shouldn't
17 belong in. And so I'm hopeful that we can explore this
18 and do as much as possible. We recognize that if we try
19 this and we get to a place that's non-VRA compliant, then
20 we just cannot. But I'd be more willing to press through
21 whatever it would require to try and accomplish as much
22 of this as possible based on any of the other constraints
23 that we have.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: One -- thank you. And that's
25 appreciated. I also recognize any -- all the changes

1 we're making across the state of California, they're maps
2 for ten years. We want them to be fair maps that
3 represent and allow all communities to be able to elect
4 people -- candidate of their choice. And so I want to
5 hear from other folks about how we're feeling around
6 this, or thoughts. Okay. Seeing no hands up, I'm just
7 going to pose the question.
8 Is the Commission comfortable with this explorat --
9 moving in the exploration phase and -- all right. So
10 it -- okay. Is anyone not comfortable with going --
11 exploring here?
12 And then let's think about the consequences of
13 exploring, because I always want to think about the
14 consequences. So can we scroll back out? Because I'm
15 just trying to think what else we need to do today. And
16 we probably do have enough time to do this, but today we
17 do have to go through Orange County still, and we also
18 have to go to the -- Imperial, and then we have to do
19 work in Orange County -- in San Diego as well because
20 we're not done in San Diego. So we can certainly spend
21 time here in the Inland Empire; it's an area of deserved
22 time and attention. And if there's a desire -- so that's
23 the work that needs to get done today. And so we just
24 need to figure out what we're not going to do, because
25 it's a question -- it's not just a question of what we're

1 going to do, it's a question of what we're not going to
2 prioritize.
3 Commissioner Sadhwani?
4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to offer,
5 Chair, what if we put a time constraint on this? If we
6 can see the direction where we're going, we can
7 reevaluate that time constraint so we don't go overboard
8 with it.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm happy to do that. So let's put a
10 time constraint on it. I -- let me see what I had
11 allocated to this region. And let's look at -- and then
12 we can see if we can reconcile it. I'm pulling that up
13 right now.
14 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Earlier this week when -- on
15 Monday when we -- when Commissioner Fornaciari and I
16 presented our plan, it had been suggested by some
17 Commissioners that we allocate roughly based on
18 population. I certainly think that we've spent a whole
19 lot of time on many of the rural areas, and so I would
20 just, you know --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Exactly. So we need to --
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- make a play for these
23 more densely populated areas.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I'm not advocating not doing
25 this. Don't get me wrong. I want to do this because

it's -- you know, I'm always wanting to -- and everyone else on this Commission wants to do -- wants a very fair map. I think we have fair maps right now, but fairer maps, and so -- and get the COIs right because they do impact us for ten years. And so -- but it's an issue of time allocation at this point. So how about we work on this for thirty minutes.

We get to 4 o'clock, see where we are, and see the viability of this. Because at this point, we don't know the viability of the -- how -- what the impacts will be, and then we assess at 4 o'clock, and at 4 o'clock, we go back to the -- at that point, it would be the Imperial Valley, finish that. That shouldn't be -- knock on wood, that shouldn't take us very long, go up to -- go up through San Diego, up to Orange County, and then when -- as time permits, we'd come back to this region if we still have work to do. And then -- let's try that.

Is everyone amenable to that, thirty minutes here? If we need more, we can get it after we've finalized Inland -- the other regions that are a little bit less complex.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I want to hear -- that's just a suggestion. I'm just trying to figure out how to

1 allocate time.
2 Commissioner Taylor?
3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. This is in reference to
4 the map, not in reference to time allocation.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I thought I was hearing that
7 there was some thought to proportionally moving parts of
8 this. Do we have an idea of what that potential split
9 might be? Would it be along the -- the 210, or we
10 thinking that's a North/South split, an East/West? What
11 would a potential split in that district be along that
12 population?
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's begin the
14 exploration. We'll continue to 4 o'clock and we'll
15 reassess at that point. Does that --
16 Sivan, can you answer that question?
17 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. I just wanted to
18 make a snapshot of the way that the districts are now in
19 case the Commission decides to abandon these changes. So
20 just wanted to assure everyone that we can always come
21 back to this point. Would you like me to start with
22 those proposed changes to the PCO region where we were
23 previously and adding San Dimas and La Verne to this
24 Pomona-based district?
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may, I think somebody

1 said earlier to start with the Rialto, but that's
2 actually the community of interest we're trying to keep
3 together, so I -- my sense would be starting with that
4 and then kind of seeing what we would have to shift. We
5 can make decisions about San Dimas and La Verne that way.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: And Sivan, I'm also curious --
7 because I do think we have the line drawers for Los
8 Angeles now available. I'm wondering if we give you
9 high-level -- if we give you direction -- general
10 direction on what we'd like to see -- and what we'd like
11 to see and what we would like -- how we would like this
12 to help -- the direction to move this -- shift this
13 population again, it's West at this point. So how do we
14 want to shift the population West? Whether you can take
15 that and start working on that on -- without us, if we
16 give you high-level direction and enough specifics so
17 that you can do your work and in the meantime, we can
18 start working on Los Angeles, as was suggested earlier.
19 Because we do have line drawers that could do that if --
20 so that's a potential too, so that we could try to get
21 some of this done in the background while we're also
22 working and making decisions in Los Angeles.
23 MS. TRATT: Well --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: We could do that. We can do live
25 line drawing. We can do -- I'm just giving options to

1 the Commission as I'm getting them.
2 Commissioner Fornaciari?
3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I just want to make sure
4 that, you know, we need to -- I think we need to loop
5 back to San Diego because there were a couple of
6 outstanding issues that we didn't address that we need to
7 make sure that we address that and all, I guess, the term
8 is can live with the districts that we've put together
9 down there.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we -- how about we --
11 are --
12 MS. TRATT: Can I respond to your first question,
13 Chair?
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, please. Thank you.
15 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So personally, I would feel more
16 comfortable if we made some of these changes in live line
17 drawing --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
19 MS. TRATT: -- just because this is such an area
20 that has -- like, this area has a lot of COIs. It has a
21 lot of VRA considerations. And I would just feel more
22 comfortable if the Commission was giving more direct
23 direction to me to make those changes.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. So let's --
25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Yeah.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- do that.
2 MS. TRATT: Okay.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: So thirty minutes of direction here
4 and then after that, we will be shifting and seeing where
5 we are, and then we need to get back to San Diego and
6 Orange County.
7 Commissioner Turner?
8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I just wanted to name
9 where possible since we're responding to a community of
10 interest request, let's try and do it the way that
11 they've asked for first. Because if we try partially,
12 they've already also submitted what would balance, and if
13 we try a portion of what they've submitted, we won't
14 balance, and we'll think it's because of a faulty
15 submission, as opposed to at least trying to -- if we're
16 going to explore what they've submitted, I'd love to be
17 able to try on what they've submitted and then see -- you
18 know, be able to at least say, we tried for thirty
19 minutes to do -- or whatever the time frame is, and it
20 just doesn't work in its entirety. But if we start
21 mixing and matching what we believe they intended, I
22 think we may end up with a faulty product.
23 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Turner, with all due
24 respect, I think that's a really good intention, but
25 the -- to commit all of those changes would, basically,

1 be redrawing the entire map and a lot -- undoing a lot of
2 the changes that we've worked on today. Just kind of
3 zooming out for a more macro view, you can see that a lot
4 of where the lines -- the districts that are balanced in
5 this plan do not align with the districts that the
6 Commission has already drawn. So I think it would
7 require more of a mixing and matching approach just
8 because these changes were not made to the current
9 version of the map that we are looking at now and that's
10 the version that we need to be balancing, if that makes
11 sense.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: So our map has shifted since the --
13 what Sivan, I think, is trying to say is the map has
14 shifted even after the submission was -- these lines were
15 drawn, so the -- because our map is continuously
16 evolving, and so what was used as the foundation for
17 these maps is no longer the foundation, so -- because our
18 maps have shifted --
19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So what might --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- pretty significantly.
21 MS. TRATT: -- what might make more sense would be
22 to go district by district and look at what looks
23 different and then kind of prioritize what you would like
24 to adopt. But trying to match the borders exactly is
25 going to just run into a lot of other problems in other

areas, is basically what -- yeah. Exactly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I appreciate that. Thank you for that feedback. My thinking on this, particularly, is that if we somehow have -- in our trying to bring in all community of interest, if we've somehow missed it and if there is a way to draw it and have all of it included, that would be a better way, and so I just want to name that if there's a way to snapshot and try some things on, great. And then if, you know -- if we're saying it can't be done, if it was incorrect and we have our maps perfectly already, that's then a different story.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't think we're saying we have perfect maps, but we're saying that our maps are just -- have evolved this morning, because we made changes this morning that impacted all of the lines on this end as well -- or not all, but impacted some of the lines that are -- that are now the -- that were the foundation of the VRA maps that were -- so they're just different lines that we're -- different lines were used as a basis for these -- for the submission we received from the public.

So Sivan, recognizing that we have until 4 to work through some of this, what's the direction that you need from the Commission to help you work through some of this

1 integration?

2 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. So it had been

3 suggested that we start by moving Rialto in with the City

4 of San Bernardino. So if the Commission wants me to

5 commit this change and kind of move from there, I think

6 that would be a good starting point. But yes, again,

7 we'll just have to go district by district while making

8 these changes.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Is everybody comfortable with adding

10 Rialto to -- I'm getting yeses from the Commission. So

11 okay.

12 MS. TRATT: All right. So now the San Bernardino

13 district includes Rialto but is now overpopulated by

14 19.27 percent. So we can continue kind of moving

15 clockwise in swapping out population.

16 CHAIR TOLEDO: So in terms of a process, Sivan --

17 because as we make changes, we're solving some issues and

18 creating some. What's the best way to solve some of

19 these problems? Is it -- because here we have a

20 deviation of 19.27. Is it addressing those or making all

21 of our changes and then -- I'm not a line drawer, so I'm

22 trying to get some clarification as to what's the best

23 process to achieve the goal here.

24 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would say that I wouldn't go

25 too far down the road of, like, scary-high deviation,

1 because then you're just going to be undoing a lot of the
2 work that you've done. So I think if some districts are
3 overpopulated by like, you know, say, six or seven
4 percent, that would be okay, just in terms of moving
5 things around. But I would try and get nineteen percent
6 closer to five before continuing on, because --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: That makes sense.
8 MS. TRATT: -- otherwise, if you continue to make
9 changes to other districts, you're going to be like, oh,
10 wait, we have to fix that nineteen -- it's going to
11 create those (indiscernible) --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. You --
13 MS. TRATT: -- bubbles.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We might be able to get a
15 bubble that we can't fix it later. So Vazquez and
16 then -- or Commissioner Vazquez, and then Andrew.
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I like Vazquez. It makes me
18 feel like I'm part of a baseball team. So --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: We are a big team.
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I'd actually recommend
21 that we, at least, make this a bigger change by including
22 all of the community of interest that we are -- that we
23 are centering a lot of these changes around.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So including that triangle

space and then I -- then I would sort of go down the track that Sivan noted. I know it will get us to a big deviation first, but I just feel like, sort of what Commissioner Turner was saying, that, like, we should start from a very solid place and that way if we need to sort of walk some of this back, we at least know that we attempted out the gate to protect this whole community of interest.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. And I like that strategy. So let's do that.

And then let's go to Andrew for --

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I would think, in turn, I was just going to say if we sort of focus on these, then maybe just start by focusing on these four VRA districts and sort of work counterclockwise to see where we are with the changes, that might be a suggestion. So next moving Loma Linda, Redlands, over to JRC, and sort of working that way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

MR. DRECHSLER: And seeing how that population works.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's helpful advice. And it's 3:40. We have until 4 o'clock to continue and then we will get back up -- we'll come back to it. We just need to also get to the other areas as well.

1 Commissioner Fernandez?
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was just going to
3 ask Sivan to zoom out a little bit, because I did notice
4 that the Loma Linda and that little triangle that Andrew
5 was talking about, the neighboring districts are already
6 almost at a five percent, I believe, deviation, or was I
7 mistaken about that? With Loma -- excuse me -- Loma
8 Linda and Redlands, you've got the VVHD that's almost at
9 five and so is -- yeah. So I was trying to figure out
10 how we're going to move that out somehow. That's our
11 challenge right now.
12 And which district did you say to move it into,
13 Andrew?
14 MR. DRECHSLER: JRC.
15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The JRC?
16 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.
17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The little valley, right?
18 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.
19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It would extend the neck.
20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
21 MS. TRATT: Yeah. We set earlier.
22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
23 MS. TRATT: So I have that triangle area
24 highlighted, so if the Commission feels comfortable with
25 me going ahead and committing that, I can then look at

1 either moving this population into JRC or whatever else
2 the Commission would like me to explore.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez, any comments
4 there?
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm sorry. That
6 was -- I knew there was a second part to my question,
7 was -- do we want Mentone and Loma Linda to be in that
8 other district that we're potentially going to move them
9 into? That's another question for the --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: And because this is a --
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the Redlands.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and because this is a VRA
13 district, we have to pay very close attention to the
14 Latino CVAP in all of these as we go through, because
15 that is the protected population in this area. It looks
16 like these changes don't make a -- don't make too much of
17 a difference, which is appropriate and everything looks
18 good. Any problems -- any concerns from the Commission
19 around these?
20 Commissioner Vazquez?
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. That's a good
22 question, Commissioner Fernandez. I think what will have
23 to happen to move the JRC -- or to move -- with all of
24 these changes, I do think we're going to go to -- we're
25 going to have to include Redlands to maintain the JRC

1 CVAP, which I am -- which I am comfortable with. There's
2 actually quite a bit of commuter movement between
3 Redlands and Riverside County. Many folks live in
4 Redlands and work in Riverside. So there is actually a
5 logic behind making these associations. So yeah, but
6 that's a good question. I don't think we can just move
7 Grand Terrace and Loma Linda into JRC. I think we'll
8 have to move Redlands. Mentone may actually need to not
9 be included. I would recommend starting with Loma Linda
10 and Redlands first.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's turn on the Latino CVAP to
12 ensure that we're capturing the Latino communit -- the
13 Latino population, given that it is -- this is in a VRA
14 area. And counsel had advised that Loma Linda would be a
15 place that we could potentially cut population if we
16 needed to.
17 Commissioner Fernandez?
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm making sure. And
19 thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. I believe we have to
20 move Mentone because it's -- my records show that it's
21 9,500 population -- or almost 9,600 and that district is
22 already four percent, so it's going to take it over the
23 five percent, or we'll have to move some other parts to
24 it. So just trying to think ahead.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's get counsel advice on this.

1 Salvador, are -- currently we have these two communities,
2 Redland and -- portions of Redland and Mentone in the VRA
3 district or in the covered space. There's a question as
4 to whether we can take them out of a protected VRA
5 district?
6 MR. PEREZ: I would advise that you try to keep them
7 in a VRA district, particularly Redlands, but this is,
8 you know -- I think it goes back to discretion. You --
9 there are going to be -- this is like a mega VRA region,
10 more or less. It's -- that's how I would put it. So the
11 boundaries of these collection of districts will have
12 inevitably some population of Latino voters that will be
13 outside of them. And it's going to be very difficult to
14 capture everyone within those boundaries. So there are
15 going to be decisions that you will have to be making
16 about whether or not you feel comfortable, for example,
17 keeping Redlands in or out, but legally speaking, I would
18 encourage you to try to keep them inside a district.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: For risk purposes.
20 MR. PEREZ: What's that?
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: For risk -- for risk purposes.
22 MR. PEREZ: Exactly.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.
24 Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Vazquez,
25 others?

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes. And I think at
2 this point, if I heard correctly what Commissioner
3 Vazquez was saying, we were going to move it from one VRA
4 district to another VRA district, so it would still be in
5 a VRA district.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Is -- my understanding was that the
7 district underneath is not a VRA district.
8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. But I believe what
9 Commissioner Vazquez said was to move it to the JRC,
10 which is a VRA district.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay. Oh, I see what you're
12 saying --
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That's correct. Yes.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: You're thinking populations from --
15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. So I think we're
16 okay in terms of --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- what Sal was saying.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's absolutely fine. All
20 right. So let's -- what is the direction, Commissioner
21 Vazquez? I thought --
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: To move --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. I misunderstood.
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That's okay. The direction
25 is to move Loma Linda and the current -- the portion of

1 Redlands, and let's just say Mentone, although I think
2 that might put us over population. But let's do the
3 Southern portion of Colton, Loma Linda, the portion of
4 Redlands and SVCHR, and Mentone into the JRC district and
5 see where that leaves us.
6 MS. TRATT: All right. One moment, please.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we are almost at 3:50. Our next
8 break, I just got a note, is at 4:25. And at 4 o'clock
9 we are going to reassess. And maybe give direction to
10 the line drawers.
11 MS. TRATT: All right. So making those changes
12 would -- let's see. It -- so it looks like JRC would
13 become overpopulated by about twenty-one percent and
14 would drop the Latino CVAP below fifty, although,, as we
15 know, it's severely overpopulated, so it's possible that
16 this will come back within range once the population is
17 removed. SVCHR would then be overpopulated by seven
18 percent and would have a Latino CVAP of 58.45 percent.
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I would say definitely remove
20 that portion of Mentone from this. Mentone might have to
21 go MVCB, which is, I think, where it was this morning.
22 Didn't help too much. What we could do as well, again,
23 since we're already splitting up Redlands, we could -- I
24 could also propose that you take what's currently the
25 Eastern edge of Redlands and draw a line North/South up

1 to -- you can see that pretty densely populated. Right.
2 So maybe if you draw --
3 MS. TRATT: Maybe a line --
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No. To -- one more block, I
5 guess, to the right.
6 MS. TRATT: Oh, just -- just slightly. Okay. Yes.
7 Let me try that. One moment, please.
8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: It's all -- it's mostly
9 residential in this area, so I'm hoping to get quite a
10 bit of population by moving.
11 Yeah. I would honestly -- I would probably start.
12 You can see there's a dense population of Latino. Yeah.
13 I would include that in our change, but then leave
14 everything else.
15 MS. TRATT: Okay.
16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. And then I would
17 probably use the 10 freeway as that -- as a Southern
18 boundary.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. It's 3:52.
20 MS. TRATT: More or less like that, Commissioner
21 Vazquez? I can clean it up. It's just that the blocks
22 are a little --
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
24 MS. TRATT: Okay. So that would -- that would still
25 make JRC overpopulated by 14/75 percent and the SPCHR by

1 13.93 percent. And let me just zoom out quickly so you
2 can see what those changes would look like. Let me turn
3 the purple off.
4 So JRC would move through and would pick up this
5 population highlighted in red. I would point out that
6 for contiguity issues, this would then be separated from
7 the rest of SVCHR. So I would recommend that if the
8 Commission wants to move in this direct, that we address
9 this contiguity issue before making any other changes.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. That would be a problem. So
11 there -- there would be a way to maybe not take all of
12 this but leave some in a rational place to connect -- to
13 do some kind of connection to connect the two
14 districts -- or the -- to connect the district.
15 MS. TRATT: Yeah. There is a river. Let me remove
16 some. More or less --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay?
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Not -- did we already ask about
19 this neck right here? Is this the one we asked about
20 this morning?
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: No. This is a different neck.
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Because that one's
23 looking pretty --
24 MS. TRATT: Yeah. This is a new neck.
25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Legal counsel? Mr. Perez, what

1 do you think --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Questions about compactness and
3 whether this meets the compactness requirement?
4 MR. PEREZ: Well, we are in a VRA district. So
5 compactness considerations are below it. I mean, but at
6 the same time, I think we've consistently advised the
7 Commission to even where you're drawing a VRA district to
8 draw it as compactly as you can. I'm having difficulty
9 seeing the district as a whole, so if --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you zoom out, Sivan?
11 MR. PEREZ: -- Sivan could zoom out.
12 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. One second. Let me
13 just clean these up. Yeah. So the proposed changes in
14 red would be added to this JRC region, so that would go
15 South from Corona all the way kind of stretching
16 Northeast to (indiscernible).
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: This does follow a river? There
18 is --
19 MS. TRATT: This is --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- continuity. It is contiguous.
21 It's -- the question is one of compactness.
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Does the river have water?
23 MR. PEREZ: So my understanding is that --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't know.
25 MR. PEREZ: -- the intention was to place Mentone

1 within the MVCB district. And so --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I am hearing that the river does
3 have water, so The Commissioners and I -- sorry, Mr.
4 Perez. Go on.
5 MR. PEREZ: So rather -- so my understanding was to
6 place that Eastern portion of Redlands and Mentone into
7 MVCB, if I heard Commissioner Vazquez correctly earlier,
8 and that would -- that change happens, it seems to me
9 that the compactness concern would be alleviated because
10 the border of the SBCHR district would -- and right at
11 the tip of that red highlighted portion.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. That was my thought;
14 that Mentone would have to go back with MVCB, which is
15 where it was this morning.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: And would that create deviation
17 problems if we were to do that, Sivan, for the MVCB
18 district? Because we're at 4.19 there.
19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I would just remind the
20 Commission that we spent the greater part of this morning
21 trying to balance that higher deviation in VVHD that was
22 accomplished by moving Highland and La Quinta. We're in
23 the weeds of deviation at this point, so it's a little
24 hard for me to tell which direction the Commission is
25 moving in, but I can't really speak to what the solution

1 is here.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Vazquez, do you have any

3 ideas? I mean, we're shifting population West, is what

4 it appears to me at this point. So there's -- but

5 although some of these impacts will be to the East as

6 well and potentially overpopulating Eastern districts, if

7 we were to commit these changes. Commissioner Vazquez?

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I -- yes. It does

9 seem like -- I think there's room to play a little bit in

10 MPH, for them to absorb some population. I also think

11 Southwest Riverside can absorb some population. Our --

12 Pomona, Ontario district could absorb some population.

13 Even LAOSB can absorb some population.

14 I personally would like to continue to exploring

15 this. We spent all day yesterday on the Northern part of

16 California, and even, you know, from day one as we were

17 visualizing this area, we have heard consistently from

18 this community of interest that they wanted to be kept

19 together, and so for me, I feel pretty strongly that this

20 deserves -- I mean, we spent ten minutes deciding whether

21 we were going to spend thirty minutes on doing this. So

22 for me, I feel like it deserves -- it deserves some more

23 time from us.

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I'm interested in spending more

25 time here, just the question is -- it's when. Because we

1 also have to get down through the districts in the South,
2 too. It's just prioritization. We can spend time here,
3 but it means less time in other portions as well. But
4 you're right. This area deserves significant attention,
5 too.
6 We're at 4 o'clock. I'm -- thoughts from the
7 Commission to continue here? I'm comfortable continuing
8 here if everybody else wants to continue here a little
9 bit longer, and then getting to another region. It is
10 almost -- it's 4 o'clock. We have -- we're going to
11 begin opening public comment at 5:30 and we'll take it
12 once we're finished line drawing. And we can finish line
13 drawing whenever -- as long as we have staff to help us.
14 So that's where we are. I mean, I'm willing to be here
15 all night if -- and I'm sure many of you are as well to
16 get this done. It's a commitment for ten years,
17 but I don't want to shortchange other regions in
18 California either. And we will certainly have Monday as
19 well, potentially later. So that's where we are. So
20 those are the options. And I'm comfortable with doing
21 whatever the -- what the group wants to do.
22 Commissioner Sadhwani?
23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm comfortable to continue
24 on as well. I actually just wanted to get some clarity
25 on Commissioner Vazquez's thoughts here of, is it just

1 Mentone going to MVCB or Redlands and I believe that's
2 Loma Linda underneath it. Was all of the highlighted
3 area that you wanted to move to MVCB? Just so I can get
4 a sense of how -- what we're working with here.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I just wanted to -- and while
6 Commissioner Vazquez is considering those things, just
7 asking the Commission if there's anyone that is
8 uncomfortable with us remaining here for a little bit
9 longer? Nope. No one's uncomfortable.
10 So we're going to continue on. I just have to gauge
11 the Commission. That's my job.
12 Commissioner Andersen?
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just have one quick sort
14 of clarification here. What lines are what? I -- you
15 know, I thought I had it all worked out and then I'm
16 like, okay, maybe I don't. So whose lines are which?
17 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So right now, you're just seeing
18 what the Commission has for the current boundar --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: These are our lines.
20 MS. TRATT: These are just your lines. So the
21 district that's now highlighted in green is JRC. What is
22 highlighted in red, this is the area that was proposed to
23 be moved into JRC, so the new boundary would follow where
24 my mouse is outlining.
25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Got it. Okay.

1 MS. TRATT: And then if I'm correct, I believe, the
2 suggestion from Commissioner Vazquez was to move the
3 remaining areas in SVCHR into the MVCB district.
4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. Okay. Yeah. So I
5 like this idea. I do want us to kind of maybe try and
6 look at kind of overall. We're going to try to add this,
7 add that, add this, so we can get a scope of the work
8 we're trying to do.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So maybe --
10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think that'd be very
11 helpful.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- so maybe if we can all --
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Overall scope.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- think about the direction that we
15 want to give and the scope that we want to give as we go
16 through these and just kind of look at the maps. And I
17 know Commissioner Vazquez, and Sadhwani, and Turner, and
18 others have been given very direct direction. And I
19 appreciate that.
20 Commissioner Sinay?
21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I do like the idea of putting a
22 time limit on how long we're going to work on this,
23 because again, we have not finished San Diego today.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I have no -- I don't
2 have any of the population totals in front of me, so I
3 don't know if any of this is going to work, but I'm
4 wondering -- it looks like we had split Highland this
5 morning; is that correct? That city is cut in half?
6 MS. TRATT: Yes.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Sadhwani, I do want
8 to be responsive to Commissioner Sinay --
9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, sure.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- before we go on. So how about we
11 put a time limit -- does an hour seem reasonable? That
12 we have -- one, two, three -- we have about four
13 districts that we have to work through, so -- four, and
14 potentially additional. Does an hour seem reasonable
15 time frame for us to work through these four districts?
16 Commissioner Vazquez?
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Well --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: If we need more, we need more and we
19 come back to it, but --
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I would much rather us
21 come back tomorrow and even revisit this place. I
22 just -- we spent all day yesterday on an area that's much
23 less populated than -- and we haven't really done a good
24 faith attempt to make these changes that we're -- that we
25 heard about even before we finalized our draft maps

1 because we said, oh, you know, this was our best attempt
2 forward, but we're going to come back and make changes,
3 and we haven't actually attempted to make changes. So
4 I'm good with doing an hour today, but --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So --
6 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- I would like a commitment
7 for us to spend additional time, whether tomorrow or
8 Monday on this region.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I -- as I said, I'm fine with
10 staying as late as we need to to get this done, I just
11 need to make sure that I have staff to -- staff support
12 for us to help us through this. So I'm going to check in
13 and see how late we can stay and also see -- look at
14 other options, and we do have Monday, too, and we can
15 issue -- if we can't get through it, we can issue a
16 continuance into whenever we need to.
17 So I'll look at options while we're doing this. But
18 let's start with an hour, and then if we need more, we'll
19 continue. I just need to -- I'm going to be exploring
20 options while we're doing the exploration with staff.
21 Thank you.
22 Commissioner Sinay?
23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'd rather finish this because
24 I agree with Commissioner Vazquez. I feel like Southern
25 California keeps being put last on all our lists and this

1 keeps happening to Southern California. It's not the
2 first time. So I would rather finish this and commit
3 that we're not coming back to it. Because my concern is,
4 we're going to make these changes and then the line
5 drawers are going to go and then everyone's going to come
6 back to it again to make sure they all -- we're all okay,
7 and say, oh, no, that's not what we were thinking and
8 then change it again. We're never going to get to
9 Southern Orange County and San Diego. And we really --
10 and Imperial County -- and we really need to do all of
11 it. So I'd rather finish this whole area and then do San
12 Diego tomorrow, but we -- you know, we only spent like
13 half an hour on San Diego and San Diego is much more
14 complicated than what was given to it.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. We want to -- the only
16 thing that we cannot commit to, and I'm just going to be
17 very honest with this, is once we complete these areas,
18 they still have to go through VRA compliance review, so
19 these all will have to go -- we're going to draw all
20 these lines, but they still have to go through VRA
21 counsel, and get reviewed after that, just to ensure
22 compliance with the VRA, which of course, is the second
23 criteria. It's so important. So there may be changes
24 after that, but they should just be compliance changes.
25 Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. That's what I'm asking,
2 is that they just be compliant, that we don't repeat what
3 happened in Sacramento yesterday, where we all say okay,
4 and then we bring in a new map. That -- at this point,
5 we --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Absolutely. I think --
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- we work on something until
8 we're comfortable and then -- and then we go back just to
9 do compliant but not any more big architectural --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: The way --
11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- because right now, we
12 haven't been given -- not every place has been given the
13 same amount of time to look at architectural changes,
14 look at all the different COIs and everything else. So
15 at this point, that's all I'm asking.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I am -- I just want
17 to make sure the -- I'm going to look at The
18 Commissioners -- we -- do we commit to ensuring that any
19 additional -- as we work through this and we make
20 changes, that once we come back -- and most of the
21 changes will be compliance related. These are VRA areas,
22 so the VRA has to take precedence.
23 But remember, this is a dynamic process. We're
24 going to get feedback from the public as well. And the
25 public may have input that shifts us, and that's why we

1 have meaningful public participation. That's the reason
2 why we're looking at this, is because we received public
3 part -- input.
4 Commissioner Turner?
5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Chair Toledo, I think
6 you're doing a great job. I just want to say I think
7 we're also wasting an awful lot of time saying the same
8 thing --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- over and over. And I just
11 want for me -- yeah. Cut me off. Let's just go ahead
12 and move. It's time to mo -- we're doing too much
13 talking and adding on and explaining --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- why we feel the way we
16 feel. Let's just draw the line.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's just draw the line. So
18 we're going to enforce one minute -- one minute and --
19 times on all of us. Let's draw the lines.
20 Sivan, help us move forward.
21 MS. TRATT: Okay, Chair. So I -- would you like me
22 to continue moving in the direction that we were moving
23 previously or just maybe take a bigger look at the
24 region? I -- I just -- I'm a little unclear at --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

1 MR. PEREZ: So thanks, Sivan. I have a suggestion,
2 Chair, if I may.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, Salvador.
4 MR. PEREZ: One thing that you could do as -- as
5 Sivan was saying is, look at this as a region and overlay
6 the map that you have been considering with the purple
7 lines earlier and determine which communities are outside
8 of the current districts that you'd like to include in
9 districts. And for example, earlier we talked about --
10 at least, portions of San Dimas going into a surrounding
11 VRA district. It looks like the purple line map had
12 suggested shedding Loma Linda and Mentone from VRA
13 districts and so on and so forth. Having this
14 conversation to where you are determining areas where you
15 would like communities to come in and communities to go
16 out and then advise the line drawers to proceed, either
17 on their own or through line drawing, in order to shape
18 the existing districts closer to what is being
19 recommended by the community.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Perez. And you did
21 advise us to keep Redlands and Mentone in a VRA district,
22 correct?
23 MR. PEREZ: It's -- I think my --
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Just Redlands, right?
25 MR. PEREZ: -- advice was Redlands.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Redlands. Oh, it's just
2 Redlands. Thank you for that.
3 MR. PEREZ: To the extent that you could.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: To the extent we could. Okay.
5 Perfect.
6 And Commissioner Sadhwani?
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you for that,
8 Sal, because that was exactly kind of what I was
9 thinking. I -- oh, are those the population totals that
10 you just put up?
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
12 MS. TRATT: Yes.
13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yikes. Okay. So my
14 original comment was going to be putting in Mentone and
15 making Highland -- no, sorry -- swapping, basically,
16 Mentone and Highland, having more of Highland go to VVHD,
17 but I'm seeing now that's going to put everything over.
18 MS. TRATT: Chair --
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Because if we put Mentone
20 into MVCB, something has to come out, right?
21 MS. TRATT: Exactly. And that's where you run into
22 the Coachella Valley issue that we were talking about
23 this morning. I actually have a suggestion, which you
24 are welcome to ignore completely. Just looking at these
25 two districts here, this RCFR and this SBCHR, they're

1 roughly at equal ends of the deviation spectrum, so if
2 you were able to swap between the two of them, they're
3 both VRA districts and they both -- you could switch out,
4 basically, an equal population that you moved in with
5 Rialto.
6 So again, this may not at all be what you're looking
7 to do, but you could, theoretically, move, let's say,
8 everything South of the ten, more or less, from SBCHR
9 into RCFR, and based on the city populations that are in
10 this kind of Southern portion, that could fix the
11 deviation issue kind of internally between these two
12 districts, rather than having it balloon out into the
13 rest of the area. Because -- like, I wouldn't recommend
14 touching MPH.
15 We worked really hard to get that deviation at a
16 good range, and also the Latino CVAP above fifty percent.
17 And -- yeah, that would be -- that would be something
18 that I think might be a good way to try, but would wait
19 for your direction on that.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Vazquez, Commissioner
21 Sinay?
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think that's a smart
23 way to start right now. Again, just being mindful of the
24 Latino CVAP in RCFR, because a lot of the population
25 we're going to be moving does not appear to have sort of

1 the concentrations of Latinos that we may need. But I
2 think that's a good place to start, Sivan.
3 MS. TRATT: If the Commission feels comfortable, I
4 can just start adding that so you can keep an eye on the
5 changes in this box right here and see what that would
6 look like, though I would need to cut a portion of
7 Rialto. Would you like me to keep it, like, as narrow as
8 possible or just consistently move below the 10?
9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I would use the 10 for now.
10 MS. TRATT: Great. Thank you.
11 (Pause)
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Commissioner Vazquez?
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was going to say,
14 you can also -- Sivan, you can probably -- you can also
15 probably reasonably grab the population just North of
16 Loma Linda and go up to that river.
17 MS. TRATT: Sorry. Your audio broke up for a second
18 there. I heard North of Loma Linda to the river, is
19 that, like, this area right here?
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. To the -- but more to
21 the West.
22 MS. TRATT: To the West of the 210 or more even
23 closer?
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: In the -- right.
25 MS. TRATT: Sorry. Oh, where the purple line is,

yes. I can move -- yes. One moment, please. Like, is that what you meant? Sorry. Your audio cut out again, so I'm not sure that I'm capturing what you were saying.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we'll need to take a break at 4:25 for our scheduled break. We still have about ten minutes -- a little bit less than ten minutes. And we can give direction so that Sivan can work through some of these things during break. So if you have direction for that break --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So the area that I had suggested wasn't quite enough population, so if the Commission would continue to feel comfortable with me adding maybe the rest of this portion, I think that we can fix the deviation.

MR. PEREZ: Sivan, is the Fontana Triangle a densely populated area or is that --

MS. TRATT: This area that was added in?

MR. PEREZ: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Unfortunately, I would have to -- oh, actually, yeah. Let me see if I can have a look.

MR. PEREZ: That might be an area to shift from SBCHR to RCFR.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me accept this change first, and then I can look and see how many people are in that area. One moment, please.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was also going -- I think
2 this is fine. I was also -- what I was trying to say
3 previously was there's a portion to the North of Loma
4 Linda -- yeah. Right where your cursor was, right above
5 the 10, yeah. Up to the river that you could add as
6 well, that I think makes sense. It's probably mostly
7 residential and businesses, so I'm not sure how much
8 population you'll get.
9 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Would you like me to explore
10 adding that in, rather that undoing this kind of map --
11 line --
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.
13 MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment, please.
14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Because I think that
15 triangle is pretty essential to what we're trying to do,
16 so I'd like to avoid cutting -- walking that back, if we
17 can.
18 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. One moment, please, while
19 I -- sometimes census geography plays nice and matches up
20 with what we want and sometimes not. So thank you --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: You're doing a great job, Sivan.
22 Thank you so much for --
23 MS. TRATT: -- for patience, everyone.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- helping us through this really big
25 puzzle that we -- that we want to do.

