

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC PUBLIC MEETING - LIVE LINE DRAWING

Southern California

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2021

11:00 a.m.

Reported by:

Jacqueline Denlinger



APPEARANCECSCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Outreach Manager
Toni Antonova, Data Manager

Technical Contractors

Kristian Manoff, A/V Technical Director/Comment Moderator

Line Drawing Team

Karin MacDonald, Statewide Database
Jaime Clark
Kennedy Wilson, Q2 Data & Research
Sivan Tratt, HaystaqDNA

VRA Counsel Strumwasser & Woocher

David Becker

Also PresentPublic Comment

Deborah
Floyd Bryan, ILWU
Charlotte McKenzie, Citizens University Committee, UC
Riverside
Betty Wilson
Tina Huang
Karina
Aaron
Sylvester Rojo

PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

Alexandra Mendoza

Alfred Lomas

Craig

Jesse

Lula Davis-Holmes, City of Carson

Sandra Tomayo

Mary Fujii

Jeremy Payne, Equality California

Paola Avendano

Fabian Viennese

Theresa Abraham

Shauntay Thomas

Sofia Villalobos

Gina Roberts, Valley Center Fire Protection District

Michelle Smith-McDonald

Fernando

Lauren Babb

Virginia Juralopa

Stuart Waldman, VICA

Jessica Zepeda

Ricardo Lara, City of Maywood

Pam Freccocus

Teresa Grisnabor

Sandra Rodriguez, CHIRLA

Jessica Torres, City of Maywood

Claudia Sanchez

Diana

Patty Yu

Kate Laddish

Tom Meyers

Verges Seymour

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	5
Senate Maps Line Drawing Discussion	7
Closed Session	65
Senate Maps Line Drawing Discussion	66
Public Comment	231

P R O C E E D I N G S

Tuesday, December 14, 2021 11:00 a.m.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, California. I'm Ray Kennedy. I am Chair this week of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are going to be beginning our work on the Senate maps today. We have this first half hour or so for roll call, reviewing the run of show, any announcements, reviewing outstanding iterations from yesterday, and I do believe that we have an iteration that we need to finish up, but my intent is to get us to the start of the Senate districts at approximately 11:30.

First up there, we will review the November 10 drafts in conjunction with, i.e., overlaying our current Assembly districts. And today we are hoping to start with Los Angeles area Senate districts, beginning with VR8 areas, and hoping to finish at least a first run through the remainder of Southern California. So that is the run of show.

My apologies to Ravi for keeping you waiting. Ravi, could you please call roll?

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

2 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

4 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm here.

6 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.

7 COMMISSIONER Turner: Here.

8 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

9 Commissioner Yee.

10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

11 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

12 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

13 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

15 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

16 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here.

17 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Present.

19 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

21 MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Kennedy.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

23 MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete, Chair.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ravi.

25 So are there any announcements from Commissioners or

1 staff?

2 Seeing no announcements, okay.

3 So Jaime, good morning.

4 MS. CLARK: Good morning.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: I believe we were in the midst of an
6 iteration with you when we went on break yesterday and
7 started public comment. So we need to get back to you
8 and finish what we were working on with you. So could
9 you bring us up to date on where we are with that?

10 MS. CLARK: Absolutely. Thank you so much. So
11 where we left off yesterday was in discussion of this
12 district boundary between the Shoreline District and
13 10CORR. The iteration moved Century City and this
14 country club and neighborhood just south of Hillcrest
15 Country Club into 10CORR.

16 This boundary also splits Palms neighborhood
17 council, and this was the area and the iteration under
18 discussion when we left off yesterday.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Was there a compensating
20 change on the other end of that district?

21 MS. CLARK: There was a three-district change. One
22 of the swaps was to move population -- or excuse me, to
23 move the district boundary between 10CORR and STHLA,
24 north to Manchester in the area that the hand is waiving
25 over.

1 Additionally, involved in that three-district
2 population swap was making the Westchester neighborhood
3 whole in the Shoreline district. And then additionally,
4 some of these changes. However, depending on what the
5 Commission is looking at, or is -- wishes to enact, I
6 think it would be possible, if so desired, to weave this
7 10 Corridor boundary and the Westchester Playa boundary,
8 and then look at trading population just along these
9 borders, potentially, but it depends on what the
10 Commission would like to see.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much.
12 Commissioner Vazquez.

13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to --
14 oh, first of all, obviously, thank you. Maybe not
15 obviously. Jaime, you deserve all of the -- all of the
16 praise and the thanks.

17 Then secondly, I did just want to reiterate my
18 concern about splitting Palms. Not at all opposed and
19 think it's great if we can get Century City into the 10
20 Corridor District. I'm absolutely in support of that.
21 Just not thrilled at the idea of breaking up the small
22 community of Palms.

23 If the Commission is interested, I would -- I maybe
24 might suggest splitting Culver City to the west, using
25 the 405 as a boundary. And there are several places

1 where Culver City jumps the 405. And so again, just -- I
2 used -- I lived in this area for about a decade when I
3 first moved to Los Angeles. And so I do feel like the
4 405 is a very strong community divider, especially on the
5 west side. So for me, my proposal would be to keep Palms
6 whole and then exchange that for population in Culver
7 City west of the 405.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

9 Jaime, could we just have a quick look at the
10 population figures on both sides of that, so how much
11 difference it would make if we kept Palms whole and how
12 much population we'd be looking at if we -- if we did use
13 the 405 in Culver City.

14 MS. CLARK: So this highlighted area is the western
15 part of Palms that is not included in 10CORR, and that's
16 20,766 people. And I will look at the number of people
17 west of the 405 in Culver City right now. So one moment,
18 please.

19 So this, of course, crosses the 405 here, and I can
20 look at, you know, how much the population would be
21 reducing that, but this highlighted area is 6,877 people.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And that small area further
23 along the 405 is going to be pretty minimal population.

24 MS. CLARK: Oh, didn't even see that. One second.
25 But I -- yes, I think that it's very low population; no

1 population.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Other Commissioner's thoughts
3 on this, we would -- we would -- if we were to keep Palms
4 whole, we would need to find additional population to
5 make that possible.

6 Or Commissioner Vazquez, do you have further
7 comments on this in light of those numbers?

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Not -- not especially. I
9 mean, you'll sort of note that it's -- you'll note that
10 just given that there is 20,000 people in what's
11 probably, you know, like a half mile -- half mile
12 square -- square miles, it's very, very densely
13 populated, like I said, pretty working class, very
14 densely populated.

15 So I don't have other options. I mean, I'm also --
16 my -- I would also be willing to keep Palms whole in the
17 Shoreline District. I'm not sure if that is going to be
18 even more of a challenge. Again, I don't know that this
19 is something that's especially concerning, but if we're
20 in -- if we're moving lines for population, I would just
21 like to see if we could keep Palms whole.

22 MS. CLARK: So this highlighted area is 6,489.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: So that's much closer to the area
24 west of the 405.

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That is the wrong direction,

1 right?

2 MS. CLARK: For -- yeah, so for that Culver City
3 split, that would be -- yeah. So the Shore --

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So they're both current in --

5 MS. CLARK: Well, actually, the Shoreline then would
6 be over populated -- oh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah, wrong
7 direction.

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I -- I can get -- I can
9 get comfortable with this. I just thought I would -- I
10 would flag it. Not my preference, but I'm okay with
11 this.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could I ask you, because we
13 heard a -- if I recall correctly -- or let me do it this
14 way.

15 Commissioner Akutagawa, could you remind us of your
16 comments yesterday regarding Century City?

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It was -- it was mostly
18 that it is a different kind of area. It's shopping area,
19 the theater, a lot of high-priced financial services
20 firms in the area. You know, I think about Century City
21 and its, you know, Avenue of the Stars.