1 Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Kennedy?
2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, nothing yet.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Kennedy?
4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I want to
5 caution us to be careful in this area. We heard from
6 marginalized communities on the periphery of San
7 Bernadino Airport, which is right there just -- yeah,
8 right there -- that they did not want to be split up;
9 that that would really cause them problems as far as
10 advocating for their community's environmental safety in
11 the -- in the environment of the airport. So let's just
12 be careful.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That's helpful. Thank
14 you, Commissioner Kennedy.
15 Are we looking to commit this change or what are we
16 looking for?
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'd say yes.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Kennedy, were you
19 comfortable with this change? This is not the area,
20 right?
21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's very close to the area,
22 though.
23 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So unfortunately, it looks like
24 the census -- let me turn on the boundaries for the
25 census block so you can see. Actually, I -- that's

1 the -- so the -- the blocks -- so yeah. So you wanted it
2 along the river, correct?
3 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: More or less. I mean, I
4 think -- I think you've gotten it pretty close.
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It's just that sometimes the
6 census geography doesn't exactly match what --
7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
8 MS. TRATT: -- what you would expect, so this is, I
9 think, about as close as I can get it, and obviously, I
10 can, you know, do some cleaning up offline, but for the
11 purposes of this, does this look okay to you?
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: It looks okay to me.
13 MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay. So now looking at -- so
14 now we have a bit of a population bubble over here. It's
15 still contiguous, but we are still at a negative 7.8
16 deviation. So if the Commission wanted to go ahead and
17 add the rest of this portion into RCFR, we could see if
18 that fixes the deviation issue.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any -- can you highlight and let's
20 see if any Commissioners have opposition to that or are
21 concerned about that? What would that do to our
22 deviations and our CVAPs?
23 MS. TRATT: Okay. So the problem here would be that
24 the Latino CVAP of RCFR would drop below fifty to 49.66
25 percent, but it would fix the deviation issue, so we can

play around a little bit with where this split is or go back to the drawing board.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's hear from Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Let's not include Mentone right now. I think Mentone is really going to have to go to MVCB or VBH. We could also --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're at -- we're still below -- we're still below compliance requirements.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I would --

CHAIR TOLEDO: The deviation is good.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I would walk back the -- there's a little hook around Mentone. I would go -- I would put this line where the Redlands Municipal Airport is and see if that helps deviation. There's not much population, I think it's mostly orange groves. That didn't help much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Our deviation looked pretty good. It's the CVAP that's kind of gone down.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I'm wondering also if you take that Northern line and bring it South. That Northern line, bring it South to where the river is or even -- I don't know what that -- street that is, but you can see this concentration of, like, Latinos and Latino neighborhood. So I'm trying to keep that in the

1 district, but -- yeah. Lower that. Oh, I guess you
2 probably can't because of that little neck thing.
3 MS. TRATT: So yeah. I'm -- you're talking about
4 moving this border down to the river?
5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Yeah.
6 MS. TRATT: Yeah. There's no population here, so I
7 don't think that would --
8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
9 MS. TRATT: -- make a difference, but I'm happy to
10 do that if you would like. Let me zoom out so you can
11 get a better sense of the changes that we're talking
12 about here. So this RCHR district --
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I do --
14 MS. TRATT: -- has become kind of long and runs East
15 to westward, more or less, and would wrap around to
16 include this highlighted portion here.
17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I would still take
18 that -- there's a -- a line in the Northern part of
19 Mentone. I would walk it East -- or West, sorry -- to
20 the municipal airport. It's not a ton of population,
21 but --
22 MS. TRATT: Oh, I see. Right here. Okay.
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Yeah. I'm hoping that
24 will increase the CVAP a little bit. No. Okay. JK. It
25 looks like it's still below fifty, unfortunately.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm also wondering if keeping
2 this here -- also if -- instead of using the 10 as a
3 Southern boundary, you can see some additional
4 residential populations along the 10, if you just bring
5 that Southern boundary, maybe including that additional
6 portion of Redlands. You can see Redlands Mall, even
7 like out to Brookside and Redlands.
8 MS. TRATT: It looks like those are already in the
9 district.
10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, they are already in?
11 MS. TRATT: Um-hum. So the district in green would
12 gain the red portion.
13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Got it. I feel like
14 there's more maybe we can do then within this district
15 since the deviations are good. I feel like maybe we can
16 move some internal lines to improve the Latino CVAP. And
17 then maybe we can get rid of the neck.
18 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Would you like me to commit those
19 changes?
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
21 MS. TRATT: We -- we would need to address the fact
22 that --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you.
24 MS. TRATT: -- Mentone is disconnected from this
25 district, so either adding it in and then addressing the

1 Latino CVAP internally or kind of recreating the issue
2 that we already dealt with this morning with the
3 overpopulated MVCB, which I would potentially caution
4 against.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we are at our break -- our
6 scheduled break. We need to take a fifteen-minute
7 scheduled break. In the meantime, I'll check in with
8 staff about going longer and also assess our options --
9 to continue to assess our options, but we do need to take
10 a fifteen-minute break.
11 Commissioner Sinay, is there a comment before break?
12 No. Okay. We'll wait until after break.
13 So fifteen-minute break, everyone.
14 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:28 p.m.
15 until 4:45 p.m.)
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
17 Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are relooking at
18 the maps in the San Bernadino area, the Inland Empire and
19 the surrounding areas, working through some
20 visualizations.
21 Commissioner Vazquez?
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I am wondering if
23 removing this sort of North little cone at the top of
24 SBCHR, I'm not sure how much population there is, but
25 removing that up to the 15.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I believe the line drawers have a
2 solution that they wanted to share. Is this aligned with
3 this recommendation, Andrew?
4 MR. DRECHSLER: I --
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it's --
6 MR. DRECHSLER: Go ahead.
7 MS. TRATT: -- reflected in terms of what's on the
8 screen currently. This is something that I worked out
9 during break. So it would maintain just swapping between
10 these two districts. So it would keep Mentone and the
11 Northern portion of Redlands in with SBCHR. And the
12 compromise here would be removing a portion of that
13 Fontana Triangle up to the 210. So it would be a
14 compromise adding some of it, but not all of it. That
15 would both fix the deviation and it would increase Latino
16 CVAP in RCFR to a permissible 51.4 percent.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: So SBCHR would become compliant and
18 then we would have to find population for RCFR.
19 Commissioner Vazquez? Is this a lot -- I think --
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, I just took a bite.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, no worries.
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I don't love this, but I can
23 live with it if there is no other solution.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: There may be other solutions, but
25 this is the solution that we have on the table. And

1 we -- can you also -- because we can look at Latino and
2 also African American CVAP and other CVAPs. Can we take
3 a look at the hot map -- the heat map for the African
4 American community just to make sure that we captured
5 that. We saw the Latino. We see the Latino CVAP on the
6 map right now, so just curious about that.
7 MS. TRATT: Yes. Just one moment, Chair, while I
8 get that up.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Since this is a VRA district and
10 we're looking at communities in this region. And remind
11 me, the African American concentrations would be in the
12 Rialto area and also in -- was it Colton, I believe, was
13 the COI testimony? Does anybody remember?
14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The COI testimony is what is
15 being proposed to being walked back a little bit, which
16 is why it's not my favorite.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, got it.
18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The whole point is to include
19 that entire triangle. So again, not my preferred
20 solution.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: I see. So let's see the heat map and
22 see if we're capturing the African American community in
23 this map.
24 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, Chair. I'm having
25 trouble finding -- it's -- yeah. One moment, please.

1 Thank you for your patience.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. And I think the
3 issue here is finding enough of the Latino population to
4 keep it within acceptable ranges while also -- while also
5 ensuring that the African American or as much of the
6 African American population is represented in this
7 grouping.
8 MS. TRATT: Would you like me to turn the yellow
9 shading off so you can better see the heat map
10 distribution?
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, please. Yes, please.
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I see there's a little African
14 American community to the -- where -- African American
15 community to the lefthand side of that cone.
16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. And that -- and that's
17 definitely why they asked for the boundary to be drawn at
18 baseline --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- and not at the 210. I
21 do -- I'm curious if folks are okay with exploring one of
22 the other recommendations from the Black Census Hub,
23 which could help us with the deviation in RCFR, which
24 doesn't solve the SBCHR deviation portion, but I think
25 there are other ways to trim around the boundaries of

1 SBCHR to get within the deviation. The Black Census Hub
2 is also recommending for this RCFR district to bring in a
3 portion of Ontario North of the 60, Bloomington, and the
4 rest of Rancho Cucamonga into the district to unify
5 communities of interest, and their analysis shows that it
6 does maintain the Latino VRA seats in these areas. So if
7 we need to add population to RCFR, we could attempt their
8 recommendation of how to do that.
9 And then I think for the overpopulation of SBCHR, I
10 continue to believe that Mentone can be, if not
11 completely eliminated, if we split Mentone in half,
12 maybe. And start, I think, shaving off some population
13 around the edges of SBCHR, I feel like we can get to
14 within the five percent deviation.
15 MS. TRATT: Chair, would you like me to abandon this
16 and move towards other options as outlined by
17 Commissioner Vazquez or --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's see what the Commission is --
19 where the Commission's at.
20 Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Sadhwani, others?
21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: In theory, I like, you know,
22 making Rancho Cucamonga whole, but the issue is, we'd be
23 taking from districts already in the negative. So we
24 just really need to be careful where we're heading on our
25 negative deviations. And yeah, so that's -- I think

1 that's the main -- I mean, I'd like to see us, again,
2 keep it localized, if possible.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
4 And Commissioner Sadhwani, then Commissioner Vazquez
5 again.
6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Is it -- are we
7 looking anywhere at the change in the Black CVAP on any
8 of these districts? I'm just saying like, this one piece
9 of Fontana splits the City of Fontana. And between our
10 CFR and SBCHR, I recognize that those might be slightly
11 different COIs, but I'm wondering if we might feel okay
12 accepting the suggestion that Sivan has made, recognizing
13 that it is still keeping this community of interest that
14 wanted to be kept together in one or the other district.
15 I don't know, I'm open to suggestion here, and I
16 recognize what the testimony was. I'm also looking for
17 solutions to move forward.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
19 And I -- I'm seeing a lot of nods.
20 Commissioner Vazquez, and then Commissioner
21 Fernandez?
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I'm actually, I feel
23 like maybe more rather than accepting this Southern
24 portion of that triangle, I'm wondering if we instead
25 take this -- the Northern part of the triangle and moving

it into RCFR, and there may be some compactness issues with that, but it felt -- I feel like the point of this testimony is to keep that pretty densely-populated Black community with Rialto and with that portion of Rialto that's very densely Black populated. So for me, it feels important to get the section in question together with Rialto.

Again, I can live with it. I think we've gotten a majority, it seems like, of the Black communities in this area together, so I can live without this triangle, but I would like to spend a few more minutes trying to think though this -- going through other options.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So maybe the Northern part of the triangle and then --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's look at the Northern part of the triangle. And in the meantime, let's hear from Commissioner Fernandez and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I was just going to mention that the SBCHR, the CVAP for Latino and Blacks did go up from what we had in our draft maps. I just wanted to --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I think it was Commissioner Sadhwani had asked about that.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. They both went up, which
2 was good to see.
3 Commissioner Sinay?
4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to back --
5 going -- Fontana was -- is already -- was split, so that
6 triangle's not necessarily Fontana. There's Fontana on
7 the other side of the triangle. So if we did the other
8 split, Fontana would be split three times. So this is
9 better because -- oh, wait. Is this going up now towards
10 Rancho Cucamonga? No.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
12 MS. TRATT: So --
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Now I'm confused myself, sorry.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: No worries.
15 MS. TRATT: So I'm just representing the alternative
16 solution that was just presented by Commissioner Vazquez,
17 to take the portion of Fontana North of the 210 rather
18 than South. It looks like that would still fix your
19 deviation issue internally between those two districts.
20 And it looks like it would also keep RCFR above fifty.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's check with counsel to see if
22 fifty is still -- because it did move our VRA down,
23 although slightly, within -- whether that is still within
24 acceptable ranges.
25 Dale and Salvador, please opine?

1 MR. LARSON: So I don't know if Sal's back on. I
2 literally just logged in about fifteen seconds ago, so
3 I --
4 MR. PEREZ: I'm on.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sal is still on. Thank you. So Sal?
6 MR. PEREZ: I'd like to see it closer to fifty-one,
7 if not fifty-two. And I have been meaning to type into
8 say that I'd like to widen that neck between the Eastern
9 edge of San Bernadino City and the portion of the City of
10 Redlands that is on the other side.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So this is -- this change
12 would not help us with getting into compliance with VRA
13 compliance.
14 So Commissioner Sinay, Vazquez, any other?
15 We -- we'd still have this change that potentially
16 would get us to closer to 51.4. So 51.4, it's -- I
17 believe Salvador, you said, ranges a little bit higher.
18 You would be more comfortable higher and cleaning up
19 the -- the neck.
20 MR. PEREZ: Correct. 51.4, I think would be
21 sufficient if there's no other way to balance out the
22 interest that the Commission has been discussing so far.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And you'd prefer higher or keep it --
24 this would make it sufficient?
25 MR. PEREZ: Slightly higher to 52, but I think that

1 51.4 you could live with.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
3 Commissioner Vazquez, Turner, and Sinay?
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we still have to clean up the
6 neck, too.
7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or to widen the neck.
9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I feel like I would prefer to
10 widen the neck first and see where -- what that does.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Because maybe we can minimize
13 this little triangle piece.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's try to widen the neck.
15 That sounded a little strange.
16 MS. TRATT: Can I -- I'm just going to turn the heat
17 map off so that it loads faster for us.
18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The heat map -- the Latino
19 heat map may be helpful here.
20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Would you like me to turn that
21 on?
22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I -- yes, please.
23 MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment, please. So looking
24 at widening the neck, I could move this line back down to
25 the 10, if that sounds like a reasonable place to start?

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. That's probably the
2 better way to go.
3 MS. TRATT: All right. So why don't I commit this
4 change.
5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Um-hum.
6 MS. TRATT: And if counsel would tell us if this is
7 sufficient.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Where are we?
9 MS. TRATT: This is just widening the neck. It was
10 previously at the river and we moved it down to the 10 to
11 kind of help --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Our deviation's still a little high,
13 isn't it -- it's six points, but --
14 MS. TRATT: Yes.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Salvador, can you opine on the CVAP?
16 MS. TRATT: I believe we were fixing this issue and
17 then we were going to look --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a good idea.
19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. If we could get away with --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Compactness, rather.
21 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Taking even less out of that
22 triangle to achieve the same goal.
23 MR. PEREZ: Yeah. I'd feel much better about the,
24 quote/unquote, neck issue.
25 MS. TRATT: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can I -- rather than going
2 back to Fontana, can we see what it would look like to
3 split Mentone, and what that does to the deviation and
4 the CVAP? So taking only the portion of Mentone that
5 have those concentrations of Latinos, and again, I don't
6 know -- I don't actually think there's a who -- it's not
7 very densely populated. There's definitely population
8 there, but Mentone -- there's residential, and then it's
9 a lot of, like, orange groves and residences between
10 orange groves. So there is a community rationale as well
11 for splitting Mentone.
12 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Sure. Where would you -- would
13 you like me to put it in MVCB? I guess, that's kind of
14 the only option --
15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
16 MS. TRATT: -- where to put it. Okay. And where
17 would you like me to split -- would you like me to split
18 it more --
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The North/South using that
20 Latino community there. Yeah. Right there.
21 MS. TRATT: Oops.
22 (Pause)
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Salvador. Have a good
24 rest of the day.
25 MR. PEREZ: Have a good evening, everyone.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. Larson will be helping us from
2 this point.
3 MS. TRATT: So just cleaning up these stray blocks
4 while I do this. It looks like this would keep MVCB in a
5 permissible deviation range, which is good. It looks
6 like the impact on SBCHR doesn't look like it's enough
7 population to bring that 6.46 within range. It would,
8 however, let's see -- and the Latino CVAP currently in
9 that district is 55.91, although I would expect it to
10 drop once we get the deviation within range.
11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. That -- this still
12 feels like a worthwhile change to commit. Again, if
13 we're thinking about trying to minimize how much of
14 the -- particularly the Black population will be
15 splitting if we have to split it in Fontana. So for me,
16 this feels worthwhile, especially because it's not
17 changing the deviation of MVCB very much. It did raise
18 the Latino CVAP a little bit.
19 MS. TRATT: Would you like me to commit this change,
20 then?
21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I say yes.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: I am looking around the room just to
23 make sure. Everyone is yes. We have a yes. I see
24 general consensus on this.
25 Commissioner Vazquez, we're doing good in terms

1 of -- we're getting closer to our requirements. Just a
2 little bit more.
3 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I'm actually -- one
4 more time, could we put up the Black Census Hub's lines
5 to see if there's maybe any more internal swaps we could
6 do not in Fontana?
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: And before we -- and as we do this, I
8 just wanted to let the public know that we will --
9 because we decided to focus on the -- more attention
10 as -- in this region and the -- in the Inland Empire
11 as -- we will not be taking public comment today. We
12 will be taking it at our next meeting because we will be
13 working through -- as long as we possibly can to get all
14 of the maps in Southern California completed. And so we
15 will be working through as long as it takes to get these
16 maps completed, and because of that, we will not be
17 taking public comment tonight. We will be taking public
18 comment on the next -- at the next scheduled meeting,
19 which we will determine once we -- as we go through. I
20 just wanted to make that announcement.
21 But Commissioner Vazquez, please go ahead, and
22 Sivan.
23 MS. TRATT: One moment.
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I might need another
25 minute with this map.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez?
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Sivan, can you zoom
3 into that R -- which one is it -- RCFR?
4 MS. TRATT: The triangle?
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Right there. Yeah.
6 Thank you.
7 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. Yep.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I also want to make an
9 announcement to Commissioners, please make sure you have
10 your coffee, your tea, your caffeinated drinks with you
11 because we'll be working through as much as we can
12 tonight.
13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So that little piece on top
14 that is on Interstate -- you're part of that triangle and
15 Interstate 15 -- right there. Yeah. Right there. On
16 the other side -- yeah. What's the red? Is that part of
17 Fontana? Wait.
18 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I believe that's Fontana.
19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I mean, I realize this
20 isn't the exact boundary that -- I mean, this would add
21 to the boundary that we have, but I'm just wondering if
22 we can bring in maybe more of Fontana, since we're
23 already splitting it up. I don't know. I'm not sure if
24 everyone would be amenable. I'm just trying to think of
25 how we can minimize the various cuts to Fontana.

1 MS. TRATT: Yeah. We could look at adding the rest
2 of this in and then maybe swapping Bloomington as a
3 potential. How would folks feel about trying that?
4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That's intriguing.
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But wait a minute. If
6 you -- wait. If you add Bloomington to what?
7 MS. TRATT: So we would be pushing the deviations
8 further in the direction that we don't want to go in, so
9 if we're adding more to --
10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, that's right. I'm
11 sorry. My bad.
12 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech)
13 also --
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.
15 MS. TRATT: -- I was just looking at Bloomington as
16 a concentration of population that could keep the swap
17 local and potentially be another option to explore.
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'd be curious to see that.
20 MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment, please.
21 (Pause)
22 MS. TRATT: Oh. That's continuing to move in the
23 wrong direction, but --
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. You're going the wrong
25 direction.

1 MS. TRATT: Yeah. You're right. You're right. I
2 was like, it's too simple.
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, no.
4 MS. TRATT: We could look closely at --
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Undo both of them.
6 MS. TRATT: Okay. Oops.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: And to the public, while we're doing
8 this, I just want to remind the public that we do have
9 many ways of providing input to the Commission, including
10 through our online process, through our email, and that
11 we are looking at it as we speak, as we are doing this
12 line drawing, we are reviewing it, so if you continue to
13 send it in, we will continue to review it. So I just
14 want to make sure that the public is -- just remind the
15 public that there are other ways of giving input other
16 than public testimony, and that are reviewing it as we
17 speak, and as we do these changes.
18 Continue on, Commissioner Fernandez and Sivan.
19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum. Yes. Did we add
20 the Black CVAP heat map?
21 MS. TRATT: I can change that to put that on right
22 now, if you'd like. One moment.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And please go ahead
24 and undo what I had asked on that Fontana, that corner --
25 MS. TRATT: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- because all that did was
2 make it worse, so I'm trying to see if we can maybe shift
3 that Fontana up to the Interstate 30 and 210, but I need
4 to see the --
5 MS. TRATT: So can I accept this change to add
6 Colton as -- oh, I see. Okay. I see what you mean. One
7 moment, please.
8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I went the wrong way.
9 Sorry about that.
10 MS. TRATT: Yeah, we both went the wrong way. It's
11 fine.
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We both got excited and
13 then realized it's the wrong way.
14 MS. TRATT: It was too good to be true.
15 Yeah. So this looks like another potential
16 solution. Although, just looking at RCFR, it looks like
17 that's not quite enough population, as the deviation
18 would still be negative 9.79. It would keep Latino CVAP
19 at a permissible level, though. But yeah, I think if I
20 could get a sense of the direction the Commission wants
21 to move in, big picture, that might help with
22 recommendations.
23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can you zoom out just one
24 more time?
25 MS. TRATT: Oh, I'm so sorry. There's something

1 strange going on with Maptitude. This is showing the
2 current district, and this is showing what it would be.
3 So this would actually fix -- this would actually fix the
4 issue. I'm not sure why this is --
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The numbers are weird.
6 They're not -- yeah. Sorry. They're just not --
7 MS. TRATT: Well, this would fix the issue if we
8 include what you had already highlighted down in Colton.
9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum. Right.
10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So this is not just undoing
11 Commissioner Fernandez's change, but it would also be
12 adding more of Colton, and I feel like I really would
13 like to prioritize this triangle in Fontana. If I could
14 have a few minutes to just look up some COI information
15 in Colton? Although, I don't know.
16 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So this would -- this would keep
17 the City of Colton whole. It would make Fontana split
18 only once, whereas previously, it was split twice. It
19 would also maintain the split as requested by the Black
20 Census. Oops. Excuse me. Let me just turn those lines
21 on. So it would -- it would extend that area a little
22 bit to an area they hadn't included, but it would -- it
23 would keep the boundary at -- I'm sorry -- I'm blanking
24 on the name of the street, but below the 210.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So and that CVAPs are at what

level? 62.92 and 57.91?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. 52.63 and 54.75.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry. I'm looking at the wrong thing.

MS. TRATT: No. Yes. And I'm not sure what's going on with this. At the next break, I'll -- Maptitude is being kind of glitchy right now, so I'm not sure what's going on, but what's highlighted here is, I believe, the correct projection of what the changes would be.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So this gets us to appropriate deviations is what you're saying, or it does not?

MS. TRATT: Yes. Appropriate deviations. Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: And per counsel's recommendation, the Latino CVAP is over 52 for this district, and closer to 51 -- oh, sorry -- and 54.75 for SVCHR. So this raises the Latino CVAP.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sivan, could you show us what the Black CVAP would be? I just wanted to compare it to what it was before. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ten.

MS. TRATT: So it looks like it would increase to 15.64 from 15.41, and it would decrease slightly from 10.23 to 10.07.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And in our draft
2 maps, the SVCHR was at 13 percent, so it goes up by 2.6
3 percent. Okay. Thank you.
4 MS. TRATT: Chair, would you like me to commit this
5 change, or do we want to hear more feedback from
6 Commissioners?
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm just looking at the room for
8 general consensus. I see general consensus, so let's
9 keep going. Yes, commit it.
10 MS. TRATT: Perfect. So yeah. We have fixed those
11 issues with deviation and with the Latino CVAP, so I'm
12 not sure if there are other changes you wanted to make in
13 this area, or if you wanted to return to San Diego now?
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: It looks like we have addressed the
15 matter here, quicker than I thought. I thought it was
16 going to take longer, so that's good news for us. Maybe
17 there will be time for public comment. I'm not going to
18 (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm sure we're going to hear
20 about something -- I'm sure we're going to hear from
21 people about this, but for now, this to me, feels good,
22 and so thank you for coming on this journey, everyone.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you for helping us through
24 this journey. Sometimes, when we go on a journey, we
25 don't know how long it's going to take, and so we always

1 estimate the worst-case scenario.
2 And so let's review what we've done, Sivan, and then
3 let's go back down to San Diego, and then we'll take it
4 from there.
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. One moment. I'm
6 just going to turn off the streets layer. Okay.
7 So looking -- I'm just going to turn on the lines
8 that we had from this morning, just because I think that
9 would be easiest way to show the changes that we've made
10 because we've made some pretty big changes. So let me
11 get rid of this box here. Okay.
12 So looking at the changes that we've made to this
13 area, we added in the City of Rialto, and this identified
14 COI in the Northern portion of the City of Fontana. We
15 then made some swaps between these two districts to take
16 in the Southern cities of Bloomington, a small portion of
17 the Southern part of Rialto, Colton, Loma Linda, and a
18 portion of Southern Redlands. We also moved Mentone back
19 into MBCB, where it was this morning. Let's see what
20 else. Yeah.
21 Would you like me to review -- let me make it a
22 different color so it's a little bit easier to see.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
24 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani? And thank you

1 to everyone for encouraging the whole Commission to go
2 through this. I know this was something that the
3 Commission wanted to do. I saw that it was universal, so
4 let's -- Commissioner Sadhwani?
5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think I answered --
6 the orange is what it was; is that correct?
7 MS. TRATT: Yes. Orange is where it was this
8 morning.
9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay. Thank you.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: So these maps will go through VRA
11 Council compliance review, and then we will come back to
12 them at a later time, just for a final review. We're
13 going to get a VRA Council review, and then we will
14 review them one last time before finalizing them, just to
15 ensure complete compliance, as these are VRA lines.
16 So with that, we will -- I believe we've
17 completed -- have we completed all of our VRA districts
18 at this point, Sivan? Are there others -- I believe in
19 the Imperial County, I believe, no?
20 MS. TRATT: Oh, in this -- in this area, or --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. In this area, we've completed
22 them, I believe, right?
23 MS. TRATT: Okay. Great.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: All of the VRA district.
25 MS. TRATT: I couldn't hear you.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: How about in the Imperial County?
2 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me turn the yellow back on so
3 you can see.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: And from here, we can work up -- we
5 will have completed our VRA district from here, and then
6 from here, we can go through San Diego to the non VRA
7 district, and then work our way up into Orange County,
8 and then back again to the Inland Empire around the non
9 VRA areas, so we -- fortunately, there's a lot of VRA
10 space that we will have covered after having done this.
11 Commissioner Sinay?
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just one question on the
13 SECA --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: SECA.
15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- this morning. We have split
16 Anza-Borrego --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- Anza, California with
19 Borrego Springs. I don't know if -- I just wanted to put
20 that out there. If we feel okay, okay, but a lot of
21 times, they do -- I see that as all one region.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. There's certainly a lot of
23 need in that area of Borrego Springs. If I remember,
24 there were tribal lands in that area, as well, that
25 wanted to remain together?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Maybe if you look at --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think that was part of the
3 issue.
4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Maybe we look at it for
5 Senate or for Congress, but I just wanted to -- yes, go
6 ahead.
7 MS. TRATT: Oh. So if I'm remembering correctly,
8 this, it was made -- the decision was made to stop at the
9 San Diego County border. That was -- that took place
10 during live line drawing before the draft maps were made.
11 The native areas in question, I believe, were surrounding
12 Pala --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's where they were.
14 MS. TRATT: -- and those areas are in darker brown
15 color, and I can make them a different color if
16 Commissioners are having difficulty seeing them. All of
17 these tan areas are different landmark areas, so be it
18 conservation areas or parks, things like that.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, again. So let's -- we're
20 in SECA right now, and please -- can you give us an
21 overview of the SECA district?
22 And Commissioners, do we have any feedback on this
23 district? Any direction, here? We've already given
24 quite a bit of direction in this district in the past,
25 and I believe we have all of the COIs that we were able

1 to keep together in this district whole, so I'm looking
2 to the Commission to provide additional feedback and see
3 if there's anything that needs additional refinement at
4 this point, because we're only looking at refinement.
5 Commissioner Kennedy?
6 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If La Quinta has to be in
7 this district, can it be whole in this district?
8 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can look at bringing the rest
9 of La Quinta in. One moment, please.
10 Commissioner Kennedy, I also, just speaking of
11 refinements, I just wanted to note that we did match the
12 boundary around Needles to the Congressional maps, so
13 those will all be the same. Just before I -- just wanted
14 to make sure that I brought that up.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Sivan.
16 Commissioner Sadhwani? We don't see you, but we can
17 hear you.
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Well, I'm just taking
19 a little break over here. But I just wanted to note,
20 when it came to La Quinta, it wasn't for me that La
21 Quinta had to be in, but that we had to put something in,
22 right? And we can see from even when we had looked at
23 the Black Hub stuff, and I'm not suggesting we do exactly
24 what they want, but that there are other options. I
25 don't know that we have time to explore them all here

now, but I just wanted to raise that. If it's not La Quinta, it has to be something, so I had suggested before we could be looking at Sky Valley. We could be looking at Thousand Palms. We could be looking up to Desert Hot Springs. I just -- I'm open to other solutions, I just don't know what the right one is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

MS. TRATT: So the highlighted changes would reunite the rest of La Quinta in the SECA district. That would push the deviation to 6.66, as well as lower the Latino CVAP to 55.08. I can zoom out so you can see, kind of -- it's quite a large district, so let me know if you want me to zoom in on any particular area, but just kind of getting a sense of other swaps that could be made.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nah, let's move on. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy wants -- anyone else have any more additional feedback on this space? We're all comfortable? It's a compliant district. It meets all of the deviation and the CVAP requirements.

So let's move on to -- are we missing any place in the Imperial County? No. All right.

So let's move on to San Diego.

MS. TRATT: So yeah. We had left off by adding in

1 Barrio Logan and Logan Heights into CVSY, and decided
2 that -- or I believe the Commissioners decided that they
3 wanted to leave CVSY as is for the time being. The next
4 thing that I believe the Commission was going to discuss
5 was City Heights and/or adding in -- we added in La Presa
6 to be with Spring Valley.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And thank you for your
8 work on this.
9 Commissioner Fornaciari, we currently have La Presa
10 with Spring Valley and La Mesa. Your thoughts?
11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: (Audio interference) and
12 La Mesa (audio interference) a little closer to the blue
13 part of it for me, please.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: We're having audio difficulty,
15 Commissioner Fornaciari. Can you repeat?
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, you can't hear me?
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: We're having microphone -- there's a
18 lot of static.
19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You sound like Darth Vader.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: You sound like Darth Vader. And with
21 the background, it's kind of cool. All right.
22 So we have a district that is on higher end of the
23 deviations, but still compliant, and very diverse in
24 every way. Working class community, community -- Ms.
25 Sinay? Commissioner Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we zoom out just a little
2 bit just since I missed, kind of, what happened while I
3 was helping --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, we were just coming through. Oh,
5 okay.
6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, no. I missed what
7 happened when I was helping my family.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's right.
9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: So the VRA district is anchored with
11 Chula Vista, it's on the Southern end, and we're looking
12 at this La Mesa SVAL district. We have portions of El
13 Cajon with this district. We're on the higher end of the
14 deviation, that's why we didn't include the whole of El
15 Cajon. I believe it's the Southern area, and that's a
16 compromise that was made, actually not this time around,
17 but I believe through our visualization process last time
18 around. And that's the summary.
19 Commissioner Turner?
20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yes. I really am
21 appreciating the work.
22 With El Cajon, just kind of wish list as we move
23 through, and if there are any opportunities to remove the
24 rest of El Cajon so that it is not in the same district
25 with Santee. I think we've heard that over and over. So

1 just wanting to put that out there to see if there is
2 possibility. I know we've played around with this area
3 and made a few other concessions, but of course, we
4 continue to get reports in, testimony in, about the harm
5 that that would cause that area to still be connected in
6 the unlikely connection that we currently have.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, how many people are in the
8 rest of El Cajon? If we were to bring in all of El
9 Cajon --
10 MS. TRATT: Yeah. One moment.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- how many people are we --
12 MS. TRATT: Let me --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- how over would we be in deviation,
14 and let's see if -- let's see if there's anything we can
15 do, or if the Commission wants to move in that direction.
16 So we'd be out --
17 MS. TRATT: So there are about almost 46,000 people
18 in that area of El Cajon, and then that would push the
19 deviation of the La Mesa district to be 13.79 percent.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. I think we tried to do this
21 last time, and this is what we had -- this is what we
22 encountered last time. It's 45,000 people in the
23 district that is already on the higher end of the
24 deviation.
25 Commissioner Fornaciari, can we hear you now? Let's

1 try again. He might be calling in, actually.
2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can you hear me? Can you
3 hear me?
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: We still have a little bit of static,
5 but we can make you out.
6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You can make me out.
7 Okay.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: I can understand what you're saying.
9 It's just, we have static. It's okay. It just sounds
10 like you're raspy.
11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Can you make out
12 what I'm saying?
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I was just kind of
15 hoping to go to the parts West in this district.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We've got --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's look to the West of the
19 district. Maybe one of us can interpret for the --
20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'll call in. You want me
21 to call in?
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Just call in.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You didn't want me to say
24 it in Spanish? Is that what it was?
25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can you hear me now? Can

1 you guys hear me?
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's better. That's much
3 better.
4 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I don't know what
5 happened. I just unplugged the headset.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.
7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So zoom in a little
8 bit in the blue area, and maybe the Northern blue area.
9 I'll close the door. My wife's got the blender on, so.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So zoom into the Western,
11 Northern Western area.
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.
13 MS. TRATT: Okay. So we're abandoning the -- we're
14 abandoning this and zooming in to the City of San Diego,
15 or?
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I'm just trying to
17 see where we're at here on this end. And I don't know if
18 there's any options for a trade-off, but I want to see
19 where we are with City Heights and with the other COIs
20 that are in that area.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So I think we need to zoom in
22 so we can look at City Heights. Can you zoom in?
23 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. And I have some COIs
24 also that I can turn on for the Commission. One moment,
25 please. So this is an example of a COI that was

1 submitted on behalf of the Somali community in City
2 Heights. This is defined -- another submitted from the
3 Oromo community in City Heights. Let's see. And yeah.
4 So those are -- these are the two COIs that I have for
5 the City Heights refugee and immigrant communities.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner --
7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So do you have the AAPI --
8 MS. TRATT: Yes. I can -- oh, the --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: The COIs?
10 MS. TRATT: -- oh, the AAPI. Yes. That's not in
11 this district, but I can turn that on. One moment.
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, there's two COIs
13 from AAPI. One is --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you have the Shapefiles?
15 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- this kind of --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- goes from City Heights
19 to La Mesa, and the other one is up in the Convoy area
20 and all that, and I think -- oh, there you go. You got
21 them both.
22 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I think this is what you were
23 talking about. So this is -- yeah -- this includes the
24 City Heights area, and then -- yeah -- it goes all the
25 way up. There's also a COI that was submitted by -- this

is -- this is by the Advancing Justice Asian Law Caucus, and this is their COI that they submitted.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Could we speak to the reasons of keeping these communities together? I think they're split a little bit, but -- because I know we couldn't keep all of them together, so maybe some of the reasons -- is this a working class community, or a -- I don't know too much, so can somebody just talk a little bit about the COI testimony we've received about keeping these communities together?

Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Akutagawa, just so that we have it for the record?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is actually the Asian business community. So they've got -- there's a lot of Asian businesses in Linda Vista, Mira Mesa, Kearney Mesa, Convoy, and as well as their places of worship and living, so it's a -- that's where the service providers are at, and a lot of -- a lot of other -- banks, the Asian banks, and such. So it's a --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it's a commerce area with commerce and business and religious and cultural issues as well as other --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Exactly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- similar interests. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa, can you add to that?

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. The Convoy district
2 is kind of like the original, I don't want to call it --
3 I don't know. It's not a Chinatown. It was kind of a
4 like a mix of Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Japanese,
5 it's just like a mix of different Asian ethnicities that
6 had that small area, and they obviously, have grown quite
7 a bit. It's kind of similar to, in some ways, the West
8 San Gabriel Valley, you're going to get a mix of
9 different socioeconomic groupings, but because of the
10 businesses, it just draws different people in for
11 services for worship and also for, obviously, shopping,
12 grocery stores, and other opportunities to get familiar
13 foods and things like that.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: So great. So it's a center for
15 commerce for different communities, different ethnic
16 communities, and others.
17 Commissioner Sinay, direction on how to -- at this
18 point, we are looking at potentially moving some
19 population, it sounds like.
20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner
22 Fornaciari?
23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Could we go back to the LMESA,
24 whatever the hell? Sorry. I think that was La Mesa.
25 Yeah. That's what it -- can we zoom in a little bit on

1 that North side?
2 MS. TRATT: Around here?
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. The La Mesa district. So
4 yeah. Near the 8 and all that. I just want to make sure
5 we've got the right communities. To see if there's
6 neighborhoods here that can go to the Central San Diego
7 one and not -- can you zoom in even closer so we can see
8 the actual names of the neighborhoods? Right.
9 MS. TRATT: I can turn on the Google Maps, which
10 has --
11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. That would be helpful.
12 Thank you.
13 MS. TRATT: One moment, please.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari, did you have
15 your hand raised, too.
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I just want to comment,
17 off to the left in the other, adjacent district, in the
18 area around the 8 and the 805, there is where we got our
19 original testimony from the LGBTQ community --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's right.
21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that they all wanted to
22 be together, and they're all together in this area here,
23 from their input. So I just wanted to follow up with
24 that.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So are you suggesting any change to

this --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, I'm not suggesting any change. I just want to let everybody know that their --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- community input is -- they're all together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. They're currently connected. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if we were going to take out a portion of this area, because the COIs that you showed left it kind of open, we may -- it's interesting. They put San Diego State University North of the 8, when it's South of the 8, but that whole college area, we could move that up to central San Diego, and that might give us room for El Cajon.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's zoom out --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But it might be very dense.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's zoom out and see what that looks like.

MS. TRATT: Just one moment, please.

Commissioner Sinay, is there a street that defines this --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was thinking -- well, it's -- yeah. I mean, it's college area, but --

MS. TRATT: Maybe Montezuma?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Montezuma would kind of cut the
2 college in half, I believe. No. Well, it does in the
3 North, but then the students aren't in it, but that might
4 be okay.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, do you have the LGBT COI as a
6 shapefile that you could put on?
7 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: The LGBT one takes Talmage
9 right there, but doesn't have college, so it should be
10 okay. I mean, I would think El Cajon Boulevard because
11 that tends to be kind of a border in this area.
12 MS. TRATT: So I don't have a Shapefile for the
13 areas that were submitted by Equality California. I do
14 have two submissions from members of the public that were
15 defined as their version of the LGBT community in the San
16 Diego area, and you can see where they overlap and where
17 they differ. But again, these were not -- these were not
18 what was submitted by Equality California. I believe
19 those -- it more or less aligns with this area --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
21 MS. TRATT: -- but I just have the PDF for them.
22 Yep.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.
24 And Commissioner Sinay, you were -- what is the area
25 that you're considering making a cut?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, if -- and this is up to
2 everybody --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- it's just that you all had
5 asked --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: In terms of recommendation.
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- if there were any -- yeah --
8 it's a recommendation based on the request that you all
9 made if we could do all of El Cajon. And that would be
10 around the San Diego State area and moving it up to mid,
11 because Allied Gardens -- all of that is kind of -- is
12 connected, plus the San Diego State now has -- is going
13 to have a San Diego West, where Qualcomm Stadium used to
14 be, they're going to have a campus there.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.
16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if you move that -- it could
17 either be Montezuma or El Cajon, depending what the
18 number is needed to put in all of El Cajon.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's inquire with the Commission
20 whether they want to explore this as a trade -- a swap.
21 It's a swap for El Cajon. Let's see.
22 Fernandez and Turner.
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I just wanted to
24 make sure that -- I didn't know if we were going to go
25 into La Mesa and Lemon Grove, but I just wanted to --

1 there's a community of interest for the African American
2 community there, and then, also La Mesa and Spring Valley
3 with the working class and immigrant communities, so I
4 just wanted to make sure that we were aware of that in
5 case we were planning to go into those communities.
6 Thank you.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate that, Commissioner
8 Fernandez.
9 Commissioner Turner?
10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And Sivan, can you
11 move the map over so that I can see El Cajon again, or
12 maybe go out just a tad bit?
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we would be looking for 45,000
14 people? That's the remaining portion that we'd need
15 to -- that's the number of people that we need to bring
16 in if -- yeah, bring in if we --
17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- want to make the --
19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And so in addition to what
20 Commissioner Sinay was working towards, I'm wondering if
21 we would select the portion of El Cajon that is not
22 already in La Mesa, and if we added it into Central SD as
23 opposed to the SDSVC.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. That's a possibility, too.
25 45,000 -- what would that look like if we added that --

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just -- yeah -- the top. Um-
2 hum.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Just the top portion of El Cajon to
4 Central SD.
5 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: That would prevent the necessity to
7 swap university. Let's see what it does to our
8 deviations.
9 MS. TRATT: So that would push the deviation of
10 Central SD to 11.45, and SDSVC to negative 11, and I can
11 zoom out to give you a better sense of where you could
12 potentially get swaps back.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it's a -- because it's so many
14 people, the deviations are impacted significantly.
15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And are we able to split
16 what's left and still have a portion of it that would not
17 negatively impact -- go into La Mesa? Could we still do
18 that and keep it contiguous, and then the other -- to go
19 into Central?
20 MS. TRATT: I'm sorry. Commissioner Turner, would
21 you repeat that one more time?
22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. So if we did a split
23 of that balance of El Cajon, if we did a split and we put
24 the Eastern portion of that into La Mesa, so it wouldn't
25 be the full population that we talked about, and then put

1 the Eastern part of it into Central SD?
2 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can definitely look at that.
3 Are you thinking maybe splitting it along the 67, or is
4 there another place you had in mind, like the 8 or
5 something else?
6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Could we see -- let's see. La
7 Mesa. Can we try first the 8, and then go over to the --
8 let's try the 8 first, and if not, try the other one?
9 Let's see what balances.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay?
11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to say, being
12 high isn't a problem down here, because there's a lot we
13 can -- there's wiggle room up higher. So I just wanted
14 to give people that okay.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So that jump to push up population is
16 what you're suggesting?
17 MS. TRATT: I'm sorry. Was that question for me,
18 Chair?
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Yes. I'm saying that,
20 yes, we can push -- we can -- the West --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We can rotate something --
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous
23 speech) the coast was negative and there might be other
24 areas as well, so.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: We can be negative. It just can't be

more than five percent negative.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right. But it was just -- I was just saying that we have some wiggle room.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Got it. Thank you. All right.

MS. TRATT: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) how does this look?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So this still throws off our deviations, 8.77 and negative 8.45. Because it's 45,000, the -- other options.

So Sivan, do you have options for us? I think one option that Commissioner Sinay suggested was potentially a swap with 45,000 people up towards the university.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I don't think we actually looked to see how many people are in that area, but I can tell you that now, if you'd like me to check and see if maybe --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you grab 45,000 and just let us see what it looks like up on top? Because that would be an option that would allow us to make this if this is a priority for the Commission, and I'm going to look and see if nods, yes, it's a priority to bring in El Cajon, or want to move on? Let's see. Not seeing any nods yes or no. Let's look at the 45,000 and see, and then maybe that'll help us decide.

1 Commissioner Sinay, while we do that, do you have a
2 comment? Okay.
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wouldn't go that far --
4 MS. TRATT: Yeah, I was going to say. Where would
5 you like me to -- so this is now at El Cajon.
6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.
7 MS. TRATT: Would you like --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So this is what we need to bring in
9 El Cajon?
10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So it's 27,000.
11 MS. TRATT: So that's about what that portion that
12 Commissioner Turner had talked about. That was more or
13 less that population of El Cajon West of the -- where did
14 we split that? I think it was the 8. Yes. So we --
15 although it's -- now you're looking at kind of a
16 clockwise rotation, but in terms of population numbers,
17 it's the same. But again, I'm not really sure what
18 the -- what the big picture here is.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's think big picture. So this
20 would be, essentially, a swap for El Cajon. So we would
21 bring in El Cajon, the whole entirety of El Cajon, swap
22 out University District, and then let's start moving
23 Northward to try to find -- to try to fix deviations up
24 there.
25 Commissioner Turner and others?

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. What I'm trying to
2 accomplish, and then Sivan and others may have a better
3 way of doing it, is that we've received a lot of COI
4 testimony, or repeated, I should say, COI testimony
5 trying to keep El Cajon, and there is, I understand,
6 also, some conflicting but strong testimony to trying to
7 keep El Cajon out of the same district, out of the SESDC
8 with Santee, and so I'm trying to find a way, if we need
9 to split El Cajon and have a portion of it go with
10 central and have a portion of it stay in La Mesa. I'm
11 trying to shift it, if it's not in its entirety, how do
12 we have it in a different district? And this is what
13 they're saying, basically, is that they are immigrant and
14 refugee communities that feel that they will have a
15 greater representation outside of the SESDC district.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: And this swap would achieve that
17 goal? This is population in the red would achieve the
18 goal of bringing in the rest of El Cajon into the La Mesa
19 (indiscernible) out or moving it from the SESDC district,
20 and I believe it does it in a compliant manner; is that
21 correct, Sivan?
22 MS. TRATT: That is not correct.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: No?
24 MS. TRATT: That would be looking to add population
25 to Central SD, which would be --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it.
2 MS. TRATT: -- that would be against the -- we want
3 to add El --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it.
5 MS. TRATT: -- we want to -- I believe Commissioner
6 Turner is saying that she would prefer to prioritize
7 adding El Cajon to Central SD rather than this college
8 area.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I see. I see. I see. I
10 misunderstood.
11 MS. TRATT: And it's possible I misunderstood, so I
12 just wanted to make sure that we're on the same page.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. I understand you.
14 MS. TRATT: Not saying that -- not saying that you
15 can't do both. It's just going to be a bigger
16 disruption.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Andrew?
18 MR. DRECHSLER: One idea, I believe, if you wanted
19 to move the rest of El Cajon into Central and look at
20 population from Escondido, which is North and push some
21 of that into -- we'd have to shift up, but there is some
22 of that population could go into SESDC (indiscernible,
23 simultaneous speech) --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: So and that was the suggestion
25 Commissioner Sinay had suggested, which was, if we're

1 going to go in, let's put in the population and start
2 shifting it up, if that's a journey that -- let's see if
3 everyone is comfortable with that journey? Head nods?
4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'd like to try.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Everyone so far? Yes? Okay. So
6 let's do it. El Cajon into the Central SD, and then
7 we're going to shift population upwards starting with the
8 Escondido area.
9 MS. TRATT: Did we want to move the split in the El
10 Cajon so that everything South of the 8 in this portion
11 in is La Mesa, SVAL, and then the rest of the city is in
12 Central, or did you want all of the rest of the City of
13 El Cajon?
14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: A. A.
15 MS. TRATT: A. Okay. Okay.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: A. So yes, A.
17 MS. TRATT: I will start with that.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Lots of options. All right.
19 Commissioner Fornaciari and Sinay?
20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I'm comfortable going
21 this way, but I just, in thinking ahead, and we're going
22 to be --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that the Asian business
25 COI that is already split is probably going to wind up

split some more. So just FYI.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. That's the trade-off here. If we move in this direction, we're going to be trading one COI for another, but that's generally what happens in any situation. There's always a prioritization of COIs.

So Commissioner Sinay? You're on mute, Commissioner Sinay, and we want to hear you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Instead of jumping straight up to Escondido, can we go up systematically? Because there's a lot of little --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- things that can lead up to what we want, and there's a lot of neighborhoods in San Diego, so we may be able to do better by the Asian COI and better by the suburbs and whatnot.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So I'm going to commit --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Andrew?

MS. TRATT: -- if that's all right? So I can move the rest of El Cajon in with La Mesa, Spring Valley --

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. And I just wanted to point out that adding the rest of El Cajon into La Mesa will probably push that deviation above five percent. And also wanted to remind that the split that we have with El Cajon was one that has been previously asked for, so

1 just, if we wanted to look at putting off all of El Cajon
2 into Central versus dividing it at the 8. Just wanted to
3 flag that, but we can obviously do what you would like.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sounds like the Commission wants to
5 add it in. Let's see.
6 Commissioner Yee?
7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Just a little bit more of El
8 Cajon where the B is in Bostonia, I believe. Thank you.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. There we go.
10 MS. TRATT: (Audio interference).
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: As you can see, there's a interest in
12 moving this, so. All right. Let's --
13 MS. TRATT: Okay. I'm going to go ahead and commit
14 this change.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
16 MS. TRATT: And then we'll go ahead and add the rest
17 of El Cajon into La Mesa, SVALL.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's going to get us over the
19 deviation, we believe?
20 MS. TRATT: Yes. I do believe that is going to --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Is there a way to just put enough to
22 just get us closer to the 5, but then -- because we want
23 to shift population up because there's no way to shift
24 population down. I think, unless somebody else has an
25 idea on how to shift some population down.

1 MS. TRATT: I thought the Commission's next step was
2 going to be to just continue overpopulating Central,
3 including potentially making that move to El Cajon or
4 Montezuma in this college area neighborhood, and then
5 having all of that population in Central, with which to
6 continue moving upward. (Indiscernible, simultaneous
7 speech) --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I'm looking at the Commission and
9 I'm seeing a lot of head nods, so yes, that is the move,
10 so let's go in that direction.
11 MS. TRATT: Okay. So it's going to look scary for a
12 second, but then we'll fix it.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we're used to some scary
14 scenarios and having to work through them. Okay.
15 Commissioner Sinay?
16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is, just so that everybody
17 knows, this is a very radical change to move El Cajon in
18 with the City of San Diego. We've received a lot of
19 conflicting testimony from El Cajon, and they definitely
20 feel like they're part of East county. So I just want us
21 all to be aware that this is a radical change for them,
22 and so we probably will hear from the community.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And are you suggesting that you are
24 opposed to this change? Because we wouldn't want --
25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I am -- no, no, no.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- to do this without general
2 consensus.
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm don't --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: I just want to understand.
5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I am not going to have -- I
6 don't have any lines in the sand or whatever. I'm moving
7 with where the Commission wants to go. I just don't -- I
8 was just -- didn't feel right leaving El Cajon without
9 saying that out loud.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. And sometimes fair maps are
11 different than what they've --
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Exactly.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- been in the past, and that's what
14 I'm seeing from this Commission, is that this Commission
15 is interested in developing fair maps, and including,
16 when having to deal with scary deviation numbers that we
17 have to resolve, and that was the case here.
18 Commissioner Fornaciari?
19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think when we're done
20 here, I think we have a noncontiguous district in El
21 Cajon.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: When we're done here.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
25 MS. TRATT: I think it's another neck situation. I

1 don't think it's a split off because it's connected by
2 the area that's under the 8, but we -- yeah -- we could
3 look at widening the neck again.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: So that's another compactness issue.
5 So we'll have legal look at it, too.
6 MS. TRATT: So it would include --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's what we got there.
8 MS. TRATT: Commissioner Sinay, you can tell me this
9 is not what you would like to do, but it looks like you
10 could get away with splitting South to Montezuma instead
11 of El Cajon, and that would -- that would make the
12 deviation of La Mesa permissible at 4.17.
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And that's that --
14 MS. TRATT: Unless you wanted to add more, and then
15 that would further reduce the deviation.
16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And what's that West boundary?
17 MS. TRATT: The Western boundary is a Fairmont Ave.
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Perfect.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So I just wanted to make
20 an announcement to the public. I see members of the
21 public in queue, and I just wanted to remind the public
22 that the Commission will be working through the evening
23 and, at this point, until we're done with Southern
24 California, and so there may be public comment, there may
25 not be, depending on what time we are done, so just

1 wanted to let you know that there is a chance there may
2 not be public comment. But you are able to submit public
3 comment through our online systems and through our
4 various other avenues.
5 But with that, let's continue on.
6 Commissioner Fornaciari and Sivan.
7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think she wants to know
8 if you accept this or not, Chair.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry. Thank you.
10 MS. TRATT: Oh, and if Commissioner Fornaciari had
11 something to say, he's welcome to.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. I just wanted to know if --
13 because I think his hand was up.
14 So looking at the Commission, I just want general
15 consensus. If there's any nos, just -- I'm just looking.
16 I don't see any -- I don't see much movement, so I'm
17 going to say yes. Let's keep going. We're kind of
18 committed to this already.
19 MS. TRATT: Okay. So now, as we were kind of
20 talking about big picture, the Southern-most areas are
21 balanced, and all of the excess population is here. We
22 will have to address the negative eleven deviation of
23 SESDC, but I will wait for the Commission's direction on
24 what they would like to do for this.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So before we do that, let's address

the neck, the compactness issue, with the --

MS. TRATT: Oh, yes. Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- district, and I just want to get legal review on this. Yeah. There's a neck issue here in the Glendale -- in the Granite Hills area.

MR. LARSON: Sivan, could you just zoom out just a little bit here? I appreciate that you just zoomed in. Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, keeping the communities together, there's a highway through there.

MR. LARSON: Yeah. That's a little too narrow of a neck for my comfort.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. It looks like there's potentially another major street, Main Street. I could look to snapping it to Main instead of the 8, if Counsel thinks that would be a better option.

MR. LARSON: I mean, I think you just need to move this little pink part in the West to the -- to the other side of the 8, and you'll be contiguous, right, because the district line goes right on the 8.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So pushing out the -- yeah -- that area there --

MR. LARSON: So the neck is more of a hair right under the freeway.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Right.

1 MR. LARSON: Right? But if you -- if you take the
2 pink side on the East side of the freeway, there, that
3 little bit, and move it to the West, I think we're okay.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: That eliminates the neck.
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would help. So the pink
6 on the East side of the 8. That would be the West.
7 Right?
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, that's correct.
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sivan, I think adding to
10 Central --
11 MS. TRATT: Oh, you're talking about going the other
12 direction. Yes.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: The other direction.
16 MS. TRATT: Sorry about that. Okay. Yes. That
17 makes a lot more sense. Okay.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's getting late. We understand.
19 MS. TRATT: Eliminating the neck entirely. Okay.
20 Gotcha. One moment, please. Thank you, everyone.
21 Is that more or less what you were thinking,
22 Commissioner Fornaciari?
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I guess I should say yes
24 out loud. I don't know if you were looking at the
25 screen.

1 MS. TRATT: Okay. Yeah. Sorry. I don't have all
2 of my zoom -- I can only see the active speakers. So
3 okay. Perfect. I will commit this.
4 And just confirming with Counsel that this is --
5 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I mean, so right where you
6 cursor is there, and it swaps over to one side of the 8
7 just for a little bit, and then swaps -- does it swap
8 back over? Yeah. That's what I'm talking about. Right
9 there.
10 MS. TRATT: Yeah. And yeah. These are things that
11 I can also clean up off-line. They were just changes
12 that were made quickly --
13 MR. LARSON: Yeah.
14 MS. TRATT: -- for big architectural changes, but
15 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
16 MR. LARSON: That's much better.
17 MS. TRATT: -- it matches all the way around.
18 MR. LARSON: Is there just a sliver of the city
19 boundary there that's not kept, where the shape gets all
20 odd? That's something that can be cleaned up later?
21 MS. TRATT: Where are you -- where are you referring
22 to?
23 MR. LARSON: So there's that, yeah, right there.
24 Just to the right of the cursor.
25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Sometimes the way that the

projection --

MR. LARSON: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- on the map software, the lines don't look exactly like --

MR. LARSON: Got it.

MS. TRATT: -- they're snapped, but yeah. The census geography that's underlying what's displaying on the map will have that area --

MR. LARSON: Right.

MS. TRATT: -- completely (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MR. LARSON: I appreciate that.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely.

Chair, just waiting for the next direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And the next direction, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This isn't about the next direction, but it's a process question that maybe Andrew can help us answer. Last time, we worked really quickly and we did split some areas, just because that was kind of the census -- not all the censuses have been updated, even though -- like in Encinitas, it was a 1986 issue. When we're done with the maps, how can we -- should we all -- should we go through the whole maps and check every city split just to make sure we meant those city

splits, or what can we do to make sure that doesn't happen in our final maps?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll be going through the full map once we're done with the line drawing, but in addition to that, it'll be available to the public once we're done with that, and we're hoping to have the map as we draw this, as we finish the line drawing tonight, we're going to make it available to everybody so that the public can also see it, and also provide input, but also, we will be going through it as a Commission, likely on Monday.

Andrew, could you speak to additional --

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. And there's reports that we can run to ensure that the -- that the municipal boundaries are not -- that if there's any municipal boundaries that are unintentionally split that we will be able to see them, if a census block of five people is broken off, that's something that we will go through and be able to clean up throughout the -- throughout the state.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we didn't do that initially, my understanding, but it's because they were draft maps, or they're very draft and we made them public immediately after we finished the draft map process, but of course, this is getting towards the finalization, and of course, they will go through both legal and compliance

1 requirements, as well as boundary compliance. All right.
2 Where is the direction from here from the
3 Commission? Where --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we have to move population up or
5 elsewhere, so we need suggestions on what to move. We
6 had heard about potentially moving Encinita --
7 Encinito -- Escondido -- sorry, it's late -- Escondido
8 working through --
9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. So should we start
10 at -- well, would line drawers encourage us to start?
11 Because there's a lot down at the bottom, and then --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So where would you suggest we
13 start in terms of pushing population up?
14 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would probably address Central,
15 as that's --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's right.
17 MS. TRATT: -- overpopulated, and just pointing out
18 that SESVC is at a negative eleven percent. Yeah. So
19 that is what I would recommend. Potentially thinking
20 about moving some population up from Central, and then
21 potentially making a swap between these two districts, or
22 further North, as the Commission sees fit.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe Commissioner Sinay had
24 suggested potentially the university area. Is that still
25 a swap that you're interested in making, Commissioner

1 Sinay, or recommending to the Commission?
2 MS. TRATT: That is a swap that we already made.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, did we already make that? Okay.
4 Sorry about that.
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. And that's what brought the La
6 Mesa within the five percent deviation, and it was my
7 understanding that that was --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We've done it.
9 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner
11 Sinay, any other suggestions?
12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I remember that we
13 had looked at the business district COI. I'm wondering
14 if it -- we might put that back up --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.
16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- and then try to trim
17 around it to some extent as we're shifting population
18 upward. Right? So that we can attempt to maintain some
19 of the integrity of that COI that had -- it's a business
20 area that had wanted to be kept together. I would like
21 to attempt to respect that as we're shifting Northward.
22 And I, in general, very much agree with the direction
23 that we're taking with the idea that perhaps more of
24 Escondido comes Eastward, because I think we have had
25 that testimony come through.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it. So would it be through
2 the -- and I believe that's the 92 highway, but coming in
3 through the area that's highlighted right -- no -- right
4 to the East of the highlighted area. That cone there?
5 MS. TRATT: To the East of --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Can you highlight that area?
7 Yeah. The area outside of the COI, the business COI?
8 MS. TRATT: Oh, yes. Yeah. Moving that into --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Moving it into the SESDC is what I'm
10 understanding from Commissioner Sadhwani, is we would
11 want to take population from Central SD that's not within
12 the COI and shift it into the SESDC district. And that
13 would maintain the business COI together, business and
14 cultural COI together.
15 And then, Commissioner Sinay?
16 Is everybody -- can we highlight that area so we can
17 check in with the Commission to see if they're
18 comfortable with this swap that --
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think you're about to put
20 El Cajon back where you just took it out of.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Are we?
22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Are you just going to do
23 that North part?
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: No, just that little Northern part.
25 MS. TRATT: You were -- you were talking about this

1 part of the city --

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. That's the space that we're

3 looking at, not the El Cajon. El Cajon was to the South.

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we put a layer so we can

5 see what neighborhoods and communities those are?

6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Can we get the Google Maps on?

7 MS. TRATT: Yes. Yes. One moment, please. Let me

8 turn these COIs off, and the streets. So --

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari?

10 Can we zoom in a little bit more? Because we can't

11 see the neighborhoods.

12 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So this looks like Scripps Ranch,

13 Miramar Ranch North, Sabre Springs --

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is good. And you could

15 also do Rancho Penasquitos because they're all very close

16 to Poway.

17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Rancho -- right there.

18 MS. TRATT: That is -- that is drawing from a

19 different district.

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So let's just stick to this for

23 now.

24 MS. TRATT: (Audio interference) that? Okay.

25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Did we cross the district into the

1 top corner, or is that -- or is the shaded area still
2 within the same district? It's hard to tell on my
3 screen.
4 MS. TRATT: So let me just make --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.
6 MS. TRATT: -- sure it's only selecting from that
7 layer, yes. Oops. Sorry. I just selected the wrong
8 thing, and it deleted it. One moment, please, while I
9 get that back.
10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just want to make sure
11 that we weren't cutting any of Mira Mesa.
12 MS. TRATT: I believe Mira Mesa is here. I'm not
13 sure what the official neighborhood boundaries are, but
14 from what I can tell, it looks like it is in this Central
15 SD district. So giving --
16 MR. DRECHSLER: Sivan, do you want to put on the
17 COI, the two COIs again, just to --
18 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Yup. So moving the highlighted
19 portion of the City of San Diego would address the
20 deviation issue in Central, moving it from 11 to 2.33
21 percent deviation. And in orange is the -- are two
22 different versions of community-submitted API and Emensa
23 (ph.) cultural and business communities.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So we will going to break
25 in a minute. Our required break is at 6:15.

In the meantime, this does look to me to be a fair swap. I'm not hearing any concerns from the Commission, so let's make the swap. That'll get us closer to compliance. I believe we're -- or to compliance.

MS. TRATT: Yep.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then, are we okay with all of the deviations in this area that we're working through? I don't want to leave any deviations out of compliance. If you can just zoom out and let's just make -- before the break, let's make sure the deviations are good.

Is that a bottleneck there, or a --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I was just going to get rid of that quickly, just to make sure we --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- aren't creating any -- yes -- unnecessary -- all right. And now I'll zoom out. Thanks for --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's just make sure that all of our deviations are okay. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. All right. So far, so good. We still want to, my understanding is, unite the City of Escondido, and that's -- and I believe that's the next area we'll be going to.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And before we -- I'm sorry --

1 before we go there, on that North -- on Central San
2 Diego, the North border, I want to say we used 52 or 56
3 or something, but can we use the Penasquitos Creek?
4 Because that's what officially separates Northern San
5 Diego and San Diego.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So during the break, can you
7 work on following the creek instead of the current line,
8 and then let's take a break and we'll come back with
9 ideas of our next moves and that'll be in the Escondido
10 area, reuniting Escondido. All right. See you in a few
11 minutes. 15 minutes.
12 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:16 p.m.
13 until 6:30 p.m.)
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
15 Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are continuing our
16 work on our maps, finalizing the Assembly maps, or
17 working towards finalizing and refining on our way up.
18 We are in the Escondido area of San Diego, and we are
19 looking for direction for the line drawer to shift
20 population -- or to unite the City of Escondido, rather.
21 Commissioner Sinay?
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. No. I was going to
23 ask -- it looks like they did some work while we were
24 gone, so maybe they want to show us that.
25 MS. TRATT: Oh. I was -- I was going to say, yes,

1 Chair. We were -- I was still waiting to address the
2 last request from Commissioner Sinay. I just wanted to
3 point out that part of the boundary does run along the
4 creek, and just wanted to get more direction, because it
5 looks like if we were to move the rest of the boundary
6 down, that would have potentially a bigger impact. So I
7 didn't want to make --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, got it.
9 MS. TRATT: -- that change until I just talked
10 through the repercussions, which might be to the
11 Commission's liking, but I just didn't want to make any
12 changes over break.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: That makes sense, and at this point,
14 we have a compliant district.
15 Commissioner Sinay, any thoughts around keeping the
16 current boundaries as is?
17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So can we talk --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Are there any refinements you'd like
19 to make?
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I was hoping that they
21 could talk a little bit about what the repercussions are,
22 if we follow the creek all the way --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- to the 56.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So can you speak to the

1 repercussions? How many people are in that area?
2 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I'm happy to highlight that.
3 My question would just be about which district you wanted
4 to move the population into. Just knowing that there are
5 changes that you wanted to make to this Escondido
6 district, I didn't think that you would want to move
7 additional population in, but yeah.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So in terms of deviations, how far
9 under deviation would we -- we're at 2.33. Could we do
10 it without going out of compliance?
11 MS. TRATT: So maybe moving population into SD
12 Coast, there is that --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a possibility.
14 Commissioner Sinay?
15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if I would recommend -- so
16 what population are we looking at right now? I'm sorry.
17 I'm still confused.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you just highlight the area,
19 please?
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible, simultaneous
21 speech), right?
22 MS. TRATT: So yes. So you -- before we went to
23 break, you had asked that the Northern border of --
24 sorry -- I'm trying to zoom in and I just made it harder
25 to see. You had asked that the Northern border of the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If Mira Mesa could go up to Rancho Penasquitos Creek -- I mean, Penasquitos Creek.

MS. TRATT: Yes. Sorry. I messed myself up with the zoom. Yes. So you had asked that Central SD snap to the creek right here --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Gotcha.

MS. TRATT: -- and yeah. So that's, I think that was --

CHAIR TOLEDO: To my calculation.

MS. TRATT: -- the question -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So I was actually asking to use where Mira Mesa was, to move that border up. See where Mira Mesa is, to the right?

MS. TRATT: Oh, I see. Okay. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We are splitting -- we are splitting Mira Mesa, and so the idea was to move that up to the creek.

MS. TRATT: Okay. And --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's do that.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Yep. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It might get us over.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I think by -- I think by doing that, it -- and that's okay, because we can move stuff on the West side.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But I think by doing that, that
2 allows us to have the whole Asian business COIs together.
3 MS. TRATT: So it looks like adding that population
4 into Central SD would push the deviation to 8.4, and it
5 would push this Escondido district to negative 10.9.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it's a very densely populated
7 area.
8 MS. TRATT: Yes. And let me turn on that COI one
9 more time, just so you --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have
11 any suggestions?
12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, if we're
13 moving in this direction to try and maintain more of this
14 COI, and it seems like the neighborhood of Mira Mesa is
15 there in any case, and the district to the West is also
16 just slightly underpopulated and could take on more. I
17 don't know how populated any of these areas are, but this
18 district is currently kind of hooking upwards. It looks
19 like within a -- when the terrain layer was on into a
20 layer mountainous area, so I don't know what the
21 population is there, but perhaps swapping some of that
22 around the 56 where it comes down into -- yeah -- further
23 down South. Down, down, down, down, down, down, yep.
24 Swapping that part into the SD Coast, potentially, would
25 be a thought in order to bring some more of this in.

1 These are minor refinements. But would support the
2 testimony that we've had.
3 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can -- would you like me to --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you highlight that so we can see
5 what that looks like?
6 MS. TRATT: Yes. So I would need to do one or the
7 other, because they're moving population in and out of
8 different districts, so just give me one moment while I
9 select that instead. So it looks like that's about as
10 close as I can get with census geography, but that would
11 be pushing Central SD to negative 4.08, and then that
12 would overpopulate SD Coast to 6.24, which, depending on
13 what the Commission's vision with Orange County might be
14 a good or a bad thing. I'm not sure.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So just -- I'm just going to think
16 through this. So before we started looking at the
17 boundary but going through the creek, we were at
18 compliance; is that correct, Sivan?
19 MS. TRATT: Where the boundary is -- oh, no.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Before looking at the creek, so if we
21 kind of undo the whole thing, we were at compliance, I
22 think with deviations of populations and everything,
23 because we're looking at potentially just straightening
24 out the line, I thought, but maybe it was more than that.
25 But I'm just calling into question as to whether we were

1 meeting the deviation requirements.
2 MS. TRATT: So before we went to break, where the
3 lines previously had been, where a portion of it was
4 along the creek, the deviation was at 2.33. I
5 misunderstood Commissioner Sinay. I thought she wanted
6 me to extend the border towards the ocean, but she meant
7 extend the border along the creek inland, and as we saw,
8 that highlighted portion did push Central SD out of
9 deviation compliance range.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So at this point, I'm just
11 curious as to where the Commission wants to go. Do we
12 want to continue to explore population or changing the
13 border, or should we move on to the Northern part of the
14 area? Because we did have complaint districts prior to
15 the -- we were trying for -- I'm just asking and I want
16 to see where we want to do -- what we want to do from
17 here. Are we okay with diverting back, and then -- they
18 were acceptable boundaries? If they're not acceptable,
19 we should refine, but if they're acceptable, we could
20 live with them, I'm seeing nods yes, we can live with
21 them. Okay.
22 So let's -- and of course, we'll get public
23 testimony. If it doesn't align, we'll hear it. So let's
24 revert back to what we had, and let's move forward,
25 because there were -- because we thought it was going to

be refinement, turned out to be a little bit more than a refinement. All right.

So let's see. Escondido.

MS. TRATT: So the Commission was looking to add the rest of Escondido into the Escondido-Bons-Rainbow -- which no longer has Bonsall or Rainbow in it. Is that correct, Chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's my understanding, that they would like to unify the City of Escondido. Can you tell us what the impact would be?

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then, of course, if that is the wish of the Commission, we have --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are we under on the right -- on the other district, aren't we way under?

MS. TRATT: The district bordering is at a negative 1.56 percent deviation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So that border already needs population. Oh, but it doesn't, actually. We're within compliance requirements, but it's under a little bit. Hopefully, it's not too populated. Does it keep us within -- this would still keep us within compliance requirements, if we add this, so fortunately, it's not too densely packed in that area. So if everyone's okay with this, it looks like we have yeses all around, so

let's add this. All right. We've added Escondido.

MS. TRATT: Where would you like to move next? Should we go up to Orange County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: At this point -- are we at the Orange County border at this point?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we just zoom out just to see the work that we --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's zoom out and look at all of San Diego and see all of the great work that we have been doing. Thanks to everyone, and to the line drawers, and the public for their public submissions. I'm seeing a lot of public input coming through.

Let's take a look at the compliance requirements and make sure our deviations are good. Our CVAP is good. I don't see any, but of course, it's going to go through -- all of this goes through legal review and compliance review as well. I don't see any necks to be concerned about.

Commissioner Sinay, anyplace -- or anybody else, anywhere you want to zoom in on to make sure we are okay with the neighborhood lines?

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I don't know if it's helpful, but just to name some of the communities of

1 interest we were able to keep together --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. That'd be awesome.
3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- it's kind of exciting,
4 right? I mean --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: It is. It's really exciting. That's
6 what we're working -- that's why we're staying late at
7 night, is to create fair maps for California.
8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's right.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's name some of the
10 business COIs and others that we --
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Including Barrio
12 Logan in VRA district, this Lemon Grove, kind of, based
13 district, we were able to get in La Presa. Were weren't
14 able to keep El Cajon whole, but we were able to keep it
15 out of Santee, which was what communities were asking
16 for. In addition, that other, more rural district, I
17 think had been asking for Fallbrook to be included. We
18 were able to do that. We were able to keep a lot of that
19 business district together. Not all of it, but -- and we
20 were able to keep whole Escondido. And I think what I am
21 excited about is that there's some wiggle room in some of
22 the deviations just in case we need shift things around
23 still, so.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. That's very exciting.
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Looking like a lot of good

1 compromises.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Good compromises, I think we have

3 good balances here. I'm feeling good about this. Is the

4 Commission feeling good? How about this? Yes, general

5 consensus is we're all feeling good about these changes,

6 and we're going to be going to Orange County.

7 Commissioner Fernandez, are you feeling good about

8 this as well?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, yes. I just wanted to

10 zoom in Hillcrest just quickly.

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Absolutely. Let's look at

12 Hillcrest.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I don't know if it's in

14 this map or in a different map, they were saying that

15 they were split, and it might not be in this one.

16 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe we kept them whole in this

17 one, but let's check.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I just want to make

19 sure.

20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's just verify. That's the

21 whole point of this process, to verify our work.

22 MS. TRATT: One moment, please.

23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're trying to zoom in.

24 MS. TRATT: Is that a neighborhood in San Diego,

25 Commissioner Sinay -- or excuse me, Commissioner

1 Fernandez?

2 MR. DRECHSLER: I believe it's a neighborhood in San

3 Diego, below --

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In San Diego.

5 MR. DRECHSLER: -- yeah -- below the 8. Just North

6 of --

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's below the 8, North of

8 Balboa Park, right by the 163. The 163 cuts it in half,

9 but we didn't cut it in this one.

10 CHAIR TOLEDO: No, I think --

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So this one's good?

12 Okay.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's take a look just to make sure.

14 Yeah. It's right in there. It's within our -- it

15 appears to be within our map --

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

17 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- in this one. We might need to

18 take a look at the Senate and Congressional --

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

20 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- if that's something of interest

21 for future.

22 So with that, let's continue on into Orange County.

23 And thank you to Orange County. We've been receiving a

24 lot of testimony from you, and I see it coming in. We

25 see it. We're reviewing it, so we're taking it into

1 consideration as we move through. All right.
2 MS. TRATT: (Audio interference) --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we zoom out of Orange County and
4 kind of get an overview of Orange County before we start?
5 We do have a VRA district, which we already discussed,
6 but let's start from the North, looking down in terms of
7 just reviewing it, and then we can figure out where to
8 start in this process.
9 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely, Chair. So these
10 borders reflect a lot of the changes that were made in
11 LA, and how they rippled into Orange County. So we have
12 NOC, which now goes into -- or let me put up the -- would
13 Commissioners like to see the draft version, or what we
14 started with, or -- excuse me. Okay. Never mind.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: No, let's just go through, just the
16 district we have, where they're at, and just give a high
17 level overview of where we are with Orange County --
18 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- outside of the VRA, because we've
20 done the VRA, but we need to do the other areas.
21 MS. TRATT: Yes. Absolutely. So yes. NOC, going
22 into LA County to pick up Cerritos and Artesia, and it
23 goes South to Cypress, and then includes a portion of
24 Anaheim that is outside of this VRA district. It also
25 includes a portion of Fullerton. And it looks like all

1 of the deviations in this area are in compliance, so
2 that's great.
3 LAOSB goes to -- it takes that Northern portion of
4 Fullerton. La Habra is no longer included, and just
5 again, pointing out that this is highlighted, but is not
6 a part of any selection. It's just a glitch in the
7 software. Goes up into San Bernadino County to pick up
8 Chino Hills and a portion of Chino, and then stops before
9 Silverado. And it includes North Tustin as well as the
10 city of -- or the Eastern portion of Orange.
11 And we also have this Irvine-based district, which
12 maintains the City of Irvine, Tustin, and Costa Mesa
13 whole and together, which was a goal of the Commission,
14 which is awesome that that worked out. We also have this
15 inland OC Riverside district, which includes some of
16 these, kind of -- these cities that are kind of up
17 against this more mountainous area and connecting to
18 Temecula, Marietta, Wildomar.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
20 MS. TRATT: We have our coastal district, which now
21 no longer includes Seal Beach, but starts North at
22 Huntington, and picks up Newport Beach, goes inland into
23 Lake Forrest.
24 And then we also have, finally, our GGW district,
25 which is a Westminster, Garden Grove, Fountain Valley,

1 Midway City, and now includes Seal Beach, Los Alamitos,
2 and Rossmore, I believe is the pink right here.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for going around the
4 district.
5 Commissioner Sadhwani, high level overview, or
6 direction, what are your -- what are your thoughts?
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: High level overview,
8 because --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That's what I was hoping
10 for.
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Good. Phew.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: I am hoping that once we get the
13 overview, to give Commissioners a little break to think
14 through their direction in these districts --
15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and then to give Sivan a little
17 break, and so I was planning to bring in Tamina for a
18 minute, and literally for a few minutes, about ten
19 minutes worth, to look at some refinements that are fully
20 compliant that were the direction of the Commission, just
21 so we can put them out of the way. There's no -- they're
22 tiny little refinements that we just need to approve on
23 the final map. So let's do this, and that'll give Sivan
24 a little bit of a break, too --
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- because she's been working
2 nonstop.
3 MS. TRATT: Thank you, Chair.
4 Kristian, just to give you a heads up for the
5 stream, I'm going to stop sharing. Just heads up.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So if you could give a high
7 overview, Sara, while the line drawers are switching out,
8 so we have --
9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, sure.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Yeah. I didn't
12 realize how that was going to play out.
13 I mean, overwhelmingly, I think this map is looking
14 really good. I mean, I think we've done a -- we've kept
15 a lot of communities of interest together. Of course,
16 we're anchored in Orange County with that VRA district in
17 the Santa Ana region, and we have a strong -- we were
18 able to keep the Vietnamese community and Little Saigon,
19 who we've heard a whole lot from, together, and I'll just
20 lift -- we've heard a little bit of conflicting COI over
21 the course of many months, but I think going back to that
22 summer testimony that we received of Garden Grove,
23 Westminster, and Fountain Valley, we have kept that
24 together, which I'm super excited about.
25 Overwhelmingly, not entirely, but overwhelmingly,

1 we've keep a coastal district, to the best of our
2 ability. That Irvine, Costa Mesa, Tustin community of
3 interest, and the City of Irvine was kept whole, as well
4 as that inland district that is kind of centered around
5 the more mountainous regions and the more Eastern portion
6 of the county, we were able to keep together.
7 I think the one piece that I'm certainly seeing is
8 the split in the City of Fullerton. So whenever we come
9 back to that, we're getting a whole bunch of testimony,
10 it looks like, coming in. And there have been some
11 suggestions about where the dividing line could be, if
12 the city needs to be split, and some suggestion are
13 farther to the North. So if we come back Orange County,
14 I'd like to just take a closer look and see if we're able
15 to honor that. I mean, I think Fullerton's probably
16 going to need to be split, but if we can take a look at
17 that --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, we're definitely coming back to
19 Orange County, because we're --
20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- finishing Southern California.
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very good.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're going to -- and we're going
24 to spend the time that it needs to get it done right.
25 But in the meantime, Tamina has the refinements that

1 we charged her with doing yesterday. They're going to be
2 quick. It's literally no more than five to ten minutes,
3 is my understanding, because Commissioner Yee, who we
4 charged with working through these refinements with our
5 line drawers, has been working with them and they're
6 minimal. They're very minimal, and we also -- and
7 they've been posted.
8 These are -- including one minor change that
9 Commissioner Turner was working on as well. So those are
10 all posted in the handouts, and we will just be approving
11 them as a Commission, because we directed them to do it,
12 but we now just need to approve it, and then that will
13 allow us to produce the map that's going to be published
14 for the public. We don't want to publish a map that
15 doesn't have the refinements we've approved. So let's
16 get these refinements reviewed and approved so we can go
17 back to Orange County, and so that Tamina can get some
18 sleep tonight. All right.
19 So let's take a look. Can you make this a little
20 bit bigger, Tamina? I think you're on mute as well.
21 MS. RAMOS ALON: Good evening, everyone. We'll be
22 going over just a few changes that you charged me and
23 Commissioner Yee of taking a look at last night. So the
24 first is in SMateo. You'll remember we were looking at
25 the split in Redwood City, and whether or not we could

1 move Belmont, or had to split Belmont and San Carlos. As
2 you can see, we are able to keep Belmont and San Carlos
3 whole in separate districts here, Belmont being with
4 SMateo district and San Carlos being with the South Penn
5 district.
6 We also took a look at the COIs that were in this
7 area, including the North Fair Oaks COI, which includes
8 both this whole census-designated place of North Fair
9 Oaks and this small part of Atherton. And the request
10 was to see if we could move that over to be in the SMateo
11 district and include that with the Redwood City COIs,
12 East Palo Alto, and this area of Menlo Park. So we were
13 able to do that, and that is the line that was moved in
14 this area.
15 On the other side of South Penn, what we did to
16 balance was we moved -- we actually just moved a few
17 blocks right down here in this section of San Jose. And
18 I can turn on the streets for you. So yesterday, we had
19 just a slight difference in where the lines were and the
20 street that we used in this particular division, and so
21 that was altered just a little bit. It actually made it
22 a little bit straighter, and so that's where we are now.
23 We did our best not to disrupt any of the other
24 districts which you had not mentioned, so we -- Gotchos
25 Cruz (phonetic) was not touched. Sunny Tino (phonetic),

1 with the exception of this line that we just went over
2 was the only thing that was touched here. Alum Rock was
3 not touched. And Fremont was not touched.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much.
5 MS. RAMOS ALON: We then took a look here in the
6 East Bay, and we started looking at the rotation. We
7 were able to, in the Alameda district, make San Leandro
8 whole. You'll recall that there was a split. And so
9 making San Leandro whole required a movement of the line
10 here in Dublin-Pleasanton, and so it was just actually
11 moved back a little bit. It was moved a few blocks back
12 to Hopyard, and that's where this line currently is.
13 We also did a few blocks of movement in this area of
14 Oakland here, right next to Berkeley. Incorporated this
15 area which was not previously in the visualization into
16 the Oakland district, when previously, it had been with
17 the East Bay district.
18 We returned the Hills to -- the Contra Costa Hills
19 to Contra Costa so they would be within the county
20 border.
21 We made no changes to East Bay, with the exception
22 of this line in Oakland. No changes to East CC. And no
23 changes to 680 CC, with the exception of the line in
24 Dublin and Pleasanton. And I believe that's it, unless
25 Commissioner Yee has something I forgot.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: So all of these changes conform to
2 the guidance and the direction that was given by the
3 Commission. We just wanted to make sure that we all saw
4 it, that we all signed off on it. It is what we directed
5 them to do, and these were the compromises that we made
6 yesterday. Just verifying with the Commission that we're
7 all comfortable with this.
8 Commissioner Andersen?
9 And these are in handouts for the public. They were
10 posted earlier today. Actually, this morning. And I
11 hope you've all had a chance to see them.
12 Commissioner Andersen?
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I believe Commissioner
14 Akutagawa had her hand up first.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. I believe -- Commissioner
16 Akutagawa, I'm sorry. Did I miss you? Oh, no.
17 Commissioner Andersen.
18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. This all
19 looks really good, Tamina. Thank you very much. But I
20 would like to look at, back in Oakland, I had requested
21 and you'd put in all the East Bay parks. Tilden, Sibley,
22 Huckleberry, and yeah. All those. And now, are they
23 gone? Looks like they've been shifted --
24 MS. RAMOS ALON: No, they're still there. The only
25 thing's -- on the other side of the San Pablo Reservoir,

1 towards Contra Costa, that was the only piece that was
2 moved. But I can turn on the terrain layer. We can see
3 exactly --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's see the terrain, so we can
5 all --
6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. If you would, please.
7 Yeah.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: There it is.
9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Because that looks --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we zoom in so we can see the
11 parks? And I believe Commissioner Yee is available --
12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. See Sibley is not --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- to speak.
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. They're not in there
15 anymore. See Sibley and -- yeah. Sibley is closer to
16 24.
17 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. Sibley was -- it was
18 requested that I move Sibley back to be with Contra
19 Costa, so that we could maintain the county line. Happy
20 to re-look at that, if that's something you'd like to do.
21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Because --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: So the question is whether we want to
23 honor the county line, or whether we want to --
24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- move back to capture --

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The only way -- yeah -- the
2 only way you can get into Sibley is from this side. You
3 can't -- there's no access from the other side.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: So --
5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, you can hike in, sort
6 of, but.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- given that it doesn't have any
8 population, I am going to recommend that we move it back
9 to where it was prior to -- because that's the map that
10 we had agree to. I know we were looking at options,
11 and -- since there's no population, it's not going to
12 impact anything. Move it back to where we had approved
13 it yesterday.
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And could you
15 blow it up just a little bit so we can see where
16 Huckleberry is? Yeah. That's a little further South.
17 MS. RAMOS ALON: And Tobin is -- Tobin is here,
18 still with East Bay and all the nature area, so on this
19 side, with Contra Costa would be Siesta, Sibley, Temescal
20 is still with East Bay.
21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And Huckleberry is in
22 there, too. Just above --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're going to get it back to
24 where it was, Commissioner Andersen.
25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. No. Siesta Valley

1 does stay with Orinda.
2 MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.
3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But Sibley comes in.
4 MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.
5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I think where it says
6 "Eastport", Huckleberry is in there somewhere. If you
7 could maybe blow it up a little bit more?
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. All right. Let's take a
9 look at that, and then after that, we will transition to
10 the next --
11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. So if you would please
12 add that one in as well.
13 MS. RAMOS ALON: I'll do that right now.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's what we had.
15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And Redwood. Redwood
16 is just a little bit further South. All of those,
17 because again, that's also the only access in, is on
18 the -- from the West.
19 MS. RAMOS ALON: Redwood. So this area --
20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Redwood is -- sorry -- go
21 ahead.
22 MS. RAMOS ALON: Reinhardt Redwood?
23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. By Roberts. Actually,
24 it's a little bit further -- no. Yes. It is. Reinhardt
25 Redwood.

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. It's Reinhardt Redwood. So
3 we'll get --
4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- all of this park area back to
6 where it was yesterday, and we're going to -- we are
7 going to accept the changes around -- the other changes,
8 just not the ones around the Oakland Hills, or Oakland-
9 Berkeley Hills. All right.
10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen, and
12 thank you for catching that.
13 And let's go around. Any other -- this reflects the
14 direction of the Commission. I see consensus.
15 Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Yee.
16 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Sorry. I'm on the train.
17 It's noisy. I just want to say that moving the park is
18 fine, but yesterday, we had more than the park with
19 Oakland, so I just wanted -- move just the parks back,
20 not some of the area around Pleasanton and so forth.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's get it to the parks.
22 Let's get it to the parks, but not a population center.
23 Commissioner Fornaciari?
24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I just wanted to look at
25 the split in Pleasanton.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: She said it was at Hopyard, but I just want to see it, if I could, when you get a chance.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we can do the split on the parks later, given that there's not people. It's mostly just parks. So let's focus on Pleasanton, and then we will approve everything except for the section around the parks, which we will revise.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. So this is the parks, and that is done. Please let me know if you would like more or less while I go to Pleasanton.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay. Okay. So we'll take a look at (audio interference).

You're quick, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we zoom in so we can see Pleasanton?

MS. RAMOS ALON: There we go.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So okay. So you basically kind of went 680 --

MS. RAMOS ALON: So we went 680. Before, we had gone 680 all the way up, but --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right. And then you dipped down --

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah. The shift was -- oops.
2 Sorry.
3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then what's that --
4 MS. RAMOS ALON: The shift was --
5 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- Las Positas? No.
6 (Indiscernible).
7 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah. It's right South -- Las
8 Positas is up here, so it's right South of it. This is
9 the canal --
10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, the canal?
11 MS. RAMOS ALON: -- actually. Yes.
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.
13 MS. RAMOS ALON: So we went to the canal to Hopyard,
14 and then Hopyard all the way up.
15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then -- yeah. Just
16 keep going.
17 MS. RAMOS ALON: Hopyard, then it becomes Dougherty.
18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. It's a little weird
19 jog there, but. All right. You got a little on the
20 other side of Dougherty Road for some reason, but okay.
21 Thank you.
22 MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh, yes. I can definitely fix
23 that. Well, I can definitely look at that census block
24 and make sure that it's not a weird one.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's look at that census block, and

if not, are we all comfortable with the refinements that we're making here? Yes, yes, I see all yeses.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: There was a COI that came in and said, yes, please take everything West of 680 and put it with Hayward. I'm just wondering if we could back out and see -- I was hoping we might be able to not need to do all the transition at this point, and stick to the 680 route, if we are adding -- switching back and forth more of the unincorporated areas. So if we could sort of back out and have a look at that, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So this is the direction we gave yesterday. We're trying to --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I'm just trying to see it all.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Oh, definitely. I just want to let you know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And could we see -- so we see the 680, but what was the other one?

MS. RAMOS ALON: The other one was Hopyard and then Dougherty.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. I'm sorry. If you go back a little bit further, in terms of -- remember, we were trying to balance 680 and then, is it East Contra Costa?

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh. So the 680 was -- it was on
2 680 before, and then when we made San Leandro whole,
3 that's what required the movement of this line.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And we have five more minutes,
5 and then we have to go back to Orange County.
6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. But could we expand
7 out just a little bit, so we can see East -- the East
8 Contra Costa?
9 MS. RAMOS ALON: East CC district, I did not -- we
10 did not change anything there.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: No, there was no changes to that
12 district.
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. See, because what we
14 were originally talking about is making that a little bit
15 bigger, so we didn't have to take quite as much of
16 Pleasanton and Dublin out. So instead of having it the
17 3.69, it might go up a little higher.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from Commissioner Yee.
19 I think his hand is raised.
20 COMMISSIONER YEE: Perhaps Commissioner Andersen is
21 suggesting to go farther (audio interference) --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm sorry, Commissioner Yee. We
23 can't hear you. All right.
24 So we're either going to accept these changes, or
25 we're going to revert back to what we had, because those

are the options. The option is to accept it or to revert back to what we approved.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So we couldn't just make the -- take it back to 680?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, the 680?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee, are you able to speak now? No, maybe not.

So Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was trying to interpret for Commissioner Yee. I thought he said about going -- yep. There he is. He typed it in. 680 --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- farther to the North.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay. I couldn't hear what he was saying.

680 farther to the North? Is that what you're suggesting, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. No. Thank you. No. I'm actually talking about the boundary with Alameda -- between Alameda and the 680 corridor. If we stuck to that line being 680. Remember, we went 680, but then we jogged East, and took in more of Dublin and Pleasanton.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I'm happy we can stay
2 with 680, if we trade some of that unincorporated areas
3 with --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So --
5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- (indiscernible,
6 simultaneous speech) -- 680 East CC.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: So today is a Southern California
8 day, so I want to honor that. So I'm going to ask
9 Commissioner Andersen to work with Tamina and see if
10 there's a way to address that.
11 In the meantime, we're going to keep our refinements
12 as are, but see if there's any way to do that. If there
13 isn't, and get it into compliance, then we will move on.
14 So let's see the Orange County, okay, Tamina?
15 MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sorry, Chair. May I just
16 clarify? You want to move back to the San Leandro split
17 and move Dublin back to 680?
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: No.
19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: No.
21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just want to see what is
22 the population in that little area that's East of 680.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I'm just asking you to --
24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then whatever -- yeah --
25 depending on whatever that is, see if we can actually

1 balance that, the 680 CC, by giving it to the East Bay
2 Contra Costa area.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: So off-line, Tamina, I'd like you and
4 Commissioner Andersen to look through that data to see if
5 the refinements are possible, and then bring it back,
6 either later tonight, or on Monday, or whenever we meet
7 next, but look at the data off-line, and the, of course,
8 that's -- but in the meantime, we're focused on these
9 refinements at this point.
10 So let's see the other change you were making,
11 Tamina, because we do have to come back to Orange County.
12 We have two minutes, and I'm told that this will
13 literally take two minutes, and then we're going back to
14 Orange County.
15 MS. RAMOS ALON: So the next change in Kennedy's
16 area, actually, is in the Stockton district. The only
17 difference here is the movement of August, which was in
18 SSAC-Stanis in with Stockton.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And this got us into
20 acceptable deviations, it didn't impact anything else,
21 and we did ask that Commissioner Turner work with Tamina
22 on -- or actually, with Kennedy on this, and so Kennedy
23 is resting now, but Commissioner Turner?
24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was just going to
25 say, the request -- this was shift request to move

1 Kennedy, Morada, and Garden Acres into the Stockton area,
2 but it was too much population. We couldn't do it
3 without starting to split other areas, and so we were
4 only able to make this one slight move.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And this would keep us within
6 acceptable deviations, Commissioner --
7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Turner and Tamina? Thank you so
9 much for researching that. If everybody is on board,
10 this is a compromise, and we couldn't include every
11 community, but we're including this smaller community
12 with their communities of interest. I see consensus
13 here, so let's accept this, and let's include it in our
14 final maps, and with that, we will be turning back to
15 Orange County, and we'll be working with -- probably
16 working with Tamina to bring back the next refinement of
17 Alameda County.
18 But with that, let's go back -- we'll transition
19 back with Sivan, so we can continue on with Southern
20 California. And I hope Sivan got a brief break. It was
21 a brief break, but hopefully she was able to get some
22 caffeine, and is ready to keep going.
23 MS. TRATT: Yes. Thank you, Chair. One moment,
24 while I share my screen.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: And just for the public, and also for

1 the Commissioners, the handout for the changes to the Bay
2 Area are posted, and you can take a look at them.
3 They're also in the -- they're available so that we can
4 look through them, and if you have any suggestions, you
5 can email them through staff.
6 Commissioner Yee, I see your hand is raised. Oh,
7 it's not raised anymore? Okay.
8 So we'll continue to refine that bring it back, but
9 I think we're close. I think we're very, very close with
10 the refinements in the Bay Area. Sivan is loading her
11 maps.
12 While we're doing that, Commissioner Akutagawa?
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I have discovered
14 the magic QGIS now. I will tell you that --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, excellent.
16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- and I got it working.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's an amazing tool, isn't it?
18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It is quite the amazing
19 tool, and yeah. It was definitely -- it'll prevent all
20 of you from hearing all of my what if questions, because
21 now I've gotten them all answered playing on this tool.
22 So thank you, Neal, for making sure that I could get
23 started on it. I did have to go back a second time for
24 some tech support, but now I -- that's why you haven't a
25 whole lot from me today.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: You can make all kinds of swaps, and
2 you can rotate population --
3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Yeah.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and you can become a geospatial
5 expert in no time.
6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know. And I was getting
7 kind of excited because I thought I was going to make
8 something work, but then it's just like Southwest
9 Riverside just did me in, so I'll just say that.
10 I do want to address -- I guess maybe I'll just
11 start with the coast, and only because we've gotten a lot
12 of requests about having one coastal district, and I know
13 part of the concern early on was that there was just not
14 enough -- there was just too much population. I did
15 figure out a way to make a coastal district work.
16 I'm just afraid to say too much right now, and
17 Chair, I don't know how you want me to go about it, I'll
18 just say, though, out loud, for the public, it meant
19 splitting Huntington Beach. There was a request from
20 some of the Vietnamese community up to a certain point to
21 include that as part of Little Saigon, so I used that as
22 my split for Huntington Beach, although I know that I
23 also saw a lot of COI testimony to not split Huntington
24 Beach. We're also seeing quite a bit now from Fullerton,
25 too, that does not want to be split.

1 But I think there's a way that doing a coastal
2 district can minimize the ripple effects, and I mean, I
3 think we can keep it within just Orange County and not
4 ripple out to LA or Riverside or -- I mean, San Diego,
5 there's already a San Diego district, and there's already
6 a Orange County-San Diego district -- or Orange County-
7 Riverside district, so I suspect it's going to be
8 minimal, but how do you want to do this? Is this
9 something that you'd want me to just come back to and
10 make sure what I figured out will work with the line
11 drawer, with Sivan, and then come back tomorrow?
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think what we are wanting to do
13 tonight is finish Orange County, so we're going to be
14 doing live line drawing. And I know it may be
15 challenging, but we'll -- how about we go around, just
16 every Commissioner, and -- because we've received so much
17 feedback from Orange County, it's one of the areas where
18 we get a lot of feedback from. We get feedback from all
19 over California, but we're getting a lot of feedback,
20 mostly because I think the public understands that we're
21 working in this area. So just in terms of priorities, if
22 we can all give one priority, and I'll make sure that we
23 address the -- at least have a conversation around them
24 as we prioritize.
25 So Commissioner Akutagawa, could you go first? One

priority, your top priority for the Orange County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'd like to be able to honor that request for a coastal district and see if we could just keep a Seal Beach to San Clemente district, all coast district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: An all coast district. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That also was my top priority for Orange County. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So a coastal district for --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you for coming up with that, Commissioner Akutagawa.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Yee, if we can hear you? I don't know if we can. His top priority is the same. At least exploring the -- his priority is exploring the possibility of a coastal district.

Commissioner Turner? She is also in alignment.

Commissioner Andersen? Exploration of a coast district. What's your --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, certainly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- top priority for Orange County?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I would say -- I would have to say that. I don't have any other pressing issues that jump out at me.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: You don't have to have a priority.
2 You don't have to have a top priority.
3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I don't have a
4 pressing issue that I -- there are a lot of things that I
5 see --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: It could just be a balance, making
7 sure our deviations are appropriate, and that --
8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yep.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we are (indiscernible,
10 simultaneous speech) --
11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, I would like the coast
12 county, because I believe we can do that, if you look at
13 the numbers.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So also --
15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. And --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- priority there for coastal area.
17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari, top priority
19 for Orange County?
20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think looking at
21 a coastal district would be good.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Also in support.
23 Commissioner Sadhwani, your top priority for Orange
24 County? And I'll remind the Commission that it doesn't
25 have to be limited -- there's a lot in the waters of

1 Orange County, too. Although, of course, if a coastal is
2 what is appropriate --
3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: For me, where the map stands
4 right now would just be cleaning up the Fullerton split,
5 if we're going to go in that direction.
6 I'm not opposed to looking at a coastal district. I
7 am opposed to blowing up the map.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Okay. So it's exploration. I
9 think what folks are -- what folks are saying is they're
10 open to exploring the possibility, and that's what I
11 heard.
12 Right now, Commissioner Le Mons is also open to the
13 possibility of a coastal district.
14 Commissioner Taylor?
15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good evening. I like our
16 deviations. I don't want to blow up the map. Always
17 keeping consideration of your district, not recreated the
18 work that we've done and yeah. Let's keep moving
19 forward.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I'm with Commissioner Taylor.
21 I'm open to, of course, I'm open to where the Commission
22 wants to go, and also just want to just make sure that
23 our deviations are -- compliance requirements are met
24 and, of course, honoring the will of the Commission, so
25 we will be exploring the possibility of having a coastal

1 district in Orange County.
2 Commissioner Sinay?
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is one of those regions
4 that we got really positive feedback, so yes, we have
5 gotten a lot of calls, but it was people saying, wow, you
6 got it right. If there was one thing --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's true.
8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- it might be, and it was
9 little things inland. Yes. We've gotten a lot of calls
10 around the coastal. I'm going to say it. It's
11 political. So I just don't want us to go on that trip
12 without our eyes open. I like this map, but it doesn't
13 matter if I like it. The community has liked it, and
14 this one has been really supported.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we've been getting good feedback
16 from this map. Certainly, there's other feedback for a
17 coastal district as well. So it's conflicting as well.
18 All right. So we have -- Commissioner Andersen, I think
19 you were open to --
20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Just one item. I
21 also --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- one thing that came up a
24 lot in the communities of interest is to have Seal -- not
25 Seal Beach -- Huntington Beach with Little Saigon --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. That's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- and it really is the North part. And so I appreciate what Commissioner Akutagawa was talking about.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Okay. So let's take a look at our coastal area. Let's start there. And of course, we do have constraints because of our VRA districts and also population. Some of the -- we're on the lower end of population across the region. So let's take a look.

Right now, we have -- Sivan, maybe you could walk us through the coastal areas of Orange County? Huntington Beach --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- I think it's Seal Beach, which is in one district.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So Seal Beach is currently with the Garden Grove, Westminster district. What is now the NOC coast district goes from Huntington Beach, it includes Newport Beach, Laguna Beach, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, and Laguna Woods, as well as Lake Forest.

Would you like me to make recommendations based on some --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No, I want you to keep going down the coast.

1 MS. TRATT: Oh, oh, okay.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's take a look at all the coast,
3 so that we are all acquainted with it some more. I know
4 we look at it a lot, but it's just good to, as we're
5 looking at it now, to have the whole coast view.
6 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. So the second coastal OC
7 district goes into San Diego County, and it includes the
8 Cities of Dana Point, Laguna Niguel, this is San Juan
9 Capistrano, San Clemente, and then goes into San Diego
10 County to pick up all of Camp Pendleton Base, as well as
11 the Cities of Camp Pendleton Main side and South, all of
12 Oceanside, and Vista. And that is that district.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. That's helpful.
14 Commissioner Akutagawa, what are your thoughts? I
15 mean, what I do see, and I'll just give a little bit
16 of -- I see that we are under deviation, we're right in
17 the top, Seal Beach. And I see -- we're under up there
18 in the Northern region, which would have potential ripple
19 effects, but -- but could poten -- I mean, I -- we're all
20 open to exploration, so what are your thoughts in terms
21 of unifying the coast?
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So starting with the
23 entirety of Seal Beach and then adding --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- Sivan, can you highlight
25 Seal Beach so we can --

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And Sivan, if I can ask you
2 a question, there is a small split at Huntington Beach.
3 Could I give you the other cities that I'd like to see in
4 this entire district and then come back to the split?
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. That would actually
6 be preferable because I'll have to add Huntington Beach
7 to this district. I can't remove -- so yes, as long as
8 we're adding, that's great.
9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. Sounds
10 good. And then let's keep Newport Beach. What is that
11 little -- it looks like a little white section. Is that
12 included in the district=? Is that an unincorporated
13 area, this right here?
14 MS. TRATT: Is this the area -- is this -- where my
15 mouse is circling, is this what you're talking about?
16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yeah.
17 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It looks like this is just an
18 unincorporated coastal area that's between Huntington and
19 Newport Beach.
20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. So let's
21 keep going down. And then next to Newport Beach, if you
22 could select Laguna Beach.
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh. There is an
24 unincorporated area between Laguna Beach and Newport
25 Beach. It's the wilderness area, so --

MS. TRATT: Yup. And that area is included in the coastal district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's already included? Okay. And Laguna Beach, I think, is already included?

MS. TRATT: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Laguna -- is Laguna Niguel included? No. Okay. So if you could, add Laguna Niguel and Dana Point and then San Clemente.

MS. TRATT: Did you want to add San Juan Capistrano, or (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And what I did -- yeah. I did have San Juan Capistrano added. It didn't add a whole lot. So I guess if we could just play with it and see how it goes. And then to remove --

MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment. I just need to commit this change before I can remove anything --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- so one moment, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you want to take a look? What are the changes that we're looking at? Because there's a couple, right?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So these were the changes to add Seal Beach, add Laguna Niguel, Dana Point, San Clemente, and San Juan Capistrano. And those are the areas highlighted in red. Let me --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we see the deviations --
2 MS. TRATT: Yeah.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- like, where we are?
4 MS. TRATT: Those are right here. So the deviation
5 of this coastal district would be forty-five percent
6 over, and GGW would be underpopulated by negative 9.79
7 percent. And then --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: So what I --
9 MS. TRATT: Oh.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you. Go finish --
11 MS. TRATT: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)
12 district as well.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you. So it looks like,
14 Commissioner Akutagawa, we'd be over by forty-five
15 percent. So the coast -- because this is an Assembly
16 district and we are limited to 500,000 people, we are --
17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I understand.
18 There's some areas that I need to remove.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. You see there's some areas you
20 would want to take out?
21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. That's why I asking.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Would it be just easier if
24 you wanted to move -- you -- there's still another area
25 that you have to do. Would it be easier if I just worked

1 with somebody to --

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: So there -- the areas that we still

3 have to do is Orange County because we've done most of

4 Southern California now. This is the area that we have

5 left.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right.

7 CHAIR TOLEDO: We have Orange County left. And of

8 course, if there's time --

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Then let's deal with

10 Los Angeles.

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: I mean, if there's time and there's

12 consensus around most of the other areas around Orange

13 County, we can go back to Los Angeles because my

14 understanding is that we have that -- our line-drawers

15 were able to implement the changes that we had asked for

16 in Los Angeles County and are -- the minor refinements

17 because they're minor -- the minor refinements that we

18 talked about yesterday. But we have to be comfortable

19 with Orange County.

20 So we can certainly -- my preference would be to

21 finalize Orange County tonight so that we can produce a

22 map of all of California with the way it looks right now

23 so that if we decide to do anything, it really will be

24 just refinements after that. That's the preference,

25 right? And we still have plenty of time because our

1 staff and line-drawers are here until we're done.
2 MS. TRATT: So to (indiscernible, simultaneous
3 speech) --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we've been caffeinated. I have
5 my Pepsi, and I know you guys have your tea and your
6 coffee, so we're ready.
7 MS. TRATT: So Chair, just since we're doing
8 exploration, would you like me to take a snapshot just
9 of, maybe, the starting point before we commit any
10 changes so that we can commit changes and then not feel
11 like they're permanent necessarily?
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it would help you to think through
13 some of the implications of doing this just because it's
14 so much. And some of the implications -- and maybe
15 Sivan, you can help us through this and maybe Andrew as
16 well. But I was just thinking -- and I'll give my
17 thoughts on implications. I think this will -- potential
18 implications and -- it's not that we can't do it. And we
19 have the time to do it if we want to.
20 But there will be implications probably to the San
21 Diego coast because of population and where the
22 population is located, possibly implications to Los
23 Angeles and to the borders around there. We have a lot
24 of VRA districts, and then we have -- I'm seeing some
25 more deviations are at zero and negative up there, so

1 potential issues in the inland parts of the district. So
2 we'd have to work through this area and try to contain it
3 to Orange County or Orange County because we have VRA
4 areas all over Orange County.
5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other thoughts from the
7 Commission, Commissioner Fornaciari, Andersen, Sinay?
8 Just curious about your thoughts.
9 Commissioner Fornaciari?
10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I definitely want to
11 take a snapshot --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think it's --
13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- before we go down this
14 road.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's definitely take a
16 snapshot --
17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- because if it doesn't
18 work out.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- because I think it's -- if it
20 doesn't work out, we can revert back to the map. So
21 maybe we should review all of the --
22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And I'm --
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --
24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm definitely with -- you
25 know, I'm open to exploration, but I just want to be sure

1 we don't blow things up too much, so thank you.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So we want to be -- I
3 think we want to honor the public and kind of go through
4 this exercise and see if it's something that's possible
5 to do. And recognizing that we're limited by how many
6 people are in the Assembly district, it might be
7 something we can do in more of a Senate or Congressional
8 district, but we are limited. But I see where
9 Commissioner Akutagawa is going. I just want to limit
10 the impact across the region if possible, as was stated
11 by other Commissioners.
12 Commissioner Akutagawa, sorry, and I --
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I have tried to
14 think this all through and I tried to limit it. And I
15 also wanted just, as others have done much earlier today
16 and throughout the day --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: You know, we have taken
19 time on other areas to try to honor COIs and other
20 requests, so --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- I would ask for the
23 same, you know, respect now, too.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we definitely will give you that
25 respect. So do you want to -- do you want --

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- us to go to Los Angeles County and
3 move to --
4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. I --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Los Angeles.
6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I have suggestions.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.
8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm going to go in a
9 clockwise direction.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Absolutely.
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I think, then, Sivan,
12 if you don't mind, then -- I think instead of just taking
13 away and adding to the other areas, I think what I'll do
14 is -- let me go in a clockwise direction to address some
15 of these other districts, and then because we have the
16 Inland OC and Riverside -- they do include non-VRA
17 districts, and I think that gives us -- and as you can
18 see, there's some, like, negative deviations along that
19 area. You know, I know people were not happy, but that
20 does give us a little bit of that wiggle room. Same with
21 the South Orange County/North San Diego areas.
22 And then there's still that SESGC area as well to
23 that. I think it gives us the wiggle room that is going
24 to enable, I think, what I'm envisioning to be able to
25 work out. It was just -- as the changes were being made,

it was just hard to keep up with all of the changes and to be able to try to work everything out as best as I can. But I think it was being updated on the GIS.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So how about, Commissioner Akutagawa, we -- if you can, give us your vision for this coastal district. And then maybe Sivan can give us some suggestions on how we can do it while also limiting to the coast and some of the impact and see if -- how we can make or how to -- see if we can do this without too much impact around the borders. So let's --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I mean, if I can just still see --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- what the changes are, it might --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It might help.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean, some of them are swaps. I think that's why -- it's not, like, wholesale blowing up everything.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, no, no, no.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Definitely not trying to do that.

Sivan, if you could, maybe zoom in on the GGW district.

So on that one, taking out Seal Beach obviously made

it a lot smaller. What I envision is adding in Cypress to this district.

MS. TRATT: Do you want it -- if you could, tell me all the things you want to add just so I know what order to do them in.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, sure. So I would like to add in Cypress. And then this is where I would like to add in a portion of Huntington Beach. And then that should complete this district.

MS. TRATT: Do you have a dividing line where you would like to split Huntington Beach?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. So the COI testimony that we were hearing -- and I want to just -- was, I believe, North of Garfield along Beach Boulevard. And it's essentially a strip next to Fountain Valley. And I believe where the Fountain Valley border is, that's where Garfield is. Oh, the Southern border. Sorry. Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, there it is.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And then if you go Northward up -- going North along that strip, you'll see Beach Boulevard to the West.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And if you go up, it should equal out the population within the standard deviation that will be needed for GGW. And it also honors the COI

1 request from the Vietnamese community.
2 MS. TRATT: Okay. So this is Garfield Ave here.
3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
4 MS. TRATT: Do you want me to go North where?
5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Beach. Do you see Beach
6 Boulevard? It's Highway 39 or Highway 38.
7 MS. TRATT: Oh. It is Highway 39. Okay. Yes.
8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yeah.
9 MS. TRATT: So go North? Okay. Let me just --
10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.
11 MS. TRATT: -- start with these blocks. One moment,
12 please.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioner Akutagawa, does your
14 rationale for this in terms of COI input or --
15 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's both COI input, and it
16 also enables -- once the other areas are removed, it will
17 allow the kind of standard deviation that would be
18 needed. At the same time, I know that there were lots of
19 requests from the Huntington Beach residents, and they
20 asked not to split Huntington Beach. But right now, I'm
21 just trying to do what's best for all the maps. If,
22 after these changes, it looks like we could put it back
23 in -- I mean, I think we tried to keep cities as whole as
24 we can, so I guess --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you, (indiscernible,

simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But I also know that that's been a request from the Vietnamese community too, so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you. So I just want to make sure that we put it in the record. We have note-takers that are documenting every move we make and the reasoning.

MS. TRATT: So Commissioner Akutagawa, was this the only portion of Huntington Beach that you wanted to add, or was there an additional person?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. You could go further up so that it reaches -- yeah.

MS. TRATT: To where it connects here, or where --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To the -- where it connects to the 405, so --

MS. TRATT: So right here?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Okay. What --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And that looks to be -- that looks to be a very clean line. That would be my (indiscernible, simultaneous speech).

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yeah. And then that way you could create a cleaner line. And if it helps after you do all that --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. You can continue your --

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. You see that little
2 triangle? You could capture that as well, too.
3 MS. TRATT: This triangle (indiscernible,
4 simultaneous speech)?
5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And that little
6 triangle too so that it's just clean. And then see that
7 other little triangle? Yeah, right where your cursor
8 was.
9 MS. TRATT: Okay.
10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, go further down.
11 Do you see that single box that -- it looks like -- it
12 looks like -- yeah. Just South of -- yes. Right where
13 your hand -- that little cursor is, yes.
14 MS. TRATT: Oh, yeah. So these are just census
15 blocks along roads that will clean up. They don't have
16 anyone living in them, but I'll --
17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh.
18 MS. TRATT: -- clean them up before the final maps
19 just so you can get a sense of big-picture changes just
20 so I'm not -- you guys aren't watching me just click
21 individual (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I see. Okay. Okay.
23 All right.
24 MS. TRATT: So are these the changes that you want
25 me to make? (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. And that would
2 include Cypress, right?
3 MS. TRATT: Cypress is added to the selection, yes.
4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we gave an hour to the last
6 exploration, so let's give an hour here, too. And we'll
7 know in probably less time than that what we can do, and
8 how we can do it, or what we can do.
9 MS. TRATT: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm ready
10 for your next --
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So the next one is
12 the North OC district. So do you see Stanton in there?
13 I'd like to add Stanton to the North OC district. That
14 was also stated by the Vietnamese community. But I
15 believe in doing so, it will help unite parts of the
16 Arab-American community, although I know that Little
17 Arabia is that little section there. I think that that's
18 part of the COI that we were requested in Anaheim, but I
19 also saw additional COI testimony about Stanton. It will
20 also enable some other communities to come together
21 there.
22 MS. TRATT: Okay. So adding Stanton into NOC?
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
24 MS. TRATT: All right.
25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then I think this is

1 where I'm going to ask the Commission. We've been
2 getting a lot of testimony about Fullerton. What is your
3 perspective on this? I am comfortable either way. I
4 think joining Fullerton together --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Maybe you can tell us a little bit
6 about the COI testi -- sorry to interrupt, Commissioner
7 Akutagawa.
8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you just remind us -- the COI
10 testimony -- of what's coming because I've seen it come
11 through and I've seen that I'm wanting to go with various
12 communities. Can you sum it up a little bit for us?
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure. So one piece of COI
14 testimony that we received is that there is a working
15 class immigrant low-income essential worker community
16 along that, I guess, the Southern border of Fullerton
17 which borders the top of that Santa Ana district. In
18 that --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- area, we've had several
21 conversations around that. However, Fullerton is also
22 home to one of the largest Korean-American communities
23 as -- as well, too. And we've gotten quite a bit of COI
24 testimony both from the Korean-American community, but
25 also city leaders from also Buena Park and Fullerton also

1 speaking about wanting to stay together.
2 More recently, I think we've been receiving today
3 testimony about keeping Fullerton together. There was
4 one in particular that spoke to the split of a school
5 district in terms of the current placement right now. I
6 think this is a question of, I think, choices and what
7 the Commission would prefer to do.
8 Also, the other thing to also note is that the
9 Northern part of Fullerton is a more affluent area of the
10 city. However, as others have rightly noted, it is a --
11 it's not a large city. So that is the concern, is that,
12 you know, kind of a, you know, smaller to mid-size city
13 is being split in half. But we have been splitting other
14 cities.
15 So this one -- I see both -- benefits to both.
16 However, in ensuring that Fullerton is -- the whole of
17 Fullerton is kept together, it does ensure that a COI
18 that shares community could be kept together along with
19 Buena Park and La Palma.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. So let's hear from the
21 Commission. That's a wonderful summary, Commissioner
22 Akutagawa. Thank you so much for that.
23 Commissioner Sadhwani and then others who may want
24 to give their thoughts on the Fullerton area, this is an
25 area that's very diverse, as Commissioner Akutagawa has

1 referenced, and has many essential workers.
2 Commissioner Sadhwani?
3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'll just be very
4 brief because I think Commissioner Akutagawa did a good
5 job laying out the different testimony and the
6 conflicting testimony. And certainly, we've heard a lot
7 in the past about the communities in South Fullerton that
8 are very much essential workers, working class, working
9 also in the entertainment industry.
10 And also, I will note that I certainly recall in our
11 Senate district that we pick up some of those communities
12 in South Fullerton for the VRA district that exists in
13 that area.
14 That being said, we have given the smaller
15 population size of our Assembly district. It looks like
16 we're just taking a few blocks there, it looks like. So
17 we have received a lot of testimony to keep Fullerton
18 whole. I think in our current iteration -- I'm not sure
19 exactly where Commissioner Akutagawa is going with all
20 these changes. But as it currently stands, if we put all
21 of Fullerton in the NOC district, I think that would
22 leave the LAOSB way underpopulated, and so then that's
23 going to set off a lot of ripples.
24 To me, when I had initially done the overview of
25 Orange County, you know, I was interested just to explore

1 a cut that might that be more reflective of some of the
2 COI testimony that we've had. I had noticed there's a
3 bunch of stuff coming in just today from Fullerton based
4 on these maps --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- and one of them had
7 been -- if the city cannot remain intact, the dividing
8 line should be farther to the North, perhaps Bastanchury,
9 or at worst, Valley View, Dorothy, Fullerton Creek, and
10 Yorba Linda. That would leave the core community and
11 education community centered around CSU Fullerton intact
12 as well as a few other high schools and stuff as well.
13 So for me, that would, in general, be worth
14 exploring. And I -- but I don't know exactly where we're
15 going with the development of this coastal district. But
16 I just wanted to raise that. And I think if we have -- I
17 never take splitting a city lightly. But if we do, then
18 doing so in a way that respects communities of interest
19 to the best extent possible is always preferable for me.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And since we're moving
21 through Orange County and going to potentially go back to
22 LA County once we're done, if -- we're not going to have
23 a longer dinner break, so I understand that I am very
24 understanding if you want to eat in front of the camera,
25 or just turn off your -- you can turn off your camera if

1 you're not wanting to eat in front of the camera, which I
2 would totally understand.
3 Oh. Commissioner Yee is already eating. There she
4 goes. But we're going to -- this is a working dinner
5 session, so we'll continue on with Orange County and
6 continue on line-drawing. This is what happens you have
7 citizens of California drawing maps. We have to take
8 working dinners.
9 All right. Let's go, Commissioner Akutagawa. I'm
10 sorry for that.
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: I just wanted to make sure that
13 everyone ate so they could keep up their energy.
14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just for the sake of
15 Sivan, in the map that I did create, I kept Fullerton
16 whole. But you know, it could just as easily, you know,
17 go in the way given the testimonies that we received
18 where it goes into the LAOSB or stays in the LAOSB, the
19 Northern part.
20 MS. TRATT: So just visualizing what that would look
21 like -- I had it up a moment ago, but let me just bring
22 it up. Adding the rest of Fullerton into the NOC
23 district would make it overpopulated by 8.81. I'm not
24 sure what your map had. And then LAOSB would be negative
25 15.32.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Then let's not do
2 that. Can I also say, though -- I think what you --
3 where you have the cuts -- for example, Sunny Hills High
4 School is a very affluent area, so I would include that
5 in the LAOSB area at the very least. Take that border
6 out to Gilbert, if not a little bit further out along
7 Malvern because those are much more single-family homes
8 and definitely much more upper middle class.
9 MS. TRATT: Is that what you were thinking,
10 Commissioner Akutagawa? Do you want me to take
11 Malvern --
12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: At least go Malvern North
13 and put it into the LAOSB district. (Indiscernible,
14 simultaneous speech) --
15 MS. TRATT: And so Malvern is -- Malvern is here, so
16 would you like me to continue selecting this area?
17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That little section. Yes,
18 please. I know that Commissioner Sadhwani -- I didn't
19 have a chance to note all of the different cutoffs in
20 terms of the areas there. I think there was different
21 schools of thought. I think Cal State Fullerton is also
22 split, also. So if there is a way that we could bring it
23 in and make it full, that would be, I think, ideal.
24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think that would be the
25 Yorba Linda Boulevard option. That's running a little

bit further --

MS. TRATT: South?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Further North (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I see. I see. I see. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Cal State --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Would you like me to make that swap? This area selected would push NOC to negative 5.15. I'm not sure if you want me to back off, maybe, this change right here to keep that below five, or if you're comfortable with this knowing that you'll address it later.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think if you -- if you move that Fullerton line North, as Commissioner Sadhwani had read off, to Yorba Boulevard, would that be enough? Would it be better to make that change first? So then you'll see how much deviation is available.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Why don't we do that first? One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So do you see that little green -- here's the place. Yeah. There it is.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So you're talking about adding areas South of Yorba Linda Boulevard into NOC, correct?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Because then that

way, then, Cal State Fullerton will be in its entirety.

MS. TRATT: Oops. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, can I ask Commissioner Akutagawa a quick question?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, of course.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then Commissioner Kennedy after that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Just a quick question on this. I'm just going to say Linda because I've known you for -- it seems like forever now. Just this area with the Cal State Fullerton -- I'm not sure -- it's not necessarily just a commuter school, so they've got to have housing. I just want to make sure that we include housing as well.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was thinking about --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's my only concern. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was thinking about that too.

And then also, Sivan, you know that section across the 57 Freeway? That is not the university area. That's more of a -- kind of a business-y area.

MS. TRATT: Let me get that selection back. One

1 moment, please. So just this portion?
2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. If it could -- if it
3 could join the rest of Cal State Fullerton, that would be
4 wonderful.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that keeps us within deviation.
6 That also is perfect.
7 MS. TRATT: So now do you want to go back to looking
8 at adding this portion back into LAOSB?
9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I just saw testimony
10 that was submitted. And apparently, the Cal State
11 Fullerton students as well as, like, members of the
12 Latino community live in Fullerton along Placentia
13 Avenue. So at the very least, we want to make sure we
14 include all of the students.
15 MS. TRATT: I'm not quite sure where Placentia is.
16 Do you -- is this Placentia?
17 MR. DRECHSLER: I think I saw it on the other side
18 of 57 going up the street where the Taco Bell -- yeah.
19 There it is.
20 MS. TRATT: Oh, yes. Okay.
21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I guess they are
22 on the other side. It's most -- it is a lot of
23 businesses, but there must be, then, other apartments and
24 other things like that alongside. I usually just see
25 the -- yeah. I usually just see the businesses along the

57 there.

MS. TRATT: So you would like this to be added back in?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So the NOC is now -1.31 deviation?

MS. TRATT: Yes. And LAOSB is negative 5.2.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. Can you -- I have plans for LAOSB. Can you add in that section of Fullerton? It is an affluent area, and I think it would be better suited to the North along Gilbert and Malvern.

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And let's go to Commissioner Kennedy because he's had his hand up, so we'll just hear from him, and we'll come back to this.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And it's directly relevant to this change. And I've been hearing that the Korean community is there in that Northwestern part of Fullerton, so I'm trying to understand where the Korean community is. If somebody could show us, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Throughout all of Fullerton. If you look at Beach Boulevard alone, that is a thriving Korean business area, as is along -- actually,

1 Malvern is more residential. But if you go down to
2 Commonwealth, there is a -- there's a significant Korean
3 business district around there, as well as Orangethorpe.
4 It's really -- they're quite spread out through all of
5 Fullerton.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
7 Do we have any shape files, or is the population
8 dispersed throughout the whole area?
9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, residentially,
10 they're dispersed towards -- through the North.
11 Business-wise, in terms of --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I see.
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- you know, churches,
14 restaurants, shops, they're all throughout there. And in
15 fact, they extend out to where you see the Beach
16 Boulevard, the 39, which is in yellow right now. And it
17 splits that part, which -- I don't know if we want to
18 address that as well, too.
19 MS. TRATT: So Commissioner Akutagawa, I have
20 rehighlighted that portion. Would you like me to commit
21 this change, considering both of the deviations are below
22 five?
23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. If you were to -- if
24 you were even able to extend it -- (audio interference).
25 It's not great. The park is split, which is odd. I

1 don't know if anybody has any opinions on splitting
2 parks, if that's okay.
3 MS. TRATT: The park is not split; that's just the
4 city border. (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. That's the city
6 border for Buena Park. I realize that. I think that
7 just speaks to how intertwined the areas are. But at the
8 very least, I know that -- let's at least just -- if we
9 could, just accept that for right now. That whole
10 Northern area where that little T is left now -- that is
11 also all residential as well, too. But I don't know if
12 that -- if we have the room for the deviation.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we look at the deviations?
14 Sivan, can you go over there?
15 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. I did just want to
16 point out -- I don't know if you had a plan, but we're
17 still at a forty-two-percent deviation in this coastal
18 district --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
20 MS. TRATT: -- so I don't know if the Commissioners
21 wanted to leave this for now and address that because
22 it's a pretty big deviation.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, if we leave it, then we're
24 going to have a bubble, aren't we? And you're the line-
25 drawer, so help us think through the -- well, how you

1 would approach this because it's -- my understanding from
2 previous maps that we've done -- if we don't -- even
3 there, if we have such a huge deviation because we might
4 end up in the situation where we have a bubble and we
5 can't get out of that bubble.
6 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would agree that that is
7 probably what I would tackle. My understanding was that
8 Commissioner Akutagawa had additional swaps that would
9 address that. So if you wanted to just kind of sketch in
10 those changes, we can go back to Fullerton.
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.
12 MS. TRATT: But I was -- it makes me a little bit
13 nervous to leave this at forty-two.
14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Don't worry. That's
15 not my -- that's not my intent.
16 MS. TRATT: Okay.
17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Okay.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: And so what are your thoughts about
19 deviation or reduction, Commissioner Akutagawa?
20 And Commissioners, what are your thoughts? And I
21 see a couple of options.
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: One -- and I'll just share them. And
24 then of course, you guys can chime in. One option is to
25 try to take out some of the Eastern portions if we really

truly want a coastal area, although that would split up some COIs. And then Commissioner Akutagawa on which ones to cut out. It could also be a shorter coastal district. We also have room on the edges to move parts of the coast down and parts up.

I mean, there's plenty of options. It's just -- they're not easy ones because we have so many COIs in this area. So just want to think through -- think through all the options. We have a lot of options that are just not particular -- I mean, none of them are really good. They're all difficult because there's so many important COIs. It's a very dense area, and we have a VRA district right above it.

Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Fernandez, ideas on how to deal with this forty-percent deviation?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So can we go to the LAOSB because --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm doing the circle.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. You're going to rotate population?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So LAOSB should have North Fullerton, Brea, Placentia, Yorba Linda, and Anaheim Hills in it. I'd also like to -- it should also have East Orange as well as Villa Park. And it has North

1 Tustin.

2 I know we've received different COI testimony about

3 the City of Tustin, some asking to be with Irvine, others

4 asking to be with more of the North. In this particular

5 case, I've put Tustin with that LAOSB district. And then

6 I took in -- yeah. I think if we could take that in,

7 then I think that should be --

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: I mean, we just have to be cautious

9 here, because these are VRA areas, that we don't touch

10 the areas.

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Tustin is not.

12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. And just the -- then we're

13 so close to it. I'm just, yeah, mentioning it. But

14 Tustin, you're right, is not in the VRA district at this

15 point.

16 Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Sinay? And we

17 do need to take a fifteen-minute break after these

18 comments. So let's do Fernandez and then Sinay.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And I think I missed

20 this part, Commissioner Akutagawa, at some point. You

21 just keep it with the coastal cities within Orange

22 County, or you also going to include that piece of --

23 what is it -- Camp Pendleton from -- are we going to --

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My thought was that,

25 actually, that would go with more of the inland portion

of Orange County and then --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- stop at the coastal district at San Clemente. However --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- perhaps during the break, I could speak to Sivan --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- and (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's what I was thinking.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So that's what I'm thinking, too. Maybe --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or I could --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- just do it. Yeah. Whichever way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: You could call Sivan and work through some of this with Sivan and Andrew and then our staff.

And then in the meantime, Commissioner Sinay, do you have any comments, feedback? Yeah. Let's get that before we go to break.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Two things. Whatever you all do, please don't move it to Fallbrook-Bonsall and then put it back -- the coast of San Diego back with that,

1 please. We worked hard on that.
2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, no, no.
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Second, we heard resounding
4 requests to keep Tustin and Costa Mesa and Irvine
5 together, and I'm feeling really uncomfortable about
6 splitting up that COI.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, that's a good
8 reminder of all the feedback that we've received and some
9 of the considerations. At this point, we're get -- we
10 all said we're comfortable with exploring this possible,
11 and it's an exploration, just like we did in other parts
12 of the area. So we still have about thirty minutes of
13 exploration time. But in the meantime, let's have
14 Commissioner Akutagawa work with our line-drawers off-
15 line.
16 And the rest of us, let's have a fifteen-minute
17 break. Enjoy your dinner time and your caffeinated
18 drinks.
19 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 8:00 p.m.
20 until 8:16 p.m.)
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
22 Citizens Redistricting Commission. So excited to hear
23 about the exploration that Commissioner Akutagawa has
24 been working on with Sivan and Andrew. And hopefully,
25 we've been able to solve the difficult and complex puzzle

1 that is the districts in Orange County, especially as we
2 tried to, you know, actually respond to the request from
3 Orange County in terms of building a or developing a
4 coastal district across that region.
5 So Commissioner Akutagawa and Sivan, can you please
6 fill us in on your -- what you were able to -- your
7 exploration, what you were able to, what you were not
8 able to do, some of your opportunities, challenges, et
9 cetera so that we can all get filled in, and the public
10 as well?
11 MS. TRATT: All right. Commissioner Akutagawa, if
12 you wanted to explain --
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So Sivan was
14 helpful. What we did is I asked her about moving Alisa
15 Viejo to the Irvine district and moving -- and then
16 moving Lake Forrest right now to the Inland OC district.
17 We also talked about the -- and I will say that my -- the
18 same cities that I selected for LAOSB did not come out
19 the same deviation as (audio interference) GIS. So I
20 just want to say that.
21 So she did make a suggestion to remove Chino Hills
22 and Chino to the Southwest Riverside district, which is a
23 non-VRA district. You'll see that the numbers are a
24 little bit off, but you'll also see that the South OC --
25 SOC NSD district is minus thirty-six percent. She thinks

that there is a path forward to balance out the population in all of those districts and that this could be doable. And that's where we left it off before we came back from break.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, wow. Thank you. That's great progress.

MS. TRATT: A caveat of saying -- sorry. A caveat of saying, I do think there's a way forward, but I didn't think that the Commission was going to necessarily be pleased with that direction. But I'm happy to explain (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, I'm so glad you think there's a path forward because I didn't think there was. And so let's -- can we hear a little bit more about the potential path forward and some of the COIs that we're going to be splitting?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So just from, like, a purely population-balance perspective, it is possible, I believe, to balance between the districts that we have currently. It might include further adjusting some of these borders that we already worked on.

But the big-picture idea would basically be to reduce Southwest Riverside to a permissible deviation, whether that be moving Menifee or any of these cities into inland OC-RC until this is at below five percent

1 deviation. This would then be overpopulated by roughly
2 the same amount that SOC-NSD is underpopulated.
3 So then it would just be a question of swapping
4 either Temecula, Murietta, Wildomar, or looking -- Ranch
5 Mission Viejo, something like that. And then just
6 addressing that ten-percent deviation as well. So that
7 would be potentially more small swaps to get that down
8 below five.
9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And Sivan, I think that
10 Laguna Hills City should be moved into the inland OC. So
11 that should hopefully bring down some more of that NOC
12 coast district too.
13 MS. TRATT: Okay. Let me add that now. And it
14 looks like that would fix the deviation of NOC Coast.
15 Yes. So let me commit that.
16 So Chair, did you want me to continue playing this
17 through, or did we want to jump --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: So can you talk about options and
19 where we are? Because I see, still, very large
20 deviations in the SOC and Inland RC because one of the
21 requests was not to blow up the maps outside of Orange
22 County, and we VRA right above and to the side, so just
23 trying to -- if you and Commissioner Akutagawa and others
24 can -- can kind of -- and to contain it within Orange
25 County. I mean, there is the possibility. We have

1 talked about it before. If we need to, we have the
2 edges, right? But that would require additional work,
3 too.
4 Commissioner Sinay, then -- and you know, we gave --
5 we're giving the same consideration we gave to other
6 Commissioners to work through the region and try to make
7 it work. Let's see if another -- fifteen minutes to make
8 this work.
9 Commissioner Sinay, Akutagawa?
10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to remind everyone
11 how much the community and the collaborations and
12 everyone loved the Orange County map before we go into --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: This is exploration, and our
14 deviations are very (indiscernible, simultaneous
15 speech) --
16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know. I just wanted to keep
17 reminding everybody.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: We've also got a lot of requests to
19 try to unify the coast, and that's what I think
20 Commissioner Akutagawa is trying to do in a live line-
21 drawing to see if it's possible. And this is just to see
22 if it's possible. We don't know what the impacts are.
23 But I do agree with you. We have a -- we have received
24 so much testimony today on how wonderful our maps are.
25 And we also received some testimony that wanted other

1 communities with other coastal communities. And
2 actually, we got all sorts of testimony, as well.
3 Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have you hand up
4 before as well? Okay. I think you put it down.
5 Commissioner Akutagawa, continue, please.
6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I just wanted to also
7 note that I did see COI testimony requesting that Menifee
8 could be with Wildomar and Murietta and Temecula, and
9 that may solve that issue. And then that's where I would
10 ask, then, Sivan for that help on the SOC-NSD.
11 I also want to note for Commissioner Sinay there was
12 also quite a bit of testimony that Seal Beach did not
13 belong with the GGW -- that they wanted to be in a
14 coastal district, too. So similar to the Fallbrook and
15 other comments too, they don't want to be inland. They
16 want to be on a coast.
17 MS. TRATT: So just addressing that, Commissioner
18 Akutagawa, Menifee is too big to add the whole city to
19 this district, so that would need to be split.
20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Would it make sense to
21 move -- I mean, that would be, to me -- just from a
22 contiguity, it seems like that's the one that would make
23 the most sense.
24 MS. TRATT: And I'm not sure how much population is
25 living in this unincorporated area as well, so that would

1 be additional -- to take into consideration.
2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If that was added into the
3 VRA district, would it throw off the CVAP?
4 MS. TRATT: We worked really hard on MPH this
5 morning to get it to fifty-one. I'm (indiscernible,
6 simultaneous speech) --
7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. No problem. Just a
8 question.
9 MS. TRATT: I (indiscernible, simultaneous
10 speech) --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's on the lower end of the --
12 MS. TRATT: It's going to lower it, yeah.
13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. That's okay.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: We tried very hard to get it up, too,
15 and we just haven't found any ability to move it up at
16 this point. So if the public has suggestions on how we
17 might be able to raise the CVAP in the Santa Ana area, we
18 would appreciate that. We're getting feedback all the
19 time, and we've been testing it and haven't been able to
20 raise it anymore. But certainly, if there's any feedback
21 on how to move it up, we'll take a look at it.
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sivan, since this is Inland
23 OC-RC, that means that Lakeland Village, California as
24 well as Lake Elsinore are options as well, too.
25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can definitely explore those.

1 One moment. So that would make the deviation of
2 Southwest Riverside negative 2.35 percent, and Inland OC-
3 RC would be at 39.54 percent. And we do have another
4 neck situation, unfortunately, but that could potentially
5 be resolved.
6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Could that be -- could
7 you -- I guess it would be a small split. But could you
8 do the -- take part of Lake Elsinore to create a larger
9 neck?
10 MS. TRATT: You mean remove part of Lake Elsinore?
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
12 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please. Something
13 like that, perhaps?
14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: At least then it would
15 create a larger neck.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. That neck looks a lot
17 better. It's much more compact.
18 MS. TRATT: So just in continuing to play out this
19 scenario, the next order of business would be picking
20 where in inland OC-RC you want to draw population from to
21 move into the San Diego Coastal District.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: So it's almost 8:30. We'll
23 continue -- at 8:30, we'll check in with the Commission
24 and see where we are and see what the options are to,
25 like, work through these. But --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can I ask a question?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Would it best to -- would it -- I guess, I see that -- it looks like there's tribal areas right below Temecula. Should that be added to that SESDC? Because it is a negative deviation, but it looks like we may be splitting tribal areas, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, can you speak to that? Because I'm not as familiar with these tribal areas, or Commissioner Kennedy --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- or others who might be more familiar with the tribal areas.

And then I do see Commissioner Turner's hand raised. Before we do that, let's check in with Commissioner Turner and see where she's at.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I may or may not have something helpful. I just wanted to assist Commissioner Akutagawa and at least attempt to weigh in and ask some questions.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: She's worked really hard to make this work.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

MS. TRATT:

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And I did see the tribal lands
2 that -- I don't have any COI testimony. I was wondering
3 if, indeed, that can go below into the ESC. But for the
4 split with Temecula -- do we know anything about
5 Temecula? Can Temecula come into the SOC? Or actually,
6 yeah, because we're under -- way under there. And I'd
7 note Temecula says it's -- it's 110,000 people there. So
8 I'm just wanting to ask the question of those that there
9 familiar with the area if we have COI testimony that we
10 would be severely bringing harm to Temecula --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- if we could bring them into
13 the SOC and NSD.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Sinay and
15 Commissioner Kennedy, I think can speak to that. They've
16 been looking very carefully at those COIs.
17 Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Kennedy, please --
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- provide us with some --
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So Temecula called us, like, on
21 the -- from the very beginning, Temecula has said, please
22 do not bring us into San Diego. And it would be even
23 weirder to bring them into San Diego and go down the
24 coast because the SOC --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, sorry. I don't

1 mean to interrupt you, but -- actually, I'm sorry to
2 interrupt you. But can you explain why they were not
3 wanting with San Diego?
4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Temecula is a
5 district --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Transportation, or is it a fear?
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: They just felt that they
8 weren't getting represented well. Many people have said
9 Fallbrook, Rainbow, and Temecula should be together.
10 Most of the people -- it felt like more people from San
11 Diego wanted to be with Temecula than Temecula wanted to
12 be with San Diego. But asking Temecula --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can I ask a follow-up? Because I'm
14 not familiar with this area and I think it would be
15 helpful for all of us and the public as well. Are they
16 currently represented with San Diego?
17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's why they felt like they
19 weren't being sufficiently represented? And that's --
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. I concede on that topic.
22 Thank you so much, and continue on. I'm sorry to
23 interrupt. I just wanted to get that in my head because
24 I didn't understand.
25 Commissioner Kennedy?

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yes. As
2 I've explained before, Temecula kind of the informal seat
3 of Southwestern Riverside County, you know. So while
4 Rainbow, Fallbrook, Bonsall, may depend on Temecula,
5 Temecula doesn't depend on them at all. Temecula is in
6 the flatlands, very closely tied to Murietta, Wildomar,
7 Menifee, Lake Elsinore, that whole area but really
8 doesn't bother going across the line to Rainbow,
9 Fallbrook, Bonsall, for anything. It's a very different
10 landscape. It's very different communities.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: So do the workers go into that area,
12 or do they come to San Diego to work? I'm trying to
13 understand, like, the movements of population, or how --
14 if there are any.
15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You know, I don't have a data
16 source on that. As I said, Temecula, Murietta, Wildomar,
17 Menifee, Lake Elsinore -- that's all flatlands and --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- very -- all very closely
20 tied together. Almost immediately when you cross that
21 county line, yeah. You're in the mountains.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's very different.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I just want to ask Commissioner
25 Sinay and Commissioner Kennedy, who does -- where does

1 Temecula want -- you've seen the testimony. What does
2 the -- the COI testimony -- where does that area
3 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Southwestern Riverside
5 County.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Southwestern Riverside County?
7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. As I say, Temecula is
8 and is widely considered to be kind of the anchor of the
9 informal seat of Southwestern Riverside County.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you, both, for providing
11 that. And I see a lot heads nodding. Mr. Andrew, can
12 you --
13 MR. DRECHSLER:
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I was
15 just going to --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: I can't talk anymore.
17 (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
18 MR. DRECHSLER: I was just going to point out the
19 tribal reservation of Riverside that we were seeing as
20 the Pechanga Reservation. I believe that's how I
21 pronounce it. And it kept whole, and it is in Riverside.
22 So if we keep it in Riverside, it's kept whole. So I
23 just wanted to weigh in on that for a second. And it's
24 different than what we see in San Diego.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. Thank you, all of

1 you.

2 Commissioner Akutagawa, did that provide some

3 clarity around the Temecula area?

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. It does. And I'll

5 just say, look, you know, South Orange County doesn't

6 want to be with Riverside either, Commissioner Sinay, so

7 it's the same -- you know, these are the same things that

8 we've been talking about. I tried to see if we could

9 keep it contained. It just wasn't possible. I mean, the

10 numbers in the VRA districts don't make it possible.

11 However, with the terrain layer on, I have a

12 different idea, perhaps. I don't know if it would make

13 it any better, but perhaps to allow Southwestern

14 Riverside to not cross over into Orange County and

15 instead combine Orange County with Riverside more beyond

16 the mountains because those mountains were part of the

17 concerns that people had talked about, that Ortega

18 Highway, which is the 74 -- I think that's that the

19 highway -- you know, people said it's just difficult to

20 drive.

21 They are building a toll road. There was a lot of

22 talk about that in the COI testimony. But it's not

23 totally complete, and so it makes traversing the

24 mountains difficult. It kind of sounds familiar. So I

25 think this is where I'm going to ask for phone-a-friend

because this is the areas -- either that, or we could just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's phone a friend. So let's phone -- because we have lots of friends on here. So let's ask for Commission support. We're all friends. Any suggestions for Commissioner Akutagawa and also Sivan and Andrew? I saw Commissioner Kennedy's hands up a couple minutes ago. Let's see if there's any suggestions, or if there isn't, that's okay too. But let's try to phone a friend.

Commissioner Fernandez and Turner, we have about ten minutes of this exploration, so I'm just trying to see if we can come up with some ideas that we can maybe work off-line and to see if it's even possible (indiscernible) at this point. It's looking difficult with the very high deviations.

Commissioner Fernandez and then Turner?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, because -- I mean, the way I look at it, it looks like -- where is the population to move from one to the other -- from SOC to Inland? I think that's what -- that's kind of where we're getting stuck, and I see what you were talking about, Commissioner Akutagawa. I actually wanted to zoom out a little bit because I wanted to see all of the districts in Orange County, please. I just want to get

1 an idea. Okay. Let me think about it, Linda, and then
2 I'll come back. But I'm trying to be helpful.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
4 Fernandez. You're always helpful. Commissioner Turner?
5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just trying to do
6 that --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: You're also always helpful too.
8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm trying to be. I'm trying
9 to be helpful. I'm wondering, Commissioner Akutagawa,
10 because we're looking at the high deviations on both
11 sides for the Inland and the SLC, I'm wondering if we
12 can't -- and the reason I made the suggestion because we
13 can keep looking at it. But it kind of stares back at us
14 in its present state. So I'm wondering, is there a way
15 to walk back small increments of what we did so that by
16 the time we get here, it isn't so great and we'll have
17 other flexibility? So you made choices based on, of
18 course, COI testimony and where things needed to be,
19 grabbing large bits of population. But before we have to
20 just say it's not going to work, I'm wondering, can you
21 walk back and take smaller areas to end up with the
22 smaller deviation at the end?
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
24 And Commissioner Andersen, any suggestions from you?
25 Because you always have great suggestions, too.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. This
2 is a tough one because, you know, the obvious ones
3 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) San Diego.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: I've never heard that from you. You
5 always think you can solve anything, and I know you can.
6 I --
7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, there's always a way.
8 It doesn't mean everyone's going to be happy. And on
9 this one, a lot of people --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, that's true.
11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- are not going to be
12 happy, because all the other areas -- you know, the
13 Rancho -- they don't want to be with San Diego either. I
14 do love Commissioner Turner's idea. And the one thing I
15 was thinking is, if we don't bite off quite as much --
16 Commissioner Akutagawa says rather than all the way to
17 San Clemente, you know, start with Dana Point, something
18 like that. You know, I don't think we can actually get
19 there given the choice of what we'd have to move to San
20 Diego. I hate to say that, but that's my --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: I've never heard that you couldn't do
22 anything. Well, let's keep thinking about it. Let's
23 keep thinking about it, and maybe we'll come to a
24 solution because I know this is a priority for most of
25 us, was to unite the coast and to try to unite the coast.

1 So let's keep thinking about this, Commissioner
2 Akutagawa, and Vazquez, and Fernandez. Let's hear from
3 you, your thoughts. And we're almost time that maybe we
4 can ask Commissioner Akutagawa to work with the line-
5 drawer off-line and maybe see if there is any -- to walk
6 population through slowly and seed if there's anything
7 that they can come up with -- anything we can come up
8 with.
9 So Commissioner Akutagawa, then Vazquez, Fernandez,
10 and Sinay. You know, it's a difficult one because we
11 also don't want to -- we don't want to change the
12 architecture so much that it impacts the surrounding
13 counties, and we have VRA. We all know the challenges
14 here, and we have an ocean to the sides. We're limited.
15 Akutagawa, Vazquez, Fernandez, Sinay, Sadhwani. And
16 then we will be going onto Los Angeles if we don't come
17 up with a clear path, but we'll -- but we'll continue
18 to -- we'll charge Commissioner Akutagawa to continue to
19 explore with our line-drawers.
20 Commissioner Akutagawa?
21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess I appreciate
22 what everyone said. And Commissioner Turner, I was
23 thinking about this. Maybe the smallest changes -- Seal
24 Beach would like to be with more of the coastal cities.
25 That would be one.

1 The other one is we're continuing to get now lots of
2 testimony about Fullerton, much more complicated than I
3 think was, you know, what we -- in the early testimonies
4 that we received, I think we're -- I think we're going
5 to -- I think that's going to be, actually, an area where
6 we're just going to really have to figure out and make a
7 decision about that.
8 I thought that I had, based on what Commissioner
9 Kennedy said -- is looking at that Southwest Riverside
10 district. Oddly enough, it does not include the areas --
11 as he said, the seat of Southwest Riverside in that
12 district -- and I'm wondering there's kind of a swap that
13 can be made because unfortunately, that large white space
14 in the middle is just all Cleveland National Forest, and
15 I have found that there is not a lot of population there.
16 But there's a lot of population in Southwest Riverside:
17 Elsinore, Wildomar, Murietta, Temecula, and I think
18 that's why those two areas got combined in the beginning.
19 But anyway --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's a challenge.
21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Vazquez, Commissioner
23 Fernandez, Commissioner Sinay, let's hear from you.
24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe you guys have some thoughts

1 around this. Uh-huh.

2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I just wanted to state

3 that I actually -- uniting the coast for me is no longer

4 a priority given other considerations, especially real-

5 time feedback about Fullerton and the big wrinkles there.

6 So for me, I feel like we have played this out. And for

7 me, I would like to move on.

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we really did try, and yeah.

9 Commissioner Fernandez, Sinay?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I -- that is still a

11 priority for me, would be to -- the coastal. But the

12 only thing I believe you said earlier, Commissioner

13 Akutagawa, was that your game plan at the end was to put

14 Camp Pendleton with some of the inner, and I really would

15 like to keep that more with the coast because I don't

16 know what commonalities they would have with Temecula and

17 Murrieta, so -- but anyway, that -- but -- however, I

18 mean, if you still want to work on the coastal, that

19 still was my main priority, and then it was Fullerton.

20 Thanks.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

22 Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Andersen. Maybe

23 Sinay and Andersen.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I don't want to be blamed

25 for not being a phone-a-friend, so I'm going to ask a few

1 questions here. Those foothill communities -- my gut is
2 that they're probably whiter and more affluent, okay?
3 Unfortunately, that doesn't go with Camp Pendleton,
4 Oceanside, and Vista.
5 And I know the coastal doesn't as well, but one of
6 the reasons we decided to go Oceanside to Vista with Camp
7 Pendleton was so those three -- you know, that's where a
8 lot of the military families live, a lot of the veterans
9 live, low income. It's more working-class, low-income.
10 And so there was more in common there.
11 And so if it would have been more along -- you know,
12 it's -- this is where the divide is, sometimes, between
13 San Diego and Orange County. I think when it's San Diego
14 and Orange County, it's worked well the way it's been
15 now, where there's more of the coast in San Diego and
16 more of the coast in Orange County, so it's more even.
17 But right now, it would be -- it would be tough.
18 But I was -- I see what you're doing. I wouldn't
19 put it -- there is -- we have been told that there is --
20 you know, the base does go over towards Fallbrook and
21 Bonsall, some of the school district. But most of the
22 veterans -- I mean, most of the military families are in
23 Oceanside and San Clemente. That's what -- when they've
24 called in and they've written in, that's what they've
25 told us, is with -- I think, a -- yeah. Those are the

1 two big areas. And when I worked with military families,
2 that was the two big areas where they were at.
3 There are, you know -- so I'm trying to see how this
4 would work, but it would be an awkward crossing into San
5 Diego County. It wouldn't be a kind of -- in other
6 counties, we worked really hard to try to make them like
7 communities when you're crossing the county line, and
8 here, it wouldn't be. Not that it was the other way,
9 either, and I'll admit that.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
11 Commissioner Andersen, you had your hand raised.
12 I'm hoping you had -- so you figured out some solution
13 here.
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Well, I just -- okay.
15 I thought more of Huntington Beach was going to be going
16 into, you know, the Little Saigon. I still like, you
17 know, adding Seal Beach back in. That's clearly the
18 tradeoff in that area. That's just a little tiny bit. I
19 was surprised because I thought they were saying, you
20 know, Northern Huntington Beach, so I thought it was more
21 of a section like that, but maybe not quite that much.
22 In which case, I was going to give you enough to put
23 Seal Beach and possibly Dana Point because Laguna
24 Niguel -- it's not quite on the coast as much. But you
25 know, thirty-three and twenty-five, so you have to take

1 some of that out. And that's where -- but I saw that you
2 could do at least that. And then you could probably do
3 San Clemente into the South -- you know, South --
4 North -- South -- you know, the SOC and the NSC with a
5 little other jiggling. But I think that's all we were
6 going to get, unfortunately.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. I
8 know you've been trying hard to also -- to try to resolve
9 this issue. It's a difficult one. In the Assembly, we
10 are limited to 500,000 people. And unfortunately, that's
11 just not enough people, or there's either too many
12 people, not enough people, and then of course, we have --
13 as Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned, we have the coast
14 on the side and then we have VRA districts all around San
15 Diego, so we are -- you know, and certain pockets don't
16 have lots of population, so it makes it difficult to do
17 this.
18 At this time, I just want to get the sense from the
19 Commission. It's 8:47. We need to turn -- my
20 understanding -- and I'll just -- I'll give a -- I
21 believe the feedback we have been getting, as some
22 Commissioners have noted, has been pretty positive on the
23 current maps, our draft maps. You know, there could
24 potentially be some refinements. I've been hearing from
25 Commissioner Fernandez and others in the Fullerton area.

1 We could revert back now. We have a screenshot so
2 that Commissioner Akutagawa can work off-line with the
3 line-drawer and report back at a later time and see if
4 there's any progress that can be made.
5 But in the meantime, our draft maps may be the --
6 have been -- have received good feedback. Of course, we
7 always get good feedback and also some folks who want
8 some refinements, so we could do some refinements here in
9 the Fullerton area in our draft maps. And then just in
10 case we're not able to come up with a way to get a
11 coastal district with -- because I think the consensus
12 here is that we have pretty good districts that are in
13 compliance with all of the requirements.
14 But potentially, maybe addressing some of these
15 priorities that were on the table such as Fullerton --
16 and of course, we would want that to be incorporated into
17 any coastal district if we're able to succeed there. The
18 line-drawers could make sure that that happens. So I'm
19 not -- I'm looking to the Commission to see if you're
20 ready to move onto Los Angeles, if you want to address
21 Fullerton.
22 And those are the options on the -- and then
23 Commissioner Akutagawa potentially could work on the side
24 with our line-drawers to see if -- continue to explore.
25 As we saw, it's a complicated puzzle in Orange County.

1 And let's hear from the queue. And we can -- also,
2 of course, there's always the option to continue on. So
3 Akutagawa, Sinay, Turner, and Sadhwani.
4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to say that --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Whatever the Commission wants to do
6 because I'm of service to you.
7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, first, I just want to
8 say --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: And to the -- the people of
10 California, first.
11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We tried, and I just want
12 to thank everyone for going on this journey with me. I
13 think those mountains just -- yeah. Those, you know,
14 make it a little bit complicated. I would like to just
15 request that we try to address this Fullerton question
16 since we're getting -- there seems to be lots of
17 different --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, of course. Yes.
19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- differences of opinion
20 about where the borders are. And then if I can -- Sivan,
21 if I could just work with you. You know, I think if
22 there's a way that we could keep Seal Beach inside a
23 coastal district, I think that -- I know we're hearing
24 different testimony, but I think we've heard loud and
25 clear that as much as possible, keeping the coastal

1 cities seems to be, you know, high priority, too. And so
2 yeah.
3 And Commissioner Andersen, I hear what you're
4 saying. I think some of the ideas that you said -- I
5 think we're going to run into some of the same problems
6 of, you know, the puzzle pieces not quite fitting
7 together, unfortunately. So yeah. Thank you, everybody.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
9 But I know these puzzles are so hard.
10 So Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Turner -- I
11 mean, we're all going to do our best to try to solve
12 these puzzles. Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner
13 Turner?
14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to share
15 appreciation to Commissioner Akutagawa, that she tried
16 this --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Uh-huh.
18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- because she's been want --
19 she's been wanting to from the very beginning. I mean, I
20 can't remember a time you didn't want to see the whole
21 coast together, so that was a big task, and I do want to
22 appreciate -- it's just the puzzle piece -- what's
23 beautiful about California is what makes redistricting
24 complicated, and it's the diversity and -- the diversity
25 in so many different ways, from terrain, geography. It's

1 amazing.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Go on. Sorry.

3 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I agree that Fullerton

5 should be the next priority. And then I did want to go

6 back to Mira Mesa because I looked back at my notes and I

7 do think I know how to Mira Mesa whole if we can

8 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Stay with Southern California. So we

10 will go going back to San Diego for a moment to address

11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Um-hum.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: But in the meantime, we're going to

14 do Fullerton. We're going to take Commissioner Turner,

15 and I also want to appreciate Commissioner Akutagawa for

16 her -- you know, this has been a journey. We all were --

17 we're all on this journey together of trying to figure it

18 out.

19 But if there's -- we all care about the COIs and

20 every -- but -- and we all really -- but if there's one

21 Commissioner who has been trying to keep every COI

22 together and who knows all the COIs backwards and

23 forwards -- and I know there's many of us who do. But

24 Commissioner Akutagawa is just committed to keeping as

25 many COIs, as we all are, together, especially in the

1 Orange County and San Diego and Southern California, but
2 across the State of California as well.
3 So thank you so much, Commissioner Akutagawa. We'll
4 continue to -- we're going to be hopeful that you and our
5 line-drawers are able to bring back something that is --
6 solve this issue over the weekend.
7 And Commissioner Turner?
8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you,
9 Commissioner Akutagawa.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: I mean, we all had too much caffeine.
11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: As you are -- as you are
12 looking at Fullerton with Sivan, I know you're seeing
13 this COI testimony about the split with the campuses in
14 Fullerton. So the CSU Fullerton and then the Fullerton
15 College. So if we can just address that, I'd appreciate
16 it. Thank you.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Let's definitely -- let's
18 first -- let's do Fullerton. And then I am told that the
19 change in San Diego will be minimal, so we will do those,
20 too. And then we we'll go to Los Angeles as our
21 commitment is to finalize these maps as quickly as we can
22 with as good as a draft as we can and then get
23 refinements if we need to on Monday. So let's go to
24 Fullerton. Andrew and --
25 MS. TRATT: Do I need to revert to the snapshot

1 before (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's go to our draft maps.
3 Yes.
4 MS. TRATT: Okay.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Which we good feedback on, so they're
6 maps that we are proud of, too. And they have the COIs
7 together. We kept the COI -- the COIs are the
8 foundations of our map as well as the VRAs, so we keep a
9 lot of COIs together. Although if there's a way to keep
10 more of the coastal areas together, that would be ideal.
11 There we go. Fullerton.
12 Do we have direction from the floor?
13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we hear all the issues
14 first before we start drawing?
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. So who would like to
16 give the COI testimony around this area and what we're
17 hearing from the community?
18 Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Sadhwani?
19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Yes. So the latest
20 COI that came in for this area basically spoke about us
21 butchering the area. And there was a map that was also
22 sent in using our tool. But what they're saying
23 specifically is that the boundaries quite literally ran
24 through both CSU Fullerton and Fullerton College
25 campuses --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- and they go on to
3 illustrate that about a student, you know, getting
4 something to eat. They'd have to cross boundaries, et
5 cetera, et cetera. It says we've strained the community
6 in a district with -- it shared with little in common.
7 Here we go. This community has much more to do with
8 areas South of Chapman than areas to the North. That's
9 the first part of it. And so is there a South of
10 Chapman? Where is Chapman?
11 MS. TRATT: So I believe Chapman becomes Malvern
12 here, but this is Chapman Ave, where the cursor is
13 pointing.
14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Oh. And there's the
15 colleges that we have a line going through. Okay.
16 That's all I have. I'm just reading COIs. Thank you.
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Chair, can I -- so --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much, Commissioner
19 Turner. That's awesome.
20 And of course, Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner
21 Fernandez. We're all friends here. We're all going to
22 make this work. Let's figure it out.
23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I think my -- can you
24 all hear me? Because I think my --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, we can hear you.

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I think I'm frozen on
2 my end. Yeah. There has been a bunch of testimony
3 coming in. It seems like there's kind of two large
4 pockets: one around the Korean-American community in
5 North Fullerton, and then another one around kind of the
6 educational areas, including, absolutely, CSU Fullerton
7 and Fullerton College. Also, several high schools and
8 school districts. The Fullerton high schools would be
9 split as we currently have them drawn.
10 There's a little bit of differentiation, and I think
11 everybody wants to keep Fullerton whole if possible. But
12 I think I mentioned earlier, and I've seen it now on
13 several different pieces of testimony coming in, is the
14 Bastanchury Road, that that might be a more reasonable
15 cut to make. It would keep many more of the educational
16 areas together, it seems. And then West of North Parks,
17 and I don't know where North Parks is. Yeah. I'm not
18 sure --
19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It's where the line is
20 right now.
21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Come on, Andrew. Where are
22 you?
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. Sorry. I didn't know
24 my cameras was on.
25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It looks like where the border is

1 currently. This is Parks.
2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.
3 MS. TRATT: So that would be moving the Southern
4 border up to Bastanchury, which is where the hand it
5 outlining now.
6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.
7 MS. TRATT: Would you like me to visualize that,
8 Chair?
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Of course. Let's highlight it
10 and see what we see.
11 Commissioner Fernandez?
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I was going to
13 address the Fullerton, but this will cover the Fullerton
14 piece of it in terms of keeping it whole. Thank you.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Does it cover all of the COI that
16 you're referencing, Commissioner Fernandez and
17 Commissioner Turner and Sadhwani?
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, because if you look
19 down at -- on the Southern Eastern portion, California
20 State University State Fullerton right there, that's what
21 I was going to -- ensure that that stayed intact. And
22 this will -- well, actually, if we can move it down just
23 a little bit more to Chapman, that would be great. Oh.
24 Right below -- yeah.
25 MS. TRATT: This is Chapman. So Chapman includes --

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: To your right.
2 MS. TRATT: Chapman includes --
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: To your right. Yeah.
4 Right there. Chapman, right there. Yes. So that it
5 could include the Fullerton -- all of university.
6 MS. TRATT: So would you like me to cross the 57 and
7 then pick up this portion of Fullerton, as well?
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: I see a yes from the Commissioners,
9 so let's try that. And if it turns out we don't like it,
10 we can always -- we can always figure out the consensus
11 then.
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It might just be too much
13 in terms of population. That's my only concern right
14 now.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Commissioner Sadhwani?
16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to
17 offer -- I mean, let's definitely try this. But if it's
18 going to take a long time, kind of similar to other
19 Commissioners have done in Northern California for some
20 of these smaller swaps -- I'd be happy to work with Sivan
21 off-line and try and figure out some options if we think
22 it's going to end up taking more time.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we are going to be here until
24 we finish, so I think we -- I think that's fine.
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. All right.

1 MS. TRATT: Well, it looks like that area of South
2 of Bastanchury -- I'm not sure if I'm pronouncing that
3 correctly -- has about 33,000 people. So that would move
4 NOC to 6.05 percent deviation and would underpopulate
5 LAOSB by 10.71 percent.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh. What are our options here,
7 Sivan and Andrew, in terms of meeting the COIs? You're
8 familiar the COIs as well, so can you help us through
9 this and just give us some options that the Commission
10 can get back -- the Commission can consider?
11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Could we just state --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Turner.
13 I want to hear from Commissioner Turner.
14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know
15 my mic was on. But I was wondering, can we just stay on
16 the on the West side of the freeway?
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Is there a way to stay on the West
18 side of the freeway and not go across the freeway, is the
19 question, and still get enough population to balance out
20 these deviations? I see a deviation. Oh. That was
21 without it, right?
22 MS. TRATT: Sorry about that.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: I was going to say, we fixed the
24 deviation problem --
25 MS. TRATT: I put the wrong --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- but the -- we also got rid of the
2 portion that we wanted to add in. So we want to rotate
3 population through, and we're looking for solutions here.
4 Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have alternate
5 solutions or others? If others have alternate solution
6 for these COIs --
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm sorry. I think some
8 testimony just came in that suggested moving La Habra
9 into the Orange County map, which just gave me pause
10 because I think it's (audio interference) VRA districts.
11 Not --
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, that's (audio interference) we
13 can explain that to the public. So we'd love to move
14 to --
15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- La Habra out, but La Habra is
17 covered under the VRA, and we have La Habra in a VRA
18 district, so we are restricted in that regard.
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. Let's go, Commissioner
21 Sadhwani.
22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think we'll need -- we
23 need less population; is that correct? Another one that
24 had came through was Rolling Hills Drive. I don't know
25 exactly where Rolling Hills Drive is, but maybe that's

1 another place that we could potentially look at that
2 would --
3 MS. TRATT: Would that be the Northern border, or
4 would that move that Eastern border? Does it happen
5 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That doesn't seem -- that
7 doesn't seem like an idea that would help us here.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's try Commissioner
9 Fernandez. Her hand is raised. I think she may have
10 some solutions for us.
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That would be a negative
12 right now.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: I was hoping, just like you are.
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to make sure
15 that we did include Chapman in. We did get something
16 that just came in regarding the Fullerton student and
17 community split, and it's kind of almost like stairs
18 going up and down. And I'd really have to look at it to
19 try to interpret it to make sense of it because I've
20 got -- I'll come back.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. (Indiscernible,
22 simultaneous speech) --
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But just to make sure that
24 we include Chapman on the Southern portion --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- of the school, yes.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. And then I'm going
3 to ask Commissioner Akutagawa because she also has been
4 looking at the COI very carefully, and Commissioner
5 Andersen as well. So I'm going to be going thru and
6 trying to get some possible solutions here.
7 Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Andersen, other
8 Commissioners who would want to -- we're phoning friends
9 right now. And then of course, our line-drawers have
10 suggestions. Let's go to them.
11 Sivan and Andrew?
12 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Yeah. I was going to say,
13 maybe accept this change. And then I know Commissioner
14 Akutagawa, in the Western part of this where the Sunny
15 High School Hill (sic) is, she had originally moved some
16 of this over to LAOSB. So I think that might be a good
17 population swap.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. You're moving it for us? Yup.
19 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. A swap here, so if we accept
20 the current and wanted to try -- again, it's just a
21 suggestion to --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: I figured Commissioner Akutagawa had
23 a solution for us. That might be a possibility, but I
24 also hear that Commissioner Fernandez has some -- and
25 Commissioner Turner first, Sinay, Fernandez, then

1 Akutagawa. (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I'm going to be a
3 broke -- I'm going to be a broken record, and I just
4 really want (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. But let's go with
6 Commissioner -- we'll do that. Let me just --
7 Commissioner Turner first, and then we'll come to you.
8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was just going to
9 say, I love that the community is watching this time of
10 night. Who would have thought it? And they're giving us
11 real-time feedback. And if the testimony is that Chapman
12 makes no sense, then I'm not sure why we're still using
13 it at least coming in.
14 And so I do -- I would like to maybe try and -- what
15 about Commonwealth or going down? Because I'd like to
16 try to keep as much as possible whole. And can you
17 remind me which direction we're going in? I'm just
18 wondering -- if that boundary is not working -- if it
19 still splits up, can we look at a different boundary
20 before we lock in something?
21 MS. TRATT: Sure. Can I just address that quickly?
22 I think that's definitely -- would potentially be a more
23 productive direction. I think we're moving population in
24 the wrong direction. We're removing population from an
25 already underpopulated district, and it doesn't seem like

1 Commissioners have a strong plan -- or not a strong plan,
2 but just --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
4 MS. TRATT: It doesn't seem like there's an area
5 that would then continue that population swap. So I
6 would suggest maybe looking instead of moving the border
7 North where we could move it South.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I see that Commissioner Kennedy
9 has his hand raised. He might have a swap. And then
10 Commissioner Akutagawa as well. So let's go with Kennedy
11 and then Akutagawa.
12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know,
13 Sivan was reading my mind, I guess. You know, I'm
14 thinking, what about we look at this from the other side?
15 And understanding that I wouldn't be happy with splitting
16 the working-class community in South Fullerton from West
17 Anaheim, but it already is to a large extent -- if we
18 took one of the steps that Commissioner Akutagawa had
19 proposed earlier because I think there is adequate
20 support for moving Stanton from GGC into NOC. Then does
21 that -- how -- does that give us enough -- does that give
22 us enough flexibility to move -- that line in Fullerton
23 North and South as Sivan was saying. Thank you.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And now that we're open
25 to that -- does that address the Fullerton question?

1 Because what got us here was the Fullerton question. So
2 that's what I'm trying to -- and then -- and I'm getting
3 nodding -- nods that are yes. So let's explore that.
4 Akutagawa? Sivan, can you highlight areas that
5 Commissioner Kennedy has suggested and then Akutagawa, do
6 you have additional suggestions. I believe this is --
7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I was --
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we looked at this before. I think
9 it was one of your suggestions before, too?
10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I -- I -- Sivan,
11 could you zoom, like, go out wider so we could see a
12 little bit of the map. I -- I -- so -- so my -- I guess
13 my concern is -- I -- I appreciate that, you know, we're
14 trying to keep Fullerton more whole by moving the border
15 South. The -- the challenge is -- is that that it
16 pinches the, you know, the communities that, you know, we
17 were trying to help in terms of the working class
18 communities. Also, it separates -- it'll begin to then
19 separate the Korean community, the COI that is within La
20 Palma, Buena Park as well, too.
21 And I -- I did read one compelling piece of COI
22 testimony just right now. And -- and I thought I'd just
23 raise it up just as a -- as -- as kind of, like, for your
24 consideration in terms of maybe having to think through
25 this a little bit differently. It -- it came from a

1 religious leader in Fullerton who works with a lot of the
2 low income communities.
3 And -- and his concern -- his very clear concern was
4 that in separating Fullerton between what he called the,
5 you know, the kind of the more working class with the
6 more wealthier ones, he feels that -- his concern is that
7 the city leaders in Fullerton are going to completely
8 ignore that portion of Fullerton. And they're just going
9 to focus on the Assembly member who will be part of the
10 more wealthier areas that will be tied together with
11 Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, and Anaheim Hills.
12 I have to say, that gave me a lot of pause and
13 I'm -- I'm just now trying to reimagine this map in a way
14 that might enable us to keep Fullerton whole and -- and
15 possibly in the NOC district, because then it could
16 hopefully then satisfy two different COIs where you have
17 more of a working class community in that NOC COI along
18 with keeping the Korean-American COI together as well,
19 too.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
21 And thank you for continuously monitoring the COIs.
22 Let's see, Commissioner Kennedy and let's -- and Sivan,
23 can you please zoom in a little bit so we can see this
24 area a little bit closer? My eyes are not as good as
25 they used to be. There we go. Much better.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.
2 And -- and yes, Commissioner Akutagawa. As -- as I had
3 said, I wasn't happy with the idea of, you know,
4 basically diminishing the voices of that working class
5 community in South Fullerton.
6 My question, I guess, to VRA counsel at this point,
7 the SAA district is currently at a negative 1.79. As
8 I -- as I see that, that would give us the ability, if we
9 could do so without significantly lowering the CVAP, to
10 bring in 20 or 25,000 people, which could be precisely
11 that working class, immigrant community in South
12 Fullerton.
13 So I'm -- I'm wondering, you know, do we want to
14 explore adding some territory North of the 91 in South
15 Fullerton to SAA, assuming that a) we don't go over the
16 positive deviation, b) we don't -- we don't make
17 significant change to that CVAP figure. Thank you.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: So if my memory serves me, are the
19 feedback we got from Mr. Becker previously was not to go
20 below the current CVAP given the dynamics in this area
21 and the -- the voting rights analysis that -- his
22 analysis that was given to him provided to the -- the
23 general overview that we got, summary.
24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So perhaps seeing the Latino
25 heat map at this point might be --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. That -- that might be a good
2 idea. Let's look at the heat map for the VRA district.
3 MS. TRATT: One moment, please. Change it from the
4 Black CVAP. And I just wanted to highlight that adding
5 the rest of Fullerton in would be moving about 56,000
6 people.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: And Fullerton is in the NOC?
8 MS. TRATT: The Southern portion of Fullerton is in
9 NOC. I was just highlighting this to see if --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
11 MS. TRATT: -- it was mentioned that perhaps making
12 Fullerton whole was a goal. So I just wanted to provide
13 that extra piece of information.
14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If I could clarify, Chair the
15 idea of making Fullerton whole was to have it in the
16 LAOSB, not in NOC.
17 MS. TRATT: Oh --
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, got it. Got it, got it.
19 MS. TRATT: Let me see the other way what that would
20 be. One second.
21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. And that was -- that
22 was if we had been able to move Stanton. But I was -- I
23 was not seeing the negative sign in front of the GGW
24 deviation. Thank you.
25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So that's about 87,000 people.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So any thoughts about --
2 any thoughts about this region right here. And -- and --
3 re -- so when we got -- let's just start back to where we
4 started. So when we started here, there was a -- there
5 was a request to keep Fullerton or make Fullerton whole.
6 And that was from COI testimony that we had been
7 receiving. I've also heard that there's additional COI
8 testimony now that -- that -- so I'm trying to get
9 clarity now on what the goal here is. Because I -- I
10 know we've -- we've changed it a couple of times and I
11 just want to -- or maybe it's all the same and I'm just
12 losing track. So can -- can we get -- can we get clarity
13 on the goal here? What -- what are we trying to
14 accomplish here, Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner
15 Sadhwani and then we can think about a solution that --
16 that gets us to the goal because -- Commissioner
17 Akutagawa or Commissioner Sadhwani?
18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I -- I thought I
19 asked this question. Instead of trying to -- and I know
20 LAOSB is -- is short. But I'm wondering if we could
21 bring in some of the other cities in South Orange county,
22 you know, some of the mountain or foothill communities
23 and combine them with, perhaps with the LAOSB or, for
24 example, would it throw it off if we were to move --
25 yeah, some of those mountain, like in the inland OCRC,

1 just to -- just to boost up that deviation.
2 So then, my thought was that we move Cypress into
3 the Garden Grove district, the GGW, since it has a minus
4 4.68 percent deviation. I -- I don't know if moving that
5 into that district would then create space for the
6 entirety of Fullerton to just be in there? And then I --
7 again, it goes back to uniting two COIs.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Uniting two -- so the goal
9 here -- let me -- let me try to paraphrase that. I think
10 we got it from Commissioner Akutagawa. The goal here is
11 to unite two COIs through the unification of Fullerton.
12 If that's the ultimate outcome that this Commission
13 wants, I'll be looking for nods of heads or somehow --
14 I'm not seeing any, so Commissioner Sadhwani, you --
15 your -- yours was a no so I'm trying to understand what
16 the goal is in this area.
17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, it's not that it's a
18 definite no. I mean, if there's a way to keep Fullerton
19 together, that's great. But again, as I said with the
20 previous exploration, like, without blowing up the maps.
21 And I -- I'm not sure that I'm seeing the path forward to
22 do that. My -- my goal had been to clean up this -- this
23 cut through Fullerton so that it better respect the --
24 the testimony that we've received. And to me, that --
25 that's been testimony predominantly around educational

1 institutions, as well as the Korean-American community.
2 I think the Korean-American community is fairly well kept
3 together. They've used North Parks (sic) as the boundary
4 that we've been told. I believe that my understanding of
5 the maps is that -- is that not North Parks right there?
6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. So -- so in that
8 sense, the Korean-American community, I believe is fairly
9 well kept within that NOC district. I think it's just a
10 question of, can we clean up that Chapman Avenue to put
11 in more of Cal State Fullerton and Fullerton College
12 without, you know, completely decimating the -- the
13 deviations. I'm not sure if there's a way of doing that,
14 right, because we're already at negative 3.87.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Sadhwani, can you
16 help me reconcile your goal and that -- the goal that was
17 stated by Commissioner Akutagawa to unite all of
18 Fullerton and see if there's some kind of reconcile, too?
19 I'm just trying figure out is there's what the final
20 outcome is so we can help each other achieve it.
21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I think it's trying to
22 keep all of Fullerton whole, which is going to set off
23 numerous changes around -- potentially in -- in other
24 parts of the OC portions of the map. Or if it's a
25 reasonable swap that doesn't completely send our

1 deviations off, cleaning up this line and bring it -- I
2 think it's bring it up from Chapman. We've already --
3 we've already explored Bastanchury and that was way too
4 much. I see another road up there.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: And I thought we had received some
6 COI testimony that Chapman wasn't the line that we were
7 to be looking at. I thought -- I thought Commissioner
8 Turner -- and this is why I'm a little bit confused,
9 because I -- I -- I thought there was some testimony --
10 conflicting testimony here. So I'm trying to understand
11 what the goal is. Commissioner Fernandez, Fornaciari,
12 let's figure out what the goal is and -- and --
13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I'm just going to
14 respond to it. We can't bring the line up, because it's
15 already at a negative. And it'll just make it a higher
16 negative. It has to go the opposite -- so I was
17 actually -- what Commissioner Akutagawa said about
18 Cypress, I was thinking that might be enough population
19 to open it up in order allow the line to go up -- or
20 down, yeah, down, down.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Thank you, Commissioner
22 Fernandez --
23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that's helpful. Did you still
25 your hand up, Commissioner Sadhwani or no? Okay. So

1 we're looking at Cypress right now? So a swap with
2 Cypress potentially. Commissioner Fornaciari, I'm
3 phoning a friend, any advice here for the group?
4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Nope -- yeah, but the
5 population is too big. For some reason I thought it was
6 25,000.
7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So the population is too
8 big. I need time to think about these things --
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.
10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- I mean, like
11 Commissioner Fernandez is saying, I mean, if we move the
12 line down to Chapman, you know, we've heard, you know,
13 one piece of input that that wasn't a good idea. Okay.
14 Let's just be real. It -- it at least looks like it puts
15 the -- put the universities together, maybe. I don't
16 know the details. But --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: So how about, may I suggest one thing
18 and maybe -- how about, and this is a suggestion for us
19 just to keep it moving. How about we -- individually we
20 have this map, we can look at it and start -- and think
21 about this while -- and give each other time to think
22 about this while we go down to -- to San Diego and have
23 Commissioner Sinay work through her -- the change in Mira
24 Mesa -- I forgot the neighborhood, Commissioner Sinay.
25 They -- they change -- the slight refinement I'm being

1 told in San Diego. If that gives Commissioners some
2 times to -- to think through this area and try to come up
3 with some concrete -- some concrete direction for the
4 line drawers on how to achieve the goal while we do a --
5 a small refinement in -- in San Diego County. How does
6 that sound? Or -- or I'm happy to stay here. I'm happy
7 to go down there. Just to give people time to think
8 through this.
9 Commissioner Fornaciari? Fernandez?
10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, I liked what -- at
11 least with doing the Chapman, it does keep the
12 universities together and it does even out both
13 districts. I don't know where the true -- true
14 boundaries are for the housing. But I -- I feel that
15 this is still at least better than where it currently is.
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner, or -- or rather,
17 Sivan, do you have some advice for us?
18 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I -- I just wanted to point out
19 that I had visualized this change that Commissioner
20 Fornaciari was talking about. If folks are feeling
21 unhappy with Chapman, we could also look at moving to
22 Commonwealth, but I think that this is the right
23 direction to be moving population in. Just in terms of
24 accomplishing the Commission's goals.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. What is the Commission's

1 thought on -- thoughts on these areas?
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I like it.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: How about everyone else, consensus
4 here? Do we all like this? Well, I'm get -- I'm seeing
5 yeses. Any one doesn't like it? Anyone who -- I'm
6 hearing from -- let's hear from Akutagawa.
7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, there -- some of the
8 recent COI testimony also attached, I guess, the
9 Fullerton City Council district maps and there was --
10 there was one that particularly circled that kind of Cal
11 State-Fullerton area and said that, I guess, more of it
12 should go South. I know it just complicates things, but
13 I -- I thought I'd just mention that. I -- I'm trying to
14 figure out another path forward here, so --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Are you in support of this as well
16 or -- or do you want to do this in addition to that or --
17 or this does get us appropriate deviations.
18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think that at
19 least gives us a place start. So I think yes.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's -- let's start here
21 because I'm seeing a lot of yeses. So we'll -- let's
22 accept these and if we want to continue to look for
23 additional, we -- we will. Commissioner Fernandez,
24 Sadhwani, we are I believe are -- our deviations are
25 looking better.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: They are. I was just going
2 to ask Sivan if she could just highlight the Commonwealth
3 area to see how -- what that -- what those percentages
4 were?
5 MS. TRATT: Yeah. One moment, please.
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We have Commissioner
8 Akutagawa, Commissioner Sadhwani in the queue.
9 Commissioner Sadhwani, while we're visualizing this?
10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Maybe the
11 Commonwealth piece will do it. I just wanted to zoom in
12 on Fullerton College, because I -- I do think that
13 Chapman is cutting straight into it. So even if we use
14 Chapman but make a little carve out for -- for Fullerton
15 College, perhaps. But I think this might be doing it.
16 Commissioner Fernandez is on it because I'm tired.
17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I think between the
18 two of us, we might get it right.
19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm going in the wrong
20 direction.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: This is looking good. Commissioner
22 Fornaciari? You're all doing great. Or we're all doing
23 great, I should say.
24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. We're pretty close
25 to the limit. I was wondering if, you know, where I'm

waiting my mouse. If -- to -- the East might be some college housing or something, but we're almost at -- at the limit here. I just be interesting -- interested in hearing feedback on how we did on the colleges.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was kind of thinking the same thing, Commissioner Fornaciari. And I also have my mouse pointing right there. So I'm sure you could read my mouse, Sivan.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think Euclid, Commissioner Fernandez?

MS. TRATT: So just -- I moved -- it was previously as far West as Euclid. Just to see if we could add this area. I just shifted things to the East. So this now goes as far South as Fender Ave. And it goes slightly South on South State College Boulevard because it looks like that's where Commonwealth Ave. actually ends.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: How about just one more. I'm going to be picky. This is my type A. Just one more street over on the -- on the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We love your type A, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, no, no, the other way -- other way -- other way.

MS. TRATT: Oh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Other way, sorry.

1 MS. TRATT: Oh, okay.
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, no. That next one.
3 Right there where you're -- nope, over -- over to your
4 right. More. One more.
5 MS. TRATT: So cut it here?
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No one -- one more to
7 your -- to your left. No, actually that might -- no,
8 because that's Fullerton. One more --
9 MS. TRATT: Okay, I'm --
10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: One more major street.
11 MS. TRATT: To the -- include in the red or --
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. To take out --
13 MS. TRATT: Oh, okay.
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.
15 MS. TRATT: This is --
16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No.
17 MS. TRATT: No? Farther to the -- this way --
18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, actually that one
19 might work -- that might -- that might work, yeah.
20 MS. TRATT: Okay. I just wanted to point out that
21 if you did want to go all the way to Euclid it would be
22 at 4 point -- excuse me 4.49. So this is -- as it is
23 now, is permissible. But I can still cut it back if you
24 would like.
25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't know. I think -- I

1 don't know. What does everyone else think? I was
2 actually thinking of going further out. But if it works,
3 I -- I really wanted to make sure that we did include
4 Fullerton College and the University.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So -- so just so I understand the
6 goal again, like, what's the goal that we're trying to
7 achieve?
8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So the goal that I was
9 trying to achieve here is with CSU, University of
10 Fullerton, there's also some housing, because I wanted to
11 make sure that we accounted for the housing. And then
12 for the Fullerton College. It was the same type -- same
13 concept. And it also trying to ensure that we're
14 including the entire universities and colleges.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. And we did have community of
16 interest testimony regarding -- regarding this so this
17 sounds like a plausible idea. Let's see if we have
18 consensus around this. Commissioner Sinay?
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I -- I just want us to be
20 careful on the neck again. We've been working -- we've
21 been good on necks, but the further we go South, the more
22 that neck is -- with that little blip going up.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: So -- so which neck are you referring
24 to. I'm trying to --
25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This right in here --

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that one, okay --
2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- where the Costco wholesale
3 is.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's get dale on the line and see if
5 he can talk to us about compactness. It looks very
6 compact to me whenever we zoom out.
7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Dale.
8 MR. LARSON: The Commission's favorite legal issue
9 to discuss is necks.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: We love compactness. And we like to
11 be compact. Go on.
12 MR. LARSON: That one, if that change is adopted, I
13 am okay with that one.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sometimes you can't, right? That's
15 when you're doing VRA districts? You have to --
16 compactness is one of the lower ranking requirements.
17 All right.
18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: He says he likes the neck.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: He likes the neck. We had a lot of
20 neck talk today.
21 MS. TRATT: Can I go ahead and make this, Chair?
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm seeing a lot of yeses and
23 let's -- I want to -- I just want to make sure that we're
24 all in support because it's getting late and let's take a
25 look at this closely to make sure that we're all in

alignment.

So this is college area, Fullerton College, if I'm understanding this correctly. Housing and COI area here that we'd like to keep together. And it seems like we have general consensus on this so let's move forward.

MS. TRATT: Okay. And I'd like to also point out that is portion is not technically Chapman Ave., it's Malvem Ave., so for the folks that were complaining about the Southern border being Chapman, technically speaking, we have accomplished that. So hats off to you all.

Would you like me to move down to San Diego again or zoom --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Are we -- are we complete with Fullerton area. I just want to hear from the Commission because there was -- many of you said you wanted to work on Fullerton. We got to work on Fullerton. Let's see if we completed our work in Fullerton. Can you scroll back so we can look at the whole district that we just modified to make sure that it -- that is actually is what we wanted. I believe it is. It achieves our compliance goals. It unifies an important COI identified by the Commission. And it looks reasonable to me. Everyone in support before we move forward or move back to San Diego for a quick refinement?

Okay. So I don't want to keep us too much longer.

1 And so the plan for the rest of this meeting is, we're
2 going to go San Diego for a quick refinement of the -- my
3 understanding is it's a quick refinement. And then after
4 that, we're going to go and I'm being told by our line
5 drawers, it's going to be a 30 minutes in Los Angeles to
6 look at some of the refinements requested and -- and then
7 we get to go sleep. So that be an incentive for being
8 efficient, is that we get sleep. And we get to give
9 everybody an opportunity to rest.
10 And also we will have finished all of the areas in
11 California. And we will only be looking at some of
12 the -- we will have actually approved every area of
13 California and -- and so we have a completed map. We may
14 have to come back and do some minor refinements, but we
15 have an approved -- we will have a completed State map --
16 approved map to -- to show the public.
17 Commissioner Sinay, you're -- we're in Orange
18 county, Mira --
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We are in San Diego, actually,
20 in Mira Mesa.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. Thank you. Thank you so
22 much. Mira Mesa. There we go.
23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I knew -- I -- I apologize that
24 I didn't get this right earlier. I -- I knew that I had
25 the whole plan and I didn't look at my notes. So if we

could -- the goal here is to use Rancho Penasquitos Creek as the line and -- and make Mira Masa whole and swap it with Carmel Valley. So Carmel Valley would go into -- let's see, would it work -- go into San Diego Coast because it's in the same school district as San Diego Coast. So you -- instead of using the 56 both for the Central -- for Central, you'd use Rancho Penasquitos and then Mira Mesa would go up and then Carmel Valley down, I think. Let me see this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Sinay, just I -- I'm -- I'm trying to figure out what the goal. The goal is to unify Mira Marr?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Mira Mesa.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Mira Mesa, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we're going to unify -- the goal is to unify Mira Mesa because it's split right now --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- so use Penasquitos line, you also unify Carmel Valley, cause it's split with the 56. And -- and Carmel Valley is part of the same school district with -- with the coastal -- San Diego Coast.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I did see the COI testimony that those communities wanted to be together -- came in a couple -- about 30 minutes ago.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Mira Mesa is part of the Asian
2 business COI. It was the one piece we didn't get in
3 before and I was, like, I know that I did this before and
4 I couldn't remember --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's take a look at our
6 deviations --
7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- a reminder.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- as soon as possible. So with the
9 shaded, we would throw off our deviation in the Central
10 San Diego by a little bit. So this would require some
11 refinement in the --
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well --
13 MS. TRATT: It would be a swap, correct?
14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. It's a swap.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we have -- we have some
16 friends who want to help us out so Fornaciari, any ideas
17 for swaps?
18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. But I just -- I
19 just want to make sure, Patricia, you were talking about
20 moving Carmel Valley with a coast, right? With, like,
21 Del Mar Heights? If we did that --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's right.
23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- then we -- then we'd
24 have to rotate some population out of -- out of the coast
25 into ESC-BONS-RAI because -- because ESC-BONS-RAI is

1 almost three percent negative. And so we'd move that
2 down. We'd move some over. And we'd have to from the
3 coast into ESC-BONS-RAI to come out even.
4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Now -- a I was doing
5 this I was, wait, there's three districts, not two.
6 Correct? Is that why I'm -- my brain's not working? I
7 got Neal and they are both on the same line and both of
8 them are bobbing up and down at me. Okay, guys, I got
9 it.
10 Okay. So that -- can -- can we leave this to the
11 line drawers just to explore a little bit, if there is a
12 way to make Mira Mesa whole and --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's figure out what our goal --
14 our goal is to get Mira Mesa a whole and to tend to
15 rotate some population and commit --
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. and Mr. -- or Andrew?
18 MR. DRECHSLER: Would it -- would it be okay as
19 Commissioner Fornaciari suggested, to move Carmel Valley
20 to ESC-BONS-RAI district? So swap - swap between the two
21 districts. So add -- add the Central and then add to
22 ESC.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: So just to do a swap and that would
24 potentially correct the deviation --
25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I mean it wouldn't be

1 awesome, but it would at least give Mira Mesa -- give
2 that business district to be whole. It -- it doesn't
3 deal with the -- the school district being cut, but the
4 school district is cut several times down here, I'm
5 noticing. So yeah, sure.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: You can live with that? Can the
7 Commission live with that? It's a swap between --
8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's only the school -- it's
9 only the school -- my school district, but yeah.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. I'm -- I'm looking to see if
11 everyone can live with, potentially a swap here
12 connecting the business district of -- of Asian business
13 district COI and -- and some population in -- towards the
14 coast. Let's see if -- from Commissioner Fornaciari,
15 Commissioner Fernandez?
16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I -- I'm just going to
17 wait and see.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's wait and see what -- how
19 this works out. So Commissioner Fernandez --
20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to ask --
21 Yeah, I just wanted to ask Commissioner Sinay -- you
22 mentioned it's a school district? Are we breaking up the
23 school district? For the swap?
24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. That school district's
25 already a mess, I've noticed. The swap isn't breaking it

1 up. It's actually putting it a little bit more together.
2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's a large school district, I take
5 it, Commissioner Sinay? Okay.
6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sivan -- oh, yeah.
8 Sorry, Commissioner Sinay. Please respond.
9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, Rancho Santa Fe, Solano
10 Beach, Del Mar, Carmel Valley, Solano Beach, Encinitas,
11 and parts of Carlsbad.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. There's no way to keep all of
13 that together. All right. So Sivan? Especially in the
14 Assembly.
15 MS. SIVAN: Well, currently the swap is keeping in
16 about 25,000 people from this Carmel Valley area, the
17 Southern boundary being Carmel Mountain Road. And then I
18 could -- I don't believe there's any population, but I
19 could snap it back to the creek if that is desired.
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the creek --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay -- yeah.
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: The creek is what's used as the
23 official boundary, so --
24 MS. SIVAN: Yeah. It didn't change anything, so
25 if --

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.
2 MS. SIVAN: -- you'd prefer it to be there -- yeah,
3 that's great. Yeah. Should I commit this change?
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Does it get us to the acceptable
5 deviations?
6 MS. SIVAN: It does, yeah. The Escondido District
7 would be at -2.33, and Central San Diego would be at
8 2.89.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: I've never seen a refinement that --
10 we say it's going to be quick and it actually is. So I'm
11 hopeful. So Commissioner Fornaciari, let's be hopeful.
12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Do you want to go --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: What's your comment?
14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Do you want to get that
15 little corner that would keep the creek to 5 there? That
16 seemed like it was all part of it.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: And then, of course, Commissioner
18 Fernandez, let's continue to be helpful.
19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, no, the type A wants to
20 get that corner, too.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, good, good, yeah. Oh, we love
22 your type A. Can't imagine not having a type A. Well,
23 we have a lot of type A's. So love working with the type
24 A's.
25 MS. SIVAN: All right. Those changes are committed,

1 Chair.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.

3 MS. SIVAN: The deviations --

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Our deviations are corrected,

5 Commissioner Sinay, so we've achieved our goal here.

6 Let's take a --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) real quick?

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Commissioner Sinay, do you

9 have your hand raised? And then, I'll check in with our

10 line drawers while you're checking in.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just because we have them

12 everywhere, I'll just point out the neck that seems to be

13 here along the coastal area.

14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's take a look at that neck --

15 let's just get -- it looks compact to me, though, but

16 let's just verify with Dale, because we are --

17 compactness, although one of the lower ranking issues, we

18 take very seriously up in California Citizens

19 Redistricting Commission. So Dale, your opinion?

20 MR. LARSON: I'm okay with that one.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: I figured you would be. Thank you,

22 Dale.

23 MR. LARSON: You're welcome.

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. Everything looks good in

25 Southern -- we've completed Southern California. Hopeful

that we might be getting some additional refinements for the coast in Orange County. Let's go towards Los Angeles. We're going to do a swap. And this should be a quick thirty minutes, is what I'm told, because we're going to go see it. We're going to see if we love it and then we're going to -- I am very hopeful that we will love it. Because I see some faces here, and everyone wants to go to bed. And then once we're done with that, we will have approved all of our -- we'll have consensus -- general consensus on all of our districts across the state. Certainly, there might be a couple of small refinements that we will look at, but then we wouldn't do that until Monday, and they would be -- if we couldn't actually achieve those, because those refinements -- what we have is what we are going to be pushing forward.

So let's switch over to Los Angeles County.

MR. DRECHSLER: Chair, if I could just -- one question, if we could work the refinement with Seal Beach and Huntington, if we could work with Commissioner Akutagawa to make that refinement to add Seal Beach. I think that was one of the original changes that --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, so let's take a look at the coast and see if there's any refinements that we can do in the coast. So yes, please work with Commissioner

1 Akutagawa.

2 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. We'll work off-line with her

3 on that.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we'll bring it back and see if

5 there's any way to do it without major impact to our

6 maps, because at this point we have approved -- maps that

7 we have general consensus on, and so we will -- we'll

8 look at the refinements on Monday.

9 Commissioner Akutagawa?

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Well, my question

11 was really going to be, would you be open to my working

12 with the line drawers also on Fullerton to try to make it

13 so that it can balance out, but we can try to keep it

14 whole, given the testimony? I know we have a compromise

15 right now. And I think if we can't find anything better,

16 we'll just go with it, but I would like to try to see if

17 I could just maybe talk with them --

18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's ask the Commission if folks are

19 comfortable with trying to -- because I know we have a

20 compromise right now. If folks are comfortable with

21 trying to unify all of Fullerton if it's possible. Is

22 that something we're interested in looking at,

23 Commission? Yes? No? Maybe? I don't see anything

24 either way. Anyone opposed? Commissioner Sinay, I'm not

25 seeing a yes, I'm seeing more of a no. No, like, I can't

1 really tell, actually.

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's comme si, comme ca. Sure.

3 Go for it.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So I think -- I didn't see any

5 yes's and I didn't see any no's, so to me that's, let's

6 try.

7 MR. LARSON: I would just -- sorry, Chair. I would

8 just request --

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible, simultaneous

10 speech) --

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

12 MR. LARSON: I would just request that, obviously,

13 it's a sensitive area in terms of the Voting Rights Act,

14 both the area itself and the neighboring districts which

15 are VRA districts. So to the extent a major change to

16 Fullerton's going to be made, I would request that VRA

17 counsel be consulted with through that process.

18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely, and especially

19 because that whole area there is so difficult as we saw

20 as we tried to do that with the coast, the VRA districts

21 and other considerations, so yes, so please work very

22 closely with VRA counsel, line drawers, and Commissioner

23 Akutagawa, and let's see if there's anything that's

24 possible. And we'll bring it back and see if it's

25 something that we can live with as a Commission. But

1 right now, we can live with the maps that we have, and
2 that is what we would move forward with if we don't all
3 agree on the refinements that come back.
4 Commissioner Turner?
5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, I'm fine with
6 Commissioner Akutagawa working on the Seal Beach. I
7 thought earlier you gave direction, or Sadhwani
8 volunteered to work on the other, but either way it goes
9 is fine. My main point for raising my hand is I was
10 hoping we'd go ahead and take that break before we start
11 Los Angeles since we're at break time.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's take a break -- let's
13 take a fifteen-minute break. And Commissioner Sadhwani,
14 were you already working on Fullerton, because if that's
15 the case --
16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I had offered, but --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, you had offered?
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Either way.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: So maybe you can come up with a
20 solution separately, because we're supposed to be doing
21 it separately. So if you can come up with a solution to
22 make that, and maybe Akutagawa, also, and let's see what
23 we come up with and we'll bring it back. The more
24 solutions the better.
25 All right. Let's take a break and then -- at this

1 point, Orange County and the rest of Southern California
2 is complete. We're going to go to Los Angeles next.
3 Thank you. Fifteen-minute break. Fifteen -- one-five.
4 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 9:45 p.m.
5 until 10:00 p.m.)
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back, California, and
7 Commissioners. We are working through the Los Angeles
8 maps that we have been getting quite a bit of feedback
9 from the community. Thank you so much. They were posted
10 late last night and early this morning, as well in our
11 district viewer, and we're getting quite a bit of
12 feedback. Mostly positive, I want to say, so I'm glad
13 you guys are chiming in and letting us know that you are
14 appreciating our maps. Our maps are pretty impressive.
15 I mean, I was just looking through these and so many of
16 the community goals and the goals set by the Commission
17 were met. Actually, the goals that we set for this map
18 were -- and I think it's just incredible what we were
19 able to accomplish. We accomplished our three goals that
20 we set out to do, and so Jaime, please walk us through,
21 the incredible work that you've been able to do. I just
22 can't imagine having -- I can't say enough great things
23 about you and the team. So walk us through Los Angeles
24 County. We're hoping to get an overview within thirty
25 minutes so that the public can see what we have done with

1 the refinements, and then hopefully get some sleep.
2 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Would you like me to do an
3 overview of all of the districts or just the change --
4 because we sort of did a brief overview yesterday. I
5 barely just made some small changes since then. Please
6 let me know if you'd like me to review the whole thing
7 on, like, a broader scale, or just kind of look at those
8 smaller changes.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: We're just so proud of the work that
10 you're doing. I want to hear it all, but let's just for
11 now, because you already gave us the overview and we're
12 all -- and it's been posted and we've all been looking at
13 it very carefully, let's focus on the areas the
14 Commission asked you to refine and see if we're
15 comfortable with those refinements.
16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Sure. Thank you. So I got
17 direction to split Culver City at the 405. I did that,
18 so all the parts of Culver City that are East of the 405
19 are in the N10 District, and everything that's West of
20 the 405 is in the ADWESTSIDE district.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: And that was feedback from
22 Commissioner Vazquez to try to even out the lines and
23 ensure that the COIs are kept together. Thank you so
24 much, Jaime.
25 MS. CLARK: Yeah. That's correct. And then

1 additionally from Commissioner Kennedy got direction to
2 keep Greater Toluca Lake and North Hollywood together,
3 and so the line in North Hollywood got moved North, and
4 so now, those two neighborhood council areas are in the
5 South San Fernando Valley-based district. And that is
6 really the extent of the changes. They are both minor,
7 and everything is within the plus or minus five percent
8 deviation. I'll just do the map out to get a bigger
9 view.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: All the districts meet the deviation
11 requirements. They also meet the three goals set forward
12 by the -- set forth by the Commission, and in terms of
13 districts and VRA. And so with that, let's hear from the
14 Commissioners on potential refinements, and we are
15 looking at refinements of these -- the input that I'm
16 getting is so positive that I am seeing. And I know
17 there was some feedback from the San Fernando Valley and
18 other places, but let's start -- Commissioner Akutagawa
19 and then Commissioner Taylor.
20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I appreciate, Jaime,
21 all the work that you've done, and I think we're getting
22 to a really good place. I know that there's been some
23 additional concerns raised about perhaps some packing of
24 Black COIs and Chair, I don't know how you want to handle
25 that. Is this something that we can try further

1 refinements?

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can I --

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But I wanted to lift that

4 up.

5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you say again what you said?

6 Because I missed your statement.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh. I think we're getting

8 some additional feedback on concerns about packing of

9 Black COIs and -- instead of trying to distribute the

10 communities a little bit more throughout more of the

11 districts -- but I don't know how you want to handle

12 that.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's go to counsel on that in

14 terms of packing. So let's go to the -- which of the

15 districts in the Los Angeles region where we have larger

16 African-American concentrations, and see if there's any

17 issues, Counsel.

18 MR. LARSON: I haven't seen that specific feedback.

19 I'd be happy to take a look at it and we can do some

20 analysis off-line on it.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: And of course, all of our maps go

22 through compliance review. So far, there have not been

23 any compliance issues that have been raised to myself or

24 the Commission regarding these issues, but we continue to

25 analyze our maps as we get feedback, and of course, as we

make changes to them.

Commissioner Taylor and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Just something small. Jaime, if you could pull out. Can you go to Wrightwood? It should be -- I think it's in the 210 corridor, so it's North, by Big Bear, Pinon Hills. There you go. Yeah. Right there. Is there any way -- and it might not meet the population deviation -- any way we can put Wrightwood on the San Bernardino side?

MS. CLARK: Would you like me to explore that change now?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Just something real quick if the Commission is in agreement.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's highlight it. And that is -- can you --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Based on communities of interest, and that's a -- their input wants to be with Pinon Hills and Phelan. They have a similar industry. And that's on that side of the mountain. Their resources come from San Bernardino.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concern with this change? It's a minor change. It's not, as far as I can tell -- my eyes are giving out at this late of night, but as far as I can tell, the deviations still stay well within -- oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, there we go -- five, five.

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yep. Thank you for highlighting. I
3 was missing that.
4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Deviations go a little bit over.
6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So we need that -- we need
7 that population on the 210 side.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We would need population on
9 the 210 side --
10 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we'd have to do a swap.
12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: So if there's any swap that you can
14 think of, we could --
15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, I really can't. Based on
16 the work that we've done, respective to what we've done,
17 I do not see the swap, unless someone else sees something
18 else. But I don't see -- from the work that we've
19 already done. I'm not trying to undo anything at all.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: And 210 is one of our districts that
21 we are trying to not take any --
22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah.
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's --
24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Correct.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: But if there's a swap, that would be

1 awesome. Commissioner Turner?

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I just

3 wanted to bring up the "packing" that was used, so I

4 don't think it's in the same way we would consider

5 packing. And I will for sure ensure that our counsel

6 receives this latest COI that came in. But I think it

7 was just trying to balance out some of the areas that had

8 some of the same concerns about historical disinvestment,

9 so forth and so on. And it's in that 105, I think it is,

10 corridor -- in the 105 corridor where we are showing --

11 yep, 105 on there, it's showing a Black CVAP with 39.51.

12 And so there is some suggestions about moving around just

13 a couple of streets and differences, so I would -- it

14 would take longer to figure out all of the CVAP variances

15 and to ensure. But we have it in written format and

16 perhaps we can send it through and have just someone take

17 a look at it and see if we can make those changes without

18 having to make major alterations to the plan.

19 CHAIR TOLEDO: So these would be economic changes

20 due to economic status and housing and --

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

22 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- essential workforce? Yes. So

23 let's get those to our line drawers so that they can look

24 at potential refinements, minor refinements in this area

25 to ensure some balancing of the essential workforce and

1 to get them into the same districts. And we want to make
2 sure all people are represented fairly, and that we have
3 fair maps for California and for the Los Angeles region.
4 Let's see, Commissioner Vazquez?
5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Turner basically
6 made the same point. I just wanted to reiterate; I don't
7 think that this is a VRA compliance issue. It's not a
8 VRA area, but there are communities of interest regarding
9 sort of historical disinvestments that I think we'd want
10 to address with some minor refinements, hopefully.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Lots of homelessness in this area,
12 lots of disinvestment issues, lots of economic issues,
13 business opportunity issues, that need to be addressed.
14 And we want to make sure that their voices are heard
15 across all of this region, actually. Commissioner
16 Taylor, Turner, then Akutagawa. Other refinements and/or
17 changes? Any other?
18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. No, sorry, Pedro. My
19 delay as always, but thank you.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, no worries. No worries.
21 Akutagawa?
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just wanted to say to
23 Commissioner Turner, much, much more eloquent than myself
24 in terms of expressing or communicating some of the
25 concerns. So thank you for that. Yes, Chair, there are

1 a number of very knotty issues in Los Angeles facing
2 communities that are beyond just economic, too. And I
3 think we've all tried to ensure that we want to make --
4 ensure that communities are going to be well represented
5 to address a lot of these issues. So thank you for that.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I did want to take a
7 look at the San Fernando Valley, because we have been
8 getting some feedback from the San Fernando Valley about
9 business communities, as well as essential workforce
10 communities out there, and just make sure that we have
11 districts that adequately reflect the population here,
12 and meet the needs of the population. Any feedback on
13 the San Fernando Valley or this area right here? And
14 then we'll go onto the others. San Fernando Valley?
15 Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have feedback here? Nope?
16 Okay. Fernandez, feedback on the San Fernando Valley?
17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I was just a different
18 question, so I can wait.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, could you go through the San
20 Fernando Valley and the districts that we have just to
21 make sure that we are -- review them thoroughly and make
22 sure that they meet the needs of our Commission? Make
23 sure that we have solid maps for the San Fernando Valley,
24 which is such a critical part of the Los Angeles region.
25 Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Turner, and

1 then Commissioner Kennedy.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I did

3 forward that testimony to staff to ensure that the line

4 drawers get it, but want to make sure that either myself

5 or someone else that's more comfortable with the area

6 actually have an ability to work with them so that we'll

7 stay within the goals that we've already had while making

8 adjustments.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: I just want to make sure that we have

10 a general consensus to move forward with potential

11 refinements in the districts outlined. It looks -- yes?

12 So Commissioner Turner, if you would work with our line

13 drawers, and bring that back and then we can talk about

14 it at our next meeting. Thank you. Commissioner

15 Kennedy?

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I had

17 initially raised my hand while we were still on the South

18 side. I just --

19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry about that. We can go back

20 there, and then we'll come back.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I just wanted to ask

22 Jaime if she could talk us through what was or was not

23 possible as far as looking at the Florence-Graham

24 neighborhood and the request from there to group them

25 better with Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and similar

1 communities. Thank you.
2 MS. CLARK: Thank you for that question. So that
3 specific trade brought up some deviation issues for
4 ADGATEWAY. And then additionally, just based on some
5 direction from the Commission around -- basically,
6 looking at population trades, and trying to keep Gateway
7 cities together, trying to maintain San Pedro with
8 Northern cities. For example, just in looking at the
9 population trade possibilities -- that is very difficult
10 to accomplish, and meeting the Commission's other goals
11 in this area.
12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Just following up --
13 one of the -- one of the ideas, and I don't know -- I
14 don't recall how well developed the idea ever got to
15 be -- but the idea of kind of switching populations,
16 reorienting the slants of ADGATEWAY and AD5 corridor so
17 that you would put, like, Lakewood and Bellflower with
18 Norwalk, La Mirada, South Whittier, Whittier, La Habra
19 kind of thing, and grouping Vernon, South Gate, Commerce,
20 Montebello over on that side. That seems to make more
21 sense as far as the groupings of communities, but we all
22 understand population constraints. I just wondered if
23 you had been able to explore, kind of that regrouping of
24 communities? Thank you.
25 MS. CLARK: I'm having a tough time recalling if in

1 some visualization long ago we had something like that.
2 I had received direction from the Commission to try and
3 kind of use 710 as -- like, to use freeways as
4 connectors, I guess, in this area, specifically, in these
5 districts, so that's kind of how they are as they are
6 now. I am just trying to think about, like, the
7 population tradeoffs and just the shape of this. I have
8 a feeling right now that the -- like, if the goal is to
9 keep Downey, Santa Fe Springs and Norwalk together, then
10 just based on the shape of these districts, then that one
11 might end up being overpopulated. And if this is a goal
12 for the Commission, it's something I can certainly look
13 at.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we also get legal counsel just
15 because this involves a VRA district? I want to make
16 sure we get a legal opinion on this area, because I'm
17 sure that this is an area that is of concern.
18 MR. LARSON: We have a pretty healthy CVAP in both
19 of these two VRA districts. If we're talking about
20 swapping populations within these two, and not impacting
21 the districts around there, I think there are ways it
22 could be done. My main concern would be to make sure
23 that that 71.97 percent CVAP doesn't go up. I'd start to
24 have concerns if that gets too high.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: And these are pretty dense and

1 pretty -- minority populations tend to be -- especially
2 in Latino and African-American communities -- tend to be
3 clustered, and others as well. All right. Commissioner
4 Fernandez, Akutagawa, and Sadhwani.
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm sorry if --
6 Jaime, if you already mentioned this. Were you able
7 to -- that POSO boundary. I can't remember if it was in
8 the Assembly -- I know it was -- two of the three maps it
9 was incorrect. Or I shouldn't say incorrect. I think we
10 had the incorrect information.
11 MS. CLARK: Yeah. So the --
12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, you straightened.
13 MS. CLARK: The split here is on Oxnard.
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jaime.
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: Love your type A, Commissioner
16 Fernandez.
17 MS. CLARK: She's the best.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa?
19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to go back to
20 those VRA districts again, too.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And just for the record, I
23 don't think we had a visualization of this grouping of
24 cities, and certainly not one that grouped Bell Flower,
25 Downey, Norwalk, South Whittier, La Mirada -- that

1 grouping. I recall I did say that the Gateway cities,
2 specifically like Vernon, Bell, Maywood, Cudahy, Bell
3 Gardens, and Paramount could also go in that district,
4 too, if you needed to balance population some more.
5 Those would be a better match, and it could go with
6 Montebello as well, too. I think either way, I mean,
7 it's fine, but it would -- it's just one of those where
8 it could just be a little bit better. But if you don't
9 want to make the change, I think it could work.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, any thoughts about the
11 tradeoffs of rotating population at this point?
12 MS. CLARK: Just based on the shapes and where
13 population is, yeah. Again, I don't have, like, a firm
14 answer right now, and if the goal is to keep Downey,
15 Santa Fe Springs, and Norwalk together, just based on
16 where -- like, their physical location and also the
17 populations there, then I'm not sure it would be an equal
18 trade in terms of population. And if it's something that
19 the Commission wishes to explore, then I am happy to look
20 at that.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to say, I
23 think if you're able to do it, it would make for a more
24 compact district in both cases.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: If we're able to do what,

1 Commissioner Akutagawa? I'm just trying to --
2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, making that rotation --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, a rotation?
4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- to put, like -- yeah,
5 Montebello, Commerce, yeah, with Paramount. It would
6 make for a more squat or compact district.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do we have COI information on this?
8 Like the reason for the (indiscernible) rotation? It may
9 be more logical, but I'm trying to see what the COI data
10 is so that we can give -- so that we can put it in the
11 record as our basis for changing this and directing in
12 this direction.
13 Commissioner Kennedy? And I think we have all sorts
14 of COI data, and so I'm just asking.
15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I'm not going to speak
16 to the COI data on this.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I was just going to say to
19 Jaime, if in the exploration of this it is necessary to
20 split Downey, I would certainly be okay with looking at
21 that split if it's necessary. I just think that we could
22 group these communities so that it does make better
23 sense. And again, if there's a way to at least look at
24 Florence-Graham and have a good understanding of can it?
25 Or it simply won't work to get them grouped with more

similar communities, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to mention, I took a quick look at the map, and Huntington Park and Walnut Park are in the ADGATEWAY District. The one thing that I recall seeing when we were doing the Latino CVAP heat map, is that Florence-Graham has a very high -- I suspect a very high Latino CVAP based on kind of the darkness of the reds, and I think the concern that could come about is it could boost up the Latino CVAP even more.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Ms. Clark, I think you've been dealing with this issue --

MS. CLARK: Yeah. And again, happy to explore these changes and work with your VRA counsel, who just gave advice to not try and raise the Latino CVAP above sort of where it's at now for the ADGATEWAY District. And these specifically all are very highly concentrated Latino CVAP areas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's hear from the rest of the Commissioners. It's getting late, so I see fewer Commissioners -- all right, I see them all. My screen was actually changed. Any additional feedback,

comments, ideas -- Fornaciari, then Akutagawa, and then let's keep talking.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thanks, Jaime. I appreciate your hard work.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, Jaime, this is pretty incredible. You've reworked the Los Angeles area, I think three times now, four times, maybe more with visualizations. Let's see, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just want to also say my thanks to all the line drawers. I know it's a constant refinement. With that said, I guess I'll just ask a question. I know that the ADLBC deviation is minus 1.6, but if we were to add in those parts of North Long Beach to this varied district, would that help maybe balance out the Latino CVAP, so that if Florence-Graham -- if there was an effort to try to bring it in, would that help balance it out?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear --

MS. CLARK: I think --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Ms. Clark.

MS. CLARK: -- that depends on how big a rotation you want to do and how much impact you want to have on the rest of the map. This area in -- I'm spacing right now on the name of the street, but Del --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's late. We understand. No worry.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Del Amo. Del Amo.
2 MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you, thank you, thank you,
3 thank you. That Northern area of Long Beach is about
4 100,000 people, and also is -- and also when previously
5 in sort of redrawing this area -- including the Orange
6 County piece and the L.A. piece -- when I tried adding
7 that area with the ADGATEWAY District it brought the
8 Latino CVAP up pretty significantly. Again, just based
9 on all of the goals of the Commission in this area, and
10 certain cities that weren't asked to be in -- yeah, it
11 just is tricky. It's tricky.
12 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's tricky. Just like every
13 aspect -- every other part of these maps at this point,
14 because we've made commitments across the whole state so
15 now it becomes harder and harder to do it. But as we saw
16 this morning, it is possible. We were able to do so much
17 in the Inland Empire. I thought it was impossible, and
18 you all proved me wrong, because you're incredible --
19 incredibly creative.
20 So let's take a look at the San Fernando Valley --
21 just make sure that -- because we did receive testimony
22 out there, and then if we're comfortable, let's check in
23 and see if we are -- I'm hearing that there may be some
24 desire for some refinements, potentially, and I know we
25 have that one refinement that Commissioner Turner's

1 working on. And potentially, a couple of others. But
2 overall, if we're comfortable with all of these and we
3 can live with all of these districts, and if we -- and
4 then of course, charge some direction on some potential
5 refinements. We'll first just go through the San
6 Fernando Valley.
7 Come on, Ms. Clark, walk us through the San Fernando
8 Valley really briefly, and then we will have the
9 conversation. You're on mute, Ms. Clark.
10 MS. CLARK: Thank you for that. Based on direction
11 received from the Commission, including, for example, not
12 crossing Mulholland, and according to some of the changes
13 in more of like the City of Los Angeles South of
14 Mulholland, there are changes to San Fernando Valley. So
15 Glendale, roughly North of 134, Sunland-Tujunga, Burbank,
16 North Hollywood, Toluca Lake, Studio City, Sherman Oaks,
17 POSO, and Encino, are now in the South San Fernando
18 Valley-based district. In central San Fernando Valley
19 it's Canoga Park, Northridge East and West, Northridge
20 Hills West, pardon me -- Lake Balboa, Panorama City, part
21 of Pacoima and Mission Hills. The East San Fernando
22 Valley-based district is Granada Hills, Sylmar, San
23 Fernando, part of Pacoima, part of Foothills Trails, Sun
24 Valley area, North Hollywood, West Neighborhood Council
25 areas, Greater Valley Glen Council, and the Northern part

of Van Nuys.

And then the rest of San Fernando Valley, Tarzana, Woodland Hills areas, Hidden Hills, Bell Canyon, West Hills, Chatsworth, Porter Ranch, is with Santa Clarita Valley.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, my gosh, that looks amazing. Thank you so much, Jaime, you did an amazing job. Certainly, it brings in all of the feedback and direction we gave you last -- just a couple days ago. It feels like a month, but it's really only been a week. All right. So the community input that I'm seeing says, well, this is not perfect, but the community can live with it. We've received quite a bit of testimony from business and community groups out here, and it seems to be that community groups can live with it. If they can live with it, I can certainly live with it. I'm wondering here from the Commission if we have any thoughts on this area, any refinements, any changes that we would want to make? Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I just wanted to know --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to know -- I haven't seen much public input, so it would be helpful to get some.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: We can get additional
2 (indiscernible). I've been seeing it come through the
3 Voters First email.
4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Comes to the Commission.
6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- emails --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: It may be a little bit delayed,
8 though, but it should be coming through. Commissioner
9 Yee? Oh, no? No? Any changes you would want to
10 suggest, anybody? Any refinements in this area?
11 Commissioner Sinay?
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we please request to staff
13 that we make sure everything is uploaded tomorrow,
14 because if we're going to meet on Monday, we really do
15 need all the public --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.
17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- comment. So we need to be
18 getting it more quickly than we have been recently.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: So the commitment from our line
20 drawers is -- and the public may not know this, but I
21 just wanted to share --
22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. This isn't from the line
23 drawers. I'm talking about our staff, and --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay, but --
25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- from, yeah.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, oh, you're talking about the
2 input that's coming in through the Voter's First email?
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Airtable and stuff, yeah.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. I know that
5 every communication that comes in also has to be
6 scrubbed, before it gets posted, and that's the delay
7 that we're seeing. It comes through, but it comes
8 through, and it gets scrubbed by staff. So we don't put,
9 like, protected information and those things. Let's
10 see -- but in terms of the maps and posting the maps once
11 we're done, the maps as they are -- they're working on
12 three or four different maps. They have to be merged,
13 put together, and then they will be uploaded as one map
14 into the -- into our system.
15 Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Taylor.
16 Commissioner Taylor.
17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you. So we are
18 just -- I know I heard, but I'm just vocalizing -- so we
19 are going to be meeting again on Monday --
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: That's right.
21 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- and refinements are based
22 on feedback and --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: COIs.
24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- and anything we might be --
25 COI feedback -- refinements are, of course, allowed on

1 Monday, correct?

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, yes, certainly. So what we're

3 going to be doing -- so here -- and I want to see if the

4 Commission is comfortable with Los Angeles County -- we

5 can live with the districts that are being proposed at

6 this time, because at this point, we could live -- we've

7 all said, we could live with the maps as-is. We would

8 like to see some refinements. We're working on potential

9 refinements, if we can get them -- and we're going to get

10 them by Monday, and we can get them, we see them, we like

11 them, we approve them, then they'll be incorporated into

12 our final maps. If we get them and it just doesn't work

13 out; it doesn't meet our requirements' the Commission

14 doesn't have general consensus, or we need to go to a

15 vote, then that's a different thing. But I want to have

16 a map for all of California that is something that we can

17 live with. This is what -- it's not perfect. What we

18 have right now across California is not perfect; we all

19 agree it's not perfect, but we all can live with it is

20 what I've heard, and so I want to have a map -- a state

21 map that we can all live with. And at this point, I'm

22 going to be looking -- we've said we could live with all

23 of the other aspects of California that we've -- looking

24 at San Leandro right -- not San Leandro -- I have my head

25 in Northern California -- in Los Angeles, making sure

1 that we can live with this map.
2 And then, of course, Commissioners are working on
3 potential refinements that might impact that map, but
4 we'll have to approve those things on Monday, and see if
5 we will incorporate it into our approved map. And that
6 may change these maps, but they will be refinements. It
7 could be larger. Some are smaller, but individual
8 Commissioners are working with line drawers to propose
9 changes. But those changes would have to be worked out
10 and posted, and the Commission would have to review and
11 listen to them, hear them, either accept them or not.
12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Got it.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or if we don't have consensus we
14 could potentially have a vote in that manner. But of
15 course, what we always strive for and we always have at
16 the California Citizens Commission, we've always tried to
17 get a general consensus on everything. And so that
18 sometimes makes it harder, but occasionally, if we have a
19 difficult decision, we will need to take a vote, and
20 that's okay. We will do --
21 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- what we need to do. So right
23 now --
24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you for that process.
25 Thank you. I appreciate it.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: And for right now, what I'm looking
2 for is general consensus that we can live with this map
3 as-is. This is like our safety map. At the end of
4 the -- at the end of the day we'll have all of California
5 completed. We go home, we sleep, we see the whole thing,
6 we review it tomorrow, and we work on potential
7 refinements individually with the line drawers if we want
8 to see some changes. And we'll, on Monday, have worked
9 out those issues and the Commission can review them, like
10 the coastal district that Commissioner Akutagawa is
11 working on, the issues that Commissioner Turner's working
12 on, the issue that Commissioner that Jane -- actually,
13 well, I think every single one of you is working on a
14 refinement at this point, and that's okay. We'll review
15 them on Monday and go through them and either approve
16 them or not. So Commissioner Sadhwani, I saw your hand
17 up.
18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, generally,
19 yes. That being said, I still haven't seen any of the
20 public comment for the L.A. maps. That's an ongoing
21 piece for me that --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.
23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- until we see some of
24 it -- until the staff is able to get it to us --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I think what we --

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- for me because there are
2 things in this that I feel pretty uncomfortable with.
3 But that being said, I can live with it, because I was
4 told that changes would be too much. So I'll live with
5 it, but I do want to be able to see the public comment
6 before I can say, yes, a hundred percent, let's move this
7 forward.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's whether we can live with it.
9 And so I want to see if we can live with it. Certainly,
10 there has to be public input, and we're getting it
11 through the - through our processes, but we have to be
12 able to see it. And I'm directing staff to make sure
13 that we can see it tomorrow, and to get all of that
14 feedback to us in the Airtable by tomorrow so that all
15 Commissioners can see what is coming through our emails
16 and through our visualizations as well. But of course,
17 the public always has to have a meaningful opportunity to
18 present their concerns, their issues, their everything.
19 And so we wouldn't -- tomorrow is the -- if we have
20 general consensus here doesn't mean that we can't change
21 them. Honestly -- and you all know this and we all know
22 this -- the maps aren't final until we certify them,
23 right? So changes can be made up until then. But I
24 want -- what I want here is a firm commitment that we can
25 live with this map. This is a map -- if all the

1 refinements fail, we will have a backup map, because I
2 don't want us to not have a final Assembly State map.
3 And so this is our -- I want to -- this is our -- this is
4 the backup to the backup to the backup. This is what's
5 going to go forward if we can't get agreement on other
6 issues. Because this is something we said we couldn't
7 live with across the state, and we're here in Los
8 Angeles, so let's see if we can all live with Los
9 Angeles.
10 And this is definitely our failsafe map, as
11 Commissioner Russell Yee says. This is the map that we
12 would move forward if we have -- if the refinements don't
13 work out. So let's hear from -- I want to hear and see
14 if we have general consensus that we can -- we may not
15 love it. There may be issues across the state that we
16 might want to get some refinements on, but can we live
17 with it? We said we could live with all other aspects of
18 it. Let's see if we can live with Los Angeles.
19 Commissioner Akutagawa, and then I'll be going down.
20 I'm actually going to -- I just want to see general
21 consensus -- yes, we can live with it.
22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So Chair, just three things
23 that I want to say. First off --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.
25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- I just want to say thank

you to you. Great job tonight. I know it's been challenging. So I just wanted to just acknowledge you and what you've been doing. Secondly, I want to just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- reuplift something that Commissioner Turner said earlier. It was a good reminder, and I think it's something that perhaps all of us should keep in mind. It's not so much can we as a Commission live with the maps. We should just remind ourselves that it's the people who live in those districts that have to live with the maps --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- that we're going to be willing to live with. So I think it's kind of just good to keep both in mind. I think we will have to at some point, because time's going to run out, but I think we should keep that in mind. And then, third, I know we've been all on the phone a long time, but there have been twelve people that have been on the phone with us a long time, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's true.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And perhaps just for the sake that they've hung in there with us, perhaps we should take public comment and just extend our time a little bit longer.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for that. And I always
2 love taking public comments. And I want to thank you for
3 that reminder. I want to thank you for that, yes, I
4 think -- and I want to lift up the public has to live
5 with these maps. And I think what's wonderful about this
6 process and having had the honor to work with all of you,
7 is that in my heart I know that these are fair maps.
8 They're not perfect maps by any means, but they are fair
9 maps. We've struggled so much with all the COIs, with
10 the VRA issues, with the compliance, with the
11 compactness, with all of those six requirements. We've
12 struggled, struggled, and we came to these. Essentially,
13 what I -- I can't remember what Commissioner Le Mons
14 called it when we first started that we would have -- I
15 can't remember what it was -- it was, like, a unity -- I
16 can't remember what it was, but that we would have
17 something that we could all be proud of essentially. But
18 he had a much better way with words. But this is
19 something that I think we can all be proud of. We've
20 worked so hard. This is a map that is grounded in our
21 COIs, that is grounded in all the outreach and public
22 education, and VRA analysis, and everything we've done.
23 And our staff has put in hundreds and hundreds of hours.
24 So anyway, I'm selling too hard. You all know this.
25 But this is something we need to be proud of, and I am

very proud of these maps. These are not -- these are good, solid, fair maps for the State of California, and I would be very happy if they were implemented like this. But of course, if there's refinements, even better. Because those are refinements that we'd have with all of us in agreement, and I know that they can be even stronger. We can always make things stronger, right? We can't let perfection be the enemy of good.

Commissioner Fornaciari, and then we'll look for general consensus if we can live with it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I had a different question, but --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Oh, I just wanted to check in and see -- doublecheck where we're headed --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- because the schedule has -- I mean, we've kind of blown up the plan in a lot of ways. But I just want to doublecheck with Commissioner Andersen. Do you want to go to Senate next since we just finished Assembly and we're kind of on a roll the, we're still headed to Congress. So that in my day off tomorrow I can figure out where I'm going to focus.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think that's a question for all of

1 us. Do we want to go to the Senate? Do we want to go to
2 the Congress. This is a question for all of us. Where
3 are we headed next? Are we headed for the Congress or we
4 headed for the Senate? I also think we need to make sure
5 that we have consensus here. Because if we don't
6 finalize this map, we're not headed anywhere.
7 All right. Let's finalize this map, and then let's
8 figure out where we're headed next. Do we have general
9 consensus on this map? Because if we don't we can work
10 on it until we do. I see some heads, yes? I'm not
11 seeing enthusiastic yeses. Is there not -- we know that
12 this isn't perfect, and we can always -- we going to try
13 to get refinements through. Commissioner Sinay?
14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we're all a little shy
15 to be enthusiastic, because we were very --
16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- enthusiastic for the draft
18 maps --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: And it's late, too.
20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's late, but we were very
21 enthusiastic with the draft maps, and we've spent a lot
22 of time on these. But we still feel like, oh, we haven't
23 done it perfect. And it's just -- it's going to be
24 scarier each time we get closer to the deadline to say,
25 yes. And so I think what's best at this time, Chair, is

1 let everybody hear the public comments. Let everybody
2 kind of get their brain back together. We need to get
3 Stephanie to get us the public input tomorrow so we can
4 spend some time reading a lot of that, and come back with
5 maybe our top three -- because some of us like to put
6 every single comment we get. And I think we need to
7 prioritize and really understand what folks are saying
8 and what can be doable. But we're never going to feel
9 like this is awesome. But I want to go back to the fact
10 that this is awesome. This is --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: It's awesome.
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- awesome that we are an
13 independent redistricting Commission. We started from a
14 blank slate. We've listened to the community, and we
15 have created maps that were not envisioned before the
16 community and us came together. So let's --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: You just read my -- thank you so
18 much -- thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay. I think
19 that's a great reminder. And also I think -- and the
20 reason for me wanting a general consensus on this and
21 commitment on this is because, I -- I mean, I would hate
22 for us not to -- get something that we're all in
23 consensus with -- that we all can live with -- live with
24 is not that we think it's perfect -- and end up with not
25 having maps that -- maps that don't get certified and

1 ultimately go back to the courts. Because that is not
2 what the California voters want from us. What the
3 California voters -- the voters of California, the people
4 of California -- want us to have fair maps. They want us
5 to draw those maps, and they want us to draw them fairly,
6 and I think we have.
7 And certainly we can do -- we can refine more, and
8 so I want us at the end of the process, and I know we
9 will. Because I know every one of you and we're going to
10 work every single minute until we get these maps done,
11 but we want to get them finalized. So that's my goal --
12 is to see if we can live with these maps, because if we
13 don't -- if we can't live with these maps, then -- this
14 is our -- it's not perfect -- failsafe. And certainly,
15 we're going to get more community input and we're going
16 to hear testimony. And those can always be incorporated
17 if -- but these will have -- these are our backup. Is
18 that something that we can live with? Yep. Okay. I'm
19 seeing some heads, yes. Reluctant, but I see -- yes,
20 okay. I'm hearing something -- some thumbs up.
21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Chair --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, and then
23 Commissioner Fernandez.
24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to say, in regard
25 to the question that Commissioner Fornaciari brought up,

I think doing Senate after we just did --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- the Congress -- I mean, after we just did Assembly, may make a lot of sense. And really, for us to think through -- I would like us to begin with conversations before we pick up a pencil and start drawing. So just really thinking through. Are there opportunities to nest or not, what that might look like? What are we -- what is our vision for Senate districts compared -- we haven't had a lot of those conversations; we've just been jumping into line drawing, and we've never really talked about the transition from Assembly maps to Senate maps to Congressional maps. And what is our vision for all of them? We sometimes say, pain and gain -- share the pain, maybe we'll do it next time, but we haven't had those conversations so that we're all kind of on the same page. So I'd like to --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- have that conversation before.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's have that. And I did hear from Commissioner Le Mons. He's with us right here listening, and he says that he's a yes. He's a yes, and he's not reluctant. Great. Love to hear that. Commissioner Fernandez?

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I think, like, my
2 concern is -- because you say they're not perfect, can we
3 live with them? To me, those are kind of like negative
4 terms, and --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's rephrase them --
6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And well --
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- let's think positive.
8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. And what I'd like to
9 say is, I think they're good maps. I think there's some
10 refinements, and I think it's fourteen people that came
11 together that didn't know each other, and have different
12 experiences and different knowledge. And we're not
13 always going to agree, which is good; we shouldn't always
14 agree. That was the whole purpose of having this -- an
15 independent California Citizens Redistricting Commission.
16 So in terms of what we've done and how we've gotten here,
17 I feel good about it. Yes, there's a couple areas I'd
18 like to work on. Maybe do a little bit of refinement.
19 But at the end of the day, I think we did a good job of
20 taking as much information as we could, and working
21 through some of these communities of interest that we
22 can't, unfortunately, do because of our population
23 constraints and VRA constraints. But I think they're
24 going to -- whatever we come out with are going to be
25 perfect in terms of what fourteen people could come to

1 consensus with. That's how I'm going to try to see it as
2 a positive way, so.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: I love it, Commissioner Fernandez.
4 Love your positivity. And I am seeing -- general -- I
5 don't see any opposition. I'm going to take that as
6 general consensus that these are our backup maps. And so
7 I'm going to ask the line drawers to please consolidate
8 all of the maps across the state, to post them as our
9 maps for now. And then, of course, we'll do -- so that
10 the public can see all of California and the
11 Commissioners can see all of California in one place.
12 And then on Monday we can do some additional -- review
13 some additionals for refinement, and then we can move on
14 to talking about Congressional and State Senate.
15 Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Andersen.
16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I just
17 wanted to call your attention to the mappers were not
18 prepared for going to Senate districts. I think they had
19 planned kind of the way you all discussed it or talked
20 about a little bit. I think they were preparing to go to
21 Congressional next because --
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe so.
23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- of course, we know the
24 difficulty in trying to ensure that we get that down to a
25 zero deviation. It may take a little bit longer, so us

1 switching it tonight is going to cause a delay. So I
2 just want to lift that --
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: I Thank you. Thank you for the --
4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- in case there's opportunity
5 to change.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, because I wanted to raise
7 that up. I know this was a conversation that we wanted
8 to have, and so one of our constraints is staff -- is
9 consultants and maybe not needing to make sure that we
10 have the consultants are switched to State Senate. And
11 I'm not sure if we have that right now.
12 Commissioner Andersen, you may know more.
13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No.
14 Actually, Commissioner Turner really brought up what
15 I was going to say. We did have the conversation, I
16 thought, and really kind of came down to the point of,
17 we've done a lot of the work, we are very familiar with
18 these areas. In the Congress, it is the next step. We
19 can repair some of the things we wanted to do here,
20 knowing that then we'll jump into the Senate. I believe
21 it does make logical sense. And then, when we start
22 working on the Senate, it really will be -- we'll know
23 those areas so well, we'll look back at the Assemblies
24 and go, yes. These go together, those go together, those
25 go together, those don't. And I also believe on the time

1 frame that if we jump into the Congress now, even if it
2 does take a little bit more time, we have it. Whereas,
3 if we switched to the Senate, and talk a lot, and spread
4 that out, we could run into trouble with the Congress.
5 So that's what I -- that's what I -- my two cents.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
7 Maybe we can hear from our line drawers and see some of
8 the constraints, some of the opportunities, and what
9 their recommendations might be, because, I know that's --
10 and what they've been prepping for. Because I know --
11 they've been working so hard, and we want to thank you so
12 much -- long hours, and even tomorrow they'll be working
13 on some of these refinements. So I just want to hear
14 from them as well, so that they can -- so we can have all
15 the information we need to make a decision tonight about
16 what's going to happen next --
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- in terms of our map -- our journey
19 together.
20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Chair Toledo and
21 Commissioners. Thank you for that question. Yeah, we
22 were prepared to go to Congress next week. If you are
23 finalizing the maps for the Assembly on Monday, then
24 there are some technical steps that we would have to go
25 through, because we want to make sure that they're all

1 set before you can actually confidently use them for a
2 potential nesting activity. So there will be a little
3 bit of a delay in getting them ready. We can, of course,
4 do what we can to make them available, but there's
5 definitely a little bit of a technical step involved.
6 And also if you want to be able to go to Senate next
7 week, we need to modify the data set so that we can do
8 the deferral analysis quickly; we have not done that yet.
9 So essentially, it requires adding some coding to each
10 census block for the State of California to figure out
11 what's in the odd and what's in the even district, and so
12 forth. So since we weren't planning on that, that hasn't
13 been done. We were planning on doing that this week so
14 that we will be ready for the week after to go to Senate.
15 So there's a few acrobatics that need to happen before we
16 can do it.
17 We will, of course, do what you need us to do, but
18 again, there may be a little bit more of a delay on some
19 of these things because of that. So the numbering and
20 the deferral would not be able to be done as efficiently
21 as if we were going to do that afterwards. And also, I
22 just can't say that the Assembly districts are going to
23 be ready for nesting immediately. That's it. I hope
24 that made sense.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let me see if I understood you. So

1 one of the reasons we can't do nest -- we can't go to the
2 State Senate and do -- and really can't do the nesting,
3 which is the criteria, is because we're not -- we might
4 potentially have refinements on our Assembly maps on
5 Monday, because we'll reviewing them, potentially
6 approving. And because that's -- because there is that
7 Monday refinement issue -- and our maps might change on
8 Monday -- that does cause the issue with the extended
9 maps. Am I understanding correctly that that actually is
10 a potential -- is one of the reasons, not the only, but
11 one of the reasons why -- until we finalize our State and
12 Assembly maps, it would be difficult to move forward onto
13 the State Senate because of the nesting requirements? Is
14 that --
15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, certainly. I mean,
16 I --
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- am I understanding?
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, certainly. Because
19 we've heard from quite a few of the Commissioners that
20 you are interested in potentially nesting, so you
21 definitely want to have the Assembly districts ready to
22 go, I'm assuming. And once you finalize the maps --
23 remember we haven't numbered them yet -- not that that
24 has something to do with the nesting, but there are some
25 steps still that we need to do. And I mean, we can make

it happen. I don't want this to go into California history that the line drawers are preventing you for going to Senate --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No, no, no. It's certainly not you; it's us, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) with the Commission.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we're responsible for getting the maps done. So at some -- Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Actually, I would prefer to do the Congressional next week because I would like to have the Assembly somewhat finalized and have some time to have that sink in and actually look at it and review it so that I could be better informed when we come -- when we actually discuss it, if that makes sense. I'd like to be able to probably load it up into my QGIS and play with it, so and then --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Once we --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So then you can have it --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- because if we --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- for the State Senate and for --

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- nesting and all --
3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- those other -- yeah.
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So I --
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Makes sense.
7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just think it does make
8 sense to do Congressional next week, and then Senate the
9 following week. Thank you.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear other Commissioners
11 about State Senate and Congressional -- Andersen, I'm
12 hearing that it would be a hardship for the line drawers
13 to go on to the Senate, but they are willing to do it if
14 that's the will of the Commission. Commissioner
15 Andersen?
16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I was going to say
17 what Commissioner Fernandez said. I addition to -- we
18 have a sequence worked out. We're asking a lot from our
19 line drawers all the time -- to needlessly dump something
20 else on them, I think would not necessarily get us the
21 best product. And we had kind of laid this out, and had
22 made steps in that direction, and I really feel that
23 our -- we wouldn't be as efficient as we would be if we
24 did Congress next, followed by Senate. Because then
25 everyone would have time to -- as Commissioner Fernandez

said, think about them, review it, and then jump in. So I'm on Congress.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So I think Commissioner Fornaciari wanted to have a conversation about it. We're having a conversation about it. Commissioner Sinay as well. Any other aspect of the conversation, because I think there was another piece of the conversation that I might have forgotten, in terms of next steps. Commissioner Le Mons agrees that we should go to Congressional next. I just wanted to throw that out there for the public, and for our Commissioners. Anyone not wanting to go to the Congressional next, let's hear from you, because we work on general consensus at the California Citizen's Redistricting Commission. Commissioner Sadhwani, I see a big smile on your face.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just admiring you, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Have to stay awake, huh?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And you're almost done, right?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're almost done. We're almost going to go to bed.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen, you'll take over Monday or Tuesday? Monday?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Tuesday. Monday is reviewal day.

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Okay. Let's see. It's
3 Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Sinay. Anything
4 else we should discuss before we adjourn? The last thing
5 I wanted to just raise as a possibility, if we do have a
6 couple seven people on the line -- do we want to hear
7 from those seven people? Commissioner Akutagawa raised
8 this issue. I am going to defer to the Commission, as
9 they always do, because I work for you -- for us -- for
10 us -- Commissioner Taylor -- and for the people of
11 California.
12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Chair, I probably would be
13 inclined not to --
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- and that's because we
16 didn't give everyone the opportunity to join us in this
17 fashion. So I think for the sake of uniformity, I would
18 lean towards no, in an effort to be consistent.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: I like consistency --
20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- allow the public to use.
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: I love consistency, and so we can
22 certainly hear from people through our online portals or
23 our email, and also, via the other channels. And then of
24 course, on Monday, we will definitely be taking public
25 comments.

1 Anything else we wanted to discuss that I might have
2 forgotten? Commissioner Sinay? Commissioner Fornaciari?
3 Sounds like we're going to Congressional next, and then
4 back to our journey. Commissioner Sinay? Commissioner
5 Taylor, you have your hand up? Commissioner Sinay, you
6 do also. Commissioner Taylor, then Sinay, and then
7 Sadhwani. Commissioner Sinay, then Sadhwani, and then
8 Yee.
9 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You know that's a delay lower,
10 Pedro.
11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Quick question. What time on
12 Monday are we all going to get together again?
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Monday? Let's take a look.
14 Commissioner Sadhwani --
15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: 1 o'clock.
16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, 1 o'clock, 1 p.m.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: That was my memory, but I -- 1
18 o'clock. And I just wanted to verify. Commissioner
19 Sadhwani? Commissioner Yee?
20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It doesn't have to be
21 figured out now, but I do think before Monday it would be
22 helpful if we figure out at what time public comment will
23 be taken. I --
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.
25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- I think that we owe that

1 to the public since we aren't taking it today, and since
2 we don't have a lot of public comment available to us.
3 So --
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: One thing we can potentially do
5 also -- I just want to throw this out there, because I
6 always like to throw for a conversation, and I know it's
7 getting late, so we need to end this conversation, but we
8 also can discuss it -- is there is a possibility that we
9 can do a continuance today for public comment early in
10 the morning on Monday. So we can issue a continuance if
11 that's the will of the Commission, and take public
12 comment in the morning and then again in the evening if
13 we -- so public comment on this meeting, and then public
14 comment on the meeting on Monday. If that's something
15 that this group wants to do, we can start earlier, and
16 take public comments. I'm seeing some nods yes, and I
17 want to hear from everybody. Not everybody needs to be
18 there because it is public comment, but you could always
19 watch it later. But just wanted to hear -- seeing a lot
20 of yeses. Commissioner Yee, no. Commissioner -- I don't
21 see general consensus. I see a lot of yeses and a lot of
22 maybe not. So let's hear from Commissioner Yee,
23 Commissioner Sinay, and Kennedy, then Fernandez.
24 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We invited folks --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: It seems like we all want to be here

1 until midnight, which is -- I'm happy to be here until
2 midnight. I love working with all of you, and the --
3 Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Sinay and Andersen --
4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We invited (audio
5 interference) today, and seven are in (audio
6 interference). We invited folks today, and seven are
7 still hanging with us; I would like to hear them.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. I couldn't hear that,
9 Commissioner Yee. I'm having difficulty. Can you repeat
10 one more time?
11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think he said he wanted
12 to hear the people that are still --
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, oh, he does want to --
14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- hanging on --
15 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- hear the people --
16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- today.
17 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, he wants to hear the people?
18 Okay. Commissioner Sinay?
19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would definitely want to hear
20 public comment before we start doing adjustments, because
21 I mean, we're going to get them by tomorrow, and we're
22 going to --
23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Yes.
24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- read them --
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yep.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- but I would also like to
2 have -- it just always feels weird that we work on
3 something and then people give comments. And a lot of
4 times they end up giving comments on stuff before we
5 worked on it. I would rather have their comments, and
6 then we can discuss it maybe, and talk about priorities
7 like we did, and then jump into it. Yes, I keep bringing
8 up discuss first and then jump in second, because we do a
9 much better job when we discuss first and then jump in.
10 And --
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I think the public -- I
13 think if someone's here, I mean -- we've been talking --
14 we've been getting information in all different ways
15 lately. So even if we said we weren't, these folks have
16 hung on, so I would say go ahead. We've always said,
17 let's be accessible.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: So we'll do general consensus, and so
19 Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Akutagawa --
20 let's see.
21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. My
22 recommendation would be to -- I don't mind listening to
23 whoever's still logged in -- that's fine, but in terms of
24 Monday, I recommend we start on Monday at one, and we
25 start with public comment. But I don't agree with

1 starting earlier than one, because we've already posted
2 that we're starting at 1 o'clock. For anyone that might
3 not check. So that's my recommendation.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: And we can certainly do that --
5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: My preference.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: -- as well, Commissioner. Mr. Pane?
7 Chief Counsel Pane?
8 MR. PANE: Hello, Chair.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: You're up, still.
10 MR. PANE: I am with all of you.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: And you've been here all night,
12 too --
13 MR. PANE: In California.
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
15 MR. PANE: So I just would like to agree and
16 recommend Commissioner Fernandez's comments. We would
17 need to start at 1 o'clock. That's what has been
18 agendized.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
20 MR. PANE: If the Chair so wanted to --
21 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do a continuance?
22 MR. PANE: -- start with public comment, they could.
23 The order of the agenda is always subject to the Chair or
24 the Chair running the meeting. But as far as starting
25 earlier than what's been agendized, we would need to

1 start at 1 o'clock for that meeting that's been agendized
2 for Tuesday -- or for Monday, I'm sorry.
3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. If we did a
4 continuance, would we be able to start earlier?
5 MR. PANE: So continuance is a different issue. I
6 may have brought this up before. The continuation is
7 allowed when we do not -- when a public body doesn't
8 cover all of the agendized topics of the previously
9 agendized meeting. So if we didn't cover all of the
10 items in the previous meeting, a continuation order can
11 be issued. It depends whether or no -- so I'll leave it
12 at that. So a continuation order could be issued, but we
13 would need to -- the Chair would need to agree and
14 understand that we didn't cover everything that was
15 agendized. As far as what's agendized for today, you've
16 covered what you've agendized. You can also take public
17 comment this evening. Again, you can, or the other
18 option is you can take -- you can always take public
19 comment more often than what's required. If we're going
20 just by the agenda, you've covered what's agendized for
21 today.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. We did cover what's
23 agendized. We have our maps for California for backup.
24 Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Kennedy, and Le
25 Mons.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'm going to be in
2 complete agreement with Commissioner Fernandez. I was
3 going to say exactly the same thing. I'm a little
4 uncomfortable --
5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- starting earlier when --
7 yeah, it wasn't noticed.
8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you so much. And let's
9 hear from Commissioner Kennedy, Le Mons, and then we will
10 decide as a group. Commissioner Kennedy?
11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I mean,
12 that is the purpose of a continuation notice, is to give
13 notice of a continuation of the meeting. I'm looking at
14 the agenda; I see agenda item number five, public
15 comment, that we haven't done today, and I feel that it
16 is pretty much incumbent on us to issue a continuance
17 notice, and to have that session on Monday morning.
18 Close it out before 1 o'clock. We have justification for
19 closing it out before 1 o'clock. And then the 1 o'clock
20 meeting starts at 1 o'clock.
21 The other thing on the question of fairness on
22 this -- at 5:06 the announcement was, there's no public
23 comment today. At 5:17 the announcement was, maybe there
24 will be public comment today. At 5:59, the statement was
25 there may be, there may not be public comment tonight.

1 So I would say I'm happy to hear from people tonight, but
2 I think we should issue the continuance order and have
3 additional public comment on Monday morning. Thank you.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: And then we did say that we may or
5 may not, depending on when we finish, because we were so
6 optimistic that we might finish a little bit earlier.
7 Got us to eleven. Commissioner Le Mons?
8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No comment.
9 CHAIR TOLEDO: No comment. Thank you. All right.
10 And yes. So general consensus, I mean, advice right now
11 is to just -- the advice I'm getting from counsel is to
12 take comment now at seven. To limit it to one-and-a-half
13 minutes, and just take it and not issue a continuance.
14 Anyone opposed to that, or have strong opposition to
15 that? Could we all live with this? As our counsel has
16 said, it's not -- we can take more public comment than
17 not. I think the challenge would be -- yes, Commissioner
18 Kennedy has raised the issue that public comment is part
19 of our agenda, and I see the argument there.
20 Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Pane after that.
21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or, Chief Counsel Pane.
23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah. I'm
24 also persuaded by Commissioner Sinay's arguments that we
25 particularly at this point in the process when we are

1 going into what we believe are going to be our pretty
2 much final revisions of these maps, I would rather have
3 comment before we do that. So if we don't issue a
4 continuance, then my inclination would be to start that
5 meeting with public comment.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we can certainly start the
7 meeting with public comment, that may mean that we will
8 be late again, depending on how long the public comment
9 is, and how long the refinement takes. All right. So
10 let's open up the lines, Kristian, one-and-a-half
11 minutes. Let's close the lines -- let's close the lines,
12 and then take these ten callers. One-and-a-half minutes.
13 Just the people that are in the line. Thank you. We
14 want to hear from all Californians at all time. So send
15 us your feedback through our online process, and we
16 welcome all your feedback on the maps.
17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Standby, we're preparing
18 the queue. In order to maximize transparency and public
19 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
20 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
21 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
22 (877) 853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID
23 number provided on the livestream feed. It is
24 88465429407 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a
25 participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you've

1 dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate
2 you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will
3 raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn
4 to speak, you'll hear a message that says, the host would
5 like you to talk, press star six to speak. If you'd like
6 to give your name, please state and spell it for the
7 record. You are not required to provide your name to
8 give public comment. Please make sure to mute your
9 computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or
10 distortion during your call. Once you're waiting in the
11 queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And
12 again, please turn down the livestream volume. And you
13 wanted to enforce a time limit of one-and-a-half minutes?
14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. And I also wanted to close the
15 line because -- just the people who are in the queue and
16 have waited all night. Thank you.
17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right.
18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Very good. Okay.
19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: First up, we have caller
20 with the last four digits, 9747. And after that will be
21 caller 4599. Caller 9747, please follow the prompts to
22 unmute. The floor is yours.
23 MR. MORENO: Good evening, Commissioners. My name
24 is Danny Moreno (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut
25 Park for over forty years. We would like to request

1 cleaning up of maps 110LA and GATEWAY. Please move and
2 keep Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park
3 together in the 110LA map. This will help save your high
4 population on the GATEWAY maps, and it's Latino
5 percentage, while also allowing our similar communities
6 of Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park to
7 stay together. Also, please consider making the 10
8 freeway the Northern boundary for the 110LA map. Thank
9 you once again for your time.
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you for sticking
11 around with us.
12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And as a reminder to
13 those who are calling in tonight, if you're watching us
14 on the livestream, please mute the livestream before we
15 open your line. This'll prevent feedback or echo during
16 your call. Up next, we've got caller 4599. After that
17 will be caller 9048. Caller 4599, if you could please
18 follow those prompts. Go ahead.
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Buenos tardes.
20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Buenos noches.
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated)
22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Gracias.
23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Gracias. And up next, we
24 have caller 9048. And after that will be caller 1535.
25 Caller 9048, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you very much,
2 Commissioners. It is late, so I will be quick. This is
3 Mike (ph.) from North Hollywood. And I just, again, want
4 to thank you for your willingness to take public comment.
5 My neighbors and I -- I am unfortunately, the last
6 survivor, I think, tonight, but I will say again, thank
7 you for taking public comment. You have heard us before
8 when we have asked to be unified with Toluca Lake. We
9 appreciate --
10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- that. The Valley
12 neighborhoods are still very, very -- I think, fractured
13 over the way that you have organized the maps. And I
14 really appreciate, again, you willing to take more time
15 for public comment and to hear us out as the last
16 revisions were really so dramatic. Again, we hope -- the
17 last bit of feedback we offered was based off of the last
18 maps, so what we're really hoping you can do is unite
19 North Hollywood, Toluca Lake with the other working
20 communities, Valley Glen, Van Nuys, and Sun Valley.
21 These communities are aligned for a few reasons. One,
22 they have a shared Lankershim corridor which has all of
23 our core business along it. It also takes in --
24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- all the communities

that are impacted by the Burbank Airport and by the flight paths of the Burbank Airport. These communities are traditionally more working class, again, below the line, not -- and frankly, a lot more renters. So again, please unite these working --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- class communities. Please unite us together with the Lankershim corridor again, and the airport-affected communities. We advocate together all the time. And again, thank you for waiting for the public comment. We thank you for your commitment to the transparency. I've been on the phone for four hours; I'm committed, too. So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much for your commitment and for sticking with us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1535. And after that will be caller 5719.

Caller 1535, if you could please follow those prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Hi. My name is Tony Maldonado (ph.). I am Latino. I'm calling in reference to Santa Clarita. Can we live with these maps for the next ten years? No. In my humble opinion, this appears to be an exercise in futility. I am gobsmacked by how the

1 Commission has ignored the pleadings from the citizens of
2 Santa Clarita, Simi Valley, Acton, Agua Dulce, Gorman,
3 Frazier Park, Lebec, and Lake Andrews (ph.), asking to be
4 joined as a community. With all due respect, it appears
5 as if the Commission is disposed to seek revenge on Santa
6 Clarita for leaving the City of Los Angeles in 1987, and
7 becoming a largely affluent, fiscally sound, thriving
8 city. For whatever reason, the Commission has shockingly
9 joined the Santa Clarita Valley with Woodland Hills and
10 other San Fernando Valley areas on the Assembly map,
11 which are about an hour away, and shares nothing at all
12 with us. On the Congressional map, remove Simi Valley,
13 our sister city. And on the Senate map it joins us again
14 with the San Fernando Valley with its rampant
15 homelessness and gang activity, and its large
16 undocumented Latino community that will feel largely
17 estranged if tied to the affluence --
18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
19 MR. MALDONADO: -- of the Santa Clarita Valley.
20 Where's the benefit in merging affluent Santa Clarita
21 Valley with the malcontent City of Los Angeles?
22 Especially when we will lose adequate representation.
23 Thank you.
24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for sticking with us and
25 for the comments and for your feedback.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller
2 5719. And after that will be caller 7697. Caller 5719,
3 if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go
4 ahead.
5 MS. ROSEBERRY: Thank you so much. Appreciate you
6 taking public comment as well. I think it's just really
7 crucial and important. My name is Karen Roseberry (ph.).
8 I called in a couple of times, and I'm still really,
9 really, really concerned by the Antelope Valley map, by
10 the Victor Valley-High Desert map in the current
11 iteration. I hope that it does revert back to what those
12 11/10 draft maps looked like. I also would echo very
13 similar comments to the last caller that called in as
14 well in regards to Santa Clarita because of the
15 connection between the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita.
16 But the Victor Valley-High Desert map going from Lebec to
17 the state line cannot remain that way. Cutting through
18 the Antelope Valley, again, you're ripping apart school
19 districts. The divide -- it literally cuts our community
20 in half with the way that iteration presently is. And I
21 just -- I cannot implore you more to please, please
22 revisit those maps. It really can't just be can you live
23 with it. It really can be, can the residents -- can the
24 community live with it. It will be -- it will be another
25 ten years and these are not districts that are

representative. They're not fair. They're not what the community wants --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. ROSEBERRY: -- in the Antelope Valley for absolute certainty. And so we really, really hope that there'll be some additional time given to that area. Like I say, so often we're overlooked; so often we're kind of forgotten. And right now --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. ROSEBERRY: -- these maps are doing a tremendous disservice to us. Thank you again. I know it's late. Thank you for all the hard work that you're putting in, and please, please, do look back into those maps for future drafts, and not bad iterations.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much for calling in, and we appreciate your sticking with us and following along the process. It's appreciated. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller 7697. And after that will be caller 3139. Caller 7697, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name's Diana, and I'm calling in from the Keep Long Beach Together Coalition. Thank you so much for everything you're doing, especially so late

1 tonight. As you know, our coalition has worked hard to
2 be involved with your processes from the very beginning.
3 In Long Beach, we have great respect for the independent
4 redistricting process -- we even made our own, modeled
5 after yours. Our coalition represents community service,
6 racial equity, economic development, and arts and culture
7 organizations, and neighborhood throughout the City of
8 Long Beach, including numerous organizations and
9 thousands of people across the city. Please know our
10 coalition welcomes districts with our neighbors in Orange
11 County and communities like Lakewood and Bellflower. We
12 after all all share a common border. We also welcome
13 cross-county border districts if that's the direction you
14 choose. We currently have that now especially in our
15 Congressional district, but it's up to you. And just
16 know that we've heard from numerous residents, I think,
17 who've called in from Orange County in the past that also
18 support that position. Goes through the Assembly maps,
19 Congressional maps, and the State Senate.
20 For many years, our city has been connected to
21 communities in Orange County section, even as far as
22 Huntington Beach within the last twenty years.
23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We've also been paired
25 with Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, and even Stanton. We work

1 well with these communities and are supportive of being
2 connected to Orange County again if that's what you
3 choose.
4 We want to be supportive of you. We appreciate all
5 your doing on behalf of all of California and thank you
6 for keeping --
7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.
8 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- Long Beach together
9 as much as you can and for respecting our diverse and
10 inclusive community. Good night.
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And thank you for sharing
12 this evening with us.
13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next will be caller
14 3139, and after that will be caller 9481.
15 Caller 3139, if you could please follow those
16 prompts.
17 MS. TEAL: Good evening -- good evening -- yes.
18 Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Forazi Teal
19 (ph.), and I'm a resident of the City of Downey. I'll be
20 discussing my home Assembly district, 85 corridor draft,
21 and 80 Gateway draft. So after hearing the Commissioners
22 discussing my home district and the area, I do see that
23 there might be a way that you can keep both of these
24 districts compact. Currently, I see that they're not
25 compact, especially the 80 Gateway draft district, which

1 stretches from Hawaiian Gardens all the way to the
2 Vernon-Huntington Park area.
3 So I did some maps on the district to see if it's
4 more compact. And what the Commissioners can do is move
5 the Cities of Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Bellflower, and
6 Paramount, which have about a total population of
7 230,000, and move it to my home district AD-5 corridor.
8 And in exchange for the population loss,
9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
10 MS. TEAL: -- the Commissioners can move the Cities
11 of Bell, Commerce, Montebello, and Pico Rivera, which
12 have a total combined population of 211,000 between their
13 neighboring district AD Gateway draft district.
14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.
15 MS. TEAL: Both districts will then be compact and
16 closer to their communities instead of stretched apart.
17 Also I ask if the Commissioners can please do not split
18 the Cities of Lynwood in half. I --
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much for sharing the
20 evening with us and for your feedback. We appreciate it.
21 Have a good evening.
22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we'll have
23 caller 9481, and after that will be 8852.
24 Caller 9481, please follow those prompts.
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Go ahead.

1 MR. ADAMS: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
2 (Indiscernible) Adams. My pronouns are he/him/his, and
3 I'm calling on behalf of the San Diego LGBT community.
4 I'm calling thanking the Commission for providing a draft
5 map, as the map leads to 163 and dividing line in the
6 neighborhood of Hillcrest and the surrounding
7 neighborhoods. Additionally, after today's discussion as
8 the Commission has discussed suspending the Central San
9 Diego district into SDSU, we highly recommend using El
10 Cajon Boulevard, and neither (indiscernible) Boulevard
11 nor University Avenue.
12 That space can be extended as far East as College
13 Avenue, but in order to continue to empower the BIPOC
14 communities representing the La Mesa districts, we
15 believe that (indiscernible) further would harm the
16 majority minority communities represented within that
17 district. As has been represented within the heat maps
18 that was -- that were reviewed by the Commission, the
19 spaces between the 5 freeway --
20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
21 MR. ADAMS: -- 805 freeway, 810, 94 freeway
22 represent the heart of Hillcrest and the LGBTQ community.
23 What has not been represented within this draft map is
24 the area downtown which has been shown in the heat maps
25 provided to the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MR. ADAMS: If there's additional need to pick up population within this district, please consider using downtown San Diego as an additional city.

Thank you so much for your time and thank you for staying up so late.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you for staying up with us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Next up, we've got caller 8852, and after that will be caller 3995.

Caller 8852, you know what to do.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Floor is yours.

MS. ORTIZ: Good evening. Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Graciela Ortiz, mayor of the City of Huntington Park. Thank you --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. ORTIZ: -- for listening to our public comments. You don't understand how much it means to our communities to have Walnut Park, Florence-Graham, and Huntington Park together in the same Assembly district. I'm here to ask you for a minor change that may help your overall goal. The communities of Huntington Park, Walnut Park, and Florence-Graham have common social issues and in need of legislative changes.

I ask you to please keep our communities together,

1 but in the 110 LA map where Florence-Graham is now
2 placed, if you will remove Walnut Park and Huntington
3 Park from the Gateway map, you will alleviate your
4 deviation numbers on the Gateway map, and it will help us
5 remain with our communities of interest, and not with
6 communities like Lakewood, as we have nothing in common
7 with them.
8 I understand that the numbers may not allow for all
9 of Huntington Park to be on the 110 map, but at least it
10 will -- it can be in an Assembly district together with
11 Florence-Graham and Walnut Park -- I'm sorry -- and
12 Walnut Park. Then we can continue to advocate and
13 provide resources for our communities.
14 The City of Huntington Park is currently split by
15 two Assembly districts and having two individuals
16 representing us in Sacramento can be a great advantage
17 for our constituents.
18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
19 MS. ORTIZ: I humbly ask you to consider these three
20 possible options, keeping Florence-Graham with Walnut
21 Park and Huntington Park in the 110 map, keeping
22 Florence-Graham, or keeping Florence-Graham and moving
23 Walnut Park and parts of Huntington Park into the 110
24 map. And if this is not possible, please keep Florence-
25 Graham in map 110 and keep Walnut Park and Huntington

1 Park in the Gateway.
2 Thank you for your consideration and dedication.
3 You are appreciated.
4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. We appreciate you, too,
5 Mayor. Thank you for sharing the evening with us.
6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller
7 3995, and after that will be caller 5038.
8 Caller 3995, the time has come to press star six.
9 Go ahead.
10 MR. MARTINEZ: Hi. Good evening, Commissioners.
11 Thank you for taking public comment at this hour. My
12 name is Will Martinez (ph.), and I please ask that you
13 consider grouping my community of 29 Palms into the DVHD
14 Assembly district. Personally, I think that we share way
15 more community of interest with neighboring desert
16 communities in San Bernadino County than we do with the
17 current group -- than current district that we're
18 currently grouped with. Plus, this would allow for the
19 option to group the Antelope Valley together with the
20 Santa Clarita Valley while keeping San Bernadino County
21 together. This is for to keep all of our counties
22 together, and this is I feel like what's the mission --
23 the true mission of the Commission.
24 I please again ask that you consider grouping 29
25 Palms into the DVHD Assembly district. Thank you and

1 have a great evening.
2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you for sharing the
3 evening with us and for comments.
4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller
5 5038, and after that will be caller 5314. And I'd also
6 like to invite caller 3358, if you'd like to speak
7 tonight, please press star nine.
8 Up next, caller 5038, and after that will be caller
9 5314.
10 Thank you for that hand, 3358.
11 5038 -- that's a lot of numbers -- it is your time.
12 Please follow those prompts. Go ahead.
13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Good evening,
14 Commissioners. So this may run against conventional
15 wisdom, but the City of San Clarita is actually a
16 major -- majority-minority city. It's the third largest
17 city in LA County and deserves to anchor its own Assembly
18 district with neighboring communities like Acton and
19 (indiscernible) instead of diluting our power by
20 including us with overwhelmingly white and affluent areas
21 of the City of Los Angeles by West Hills, Woodland Hills,
22 and Chatsworth. So please protect communities of
23 interest by including us with our neighbors and Woodland
24 Hills with their neighbors respectfully.
25 Thank you all. Have a good night.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you and thank you for sticking
2 it with -- sticking on with us. For -- for -- for
3 continuing to -- thank you. It's late. I give up.
4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It was nice of them to
5 stick with us, Chair. I agree with you one hundred
6 percent.
7 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And up next, we've got
9 caller 53 -- up next, we've got caller 5314, and after
10 that will be caller 3358.
11 Caller 5314. Go ahead.
12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Good evening. I
13 really appreciate you guys staying on. I know it's late.
14 It's Saturday evening. Been on hold for about six plus
15 hours, so I'll make it short.
16 My name is Patricia. I've been a community -- I've
17 been a member of the community of Florence-Graham for
18 about 49 years. I want to thank the Commission, first of
19 all, and the line drawer for moving Florence-Graham out
20 of the 105 LA map and putting it back into the 110 LA
21 map. Although the change is not perfect, our community
22 members are happy with this change and want to thank you
23 for putting it with similar communities.
24 I want to ask you for your help with a minor clean
25 up modification. We ask that you also place our next-

door neighbors from unincorporated Walnut Park and Huntington Park into the same 110 LA map as us. It is imperative to have Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together with the same -- on the same map, (indiscernible) unincorporated item would only diminish our voices and efforts that we have fought so hard together over the last --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: 30-plus years. This cleanup will help decrease the excess four percent deviation that you have in the Gateway map and will also help to balance the Latino members in the Gateway map.

Thank you again. I really appreciate your time and consideration with this minor change. Have a great rest of the weekend and enjoy this holiday.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you and thank you for listening to the Commission and following our process. Good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller 3358. If you could please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening and thank you for being -- staying up so late. I too piggyback on what the last caller just said. You have an arduous task that you're undergoing and undertaking, and I appreciate it.

1 The community appreciates all of you for your time and
2 your efforts, and especially the Commission and the line
3 drawers.
4 The cleanup that we'd like done with the
5 modification for the Florence-Graham-Walnut Park area,
6 it's just -- it's much needed. It's very much needed.
7 And it will help us to be -- become more close and more
8 diverse. I am an African American, and I have been in
9 that community and this community for the last 25 years.
10 I appreciate all of your efforts, and I thank you all for
11 taking the time and spending your weekend working for us.
12 You're much appreciated. Thank you very much.
13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, and we appreciate you.
14 Thank you for listening to us and following our process.
15 With that, we are done with public comments; is that
16 correct, Kristian?
17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The queue is clear,
18 Chair.
19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Christian.
20 So with that, we have compliant maps. The maps have
21 gone. We've gone through the State of California. We
22 may have some refinements that we're going to be --
23 Commissioners may be working individually and with our
24 line drawers to propose to the Commission on Monday for
25 refinement. And we will consider those on Monday. With

1 that, thank you, California, for following our process.
2 Thank you to the Commissioners, to our staff who work so
3 hard, and everyone else. And we will see each other on
4 Monday at 1 o'clock. And we will continue to move on in
5 this journey to finalize the maps for the State Senate,
6 Assembly, and Congressional districts for the State of
7 California.
8 Thank you, all, and thank you for following this
9 journey. We'll see each other on Monday. Have a great
10 evening and a great weekend. See you Monday.
11 (Whereupon, the 2021 Citizens Redistricting
12 Commission (CRC) meeting adjourned at 11:34
13 p.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2

3 I do hereby certify that the testimony in the
4 foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein
5 stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were
6 reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and
7 a disinterested person, and was under my supervision
8 thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

9

10 And I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing
12 nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause
13 named in said caption.

14

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
16 28th day of December, 2021.

17

18

19

20 _____
JACQUELINE DENLINGER,
21 Court Reporter

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

2

3 I do hereby certify that the testimony in the
4 foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein
5 stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were
6 transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a
7 disinterested person, and was under my supervision
8 thereafter transcribed into typewriting.
9 And I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing
11 nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause
12 named in said caption.
13 I certify that the foregoing is a correct
14 transcript, to the best of my ability, from the
15 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the
16 above-entitled matter.
17
18
19 _____ December 28, 2021
LORI RAHTES, CDLT-108
20
21
22
23
24
25