22 To me, I mean, I stated it last night, I think it's
23 just a question of does it make sense? But if -- if --
24 I -- let's just say I'm not going to stop this. I just
25 wanted to just make that comment. But I hear what

1 Commissioner Vazquez is saying, and I think now it, you
2 know -- I think we just have to make a decision. You
3 know, we're going to have to center one COI over another,
4 and I think we just need to make a decision about which
5 way we want to go on this, and you know, what fits within
6 the, kind of, principles and values that we said we
7 wanted to follow, so --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I -- I've
11 been by Century City numerous times. I guess, my -- my
12 impression of it is -- is very similar to Commissioner
13 Akutagawa's, so I'm -- I'm somewhat uncomfortable with --
14 with the change of -- of putting Century City into 10
15 Corridor.

16 You know, and particularly if it involves breaking
17 up Palms. I -- I would tend to support Commissioner
18 Vazquez's desire to keep Palms whole. One way or
19 another, it -- it seems to me that it sounds more like a
20 more natural fit in 10 Corridor, but as Commissioner
21 Vazquez, I could go either way on that.

22 Commissioner Sinay.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was basically going to say
24 what the two of you said. You know, for me, when there's
25 a -- when we need to make a choice of where to divide, I

1 will -- you know, I tend to side keeping whole, those
2 communities who have been divided in the past, be it,
3 literally or figuratively. And so I would tend to say
4 Palms should -- should stay whole. It is very dense
5 working class community, and it's -- I think there's
6 ways -- Century City has -- is a big -- you know, has --
7 looks to be diverse. The parts I know are also the
8 office buildings, they -- the -- the Mormon Temple, those
9 type of things.

10 And so there might be ways, if we need to, I'd
11 rather split Culver City and find where the right
12 residential area's to be in the 10 Corridor then put all
13 of Culver City and not have Palms in there.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

15 Commissioner Turner, was your hand up?

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: It was, and then I just put it
17 down. Thank you.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez, and
19 then Commissioner Le Mons.

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Jaime, is -- is
21 Culver City already split, or is it whole? What's the
22 status of Culver City?

23 MS. CLARK: Yeah, Culver City is whole in 10
24 Corridor right now, or 10CORR.

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, remind me again why

1 we were doing all of these changes?

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: It was a proposal brought forward by
3 Commissioner Turner. Anything further, Commissioner
4 Fernandez?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm kind of with
6 Commissioner Vazquez on this. I do tend to lean to keep
7 those communities together that normally don't have time
8 to have a voice, so I don't want to split up Palms. But
9 then on the flip side of it, I don't want to split
10 something that's already whole either. So I'm kind of --
11 I'm not helping right now with this conversation. I'm
12 just stating what my -- I'm trying to be consistent with
13 how I've commented in the past, so I've got to think
14 about it. Thank you.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

16 Jaime, could you remind us of the population of that
17 Century City block?

18 MS. CLARK: This is 3,296 people. And additionally,
19 just a reminder that this area was also included in 10
20 Corridor as part of this change, so there might be a way
21 to address Palms in either direction, and then, you know,
22 either remove or add from this area as well. This
23 previously was in the Shoreline District.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons, your
25 hand was up and then went down. I want to give you an

1 opportunity here.

2 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I wanted to support keeping
3 Palms together as well. I -- I just want to comment on
4 the Century City thing, and I think I want -- yesterday,
5 I had my hand up after Commissioner Taylor because I
6 thought he really said it best.

7 So it's just some of the dialog around some of the
8 thinking that makes me a little uncomfortable in this
9 idea that, oh, well, that's a wealthy community, or
10 that's a country club. And I'm just not getting where --
11 where that's coming from. And you know, at the end of
12 the day, the representatives have the responsibility for
13 the entire district, period. And so that's what the
14 districts and the communities in those districts should
15 have expectations of their representatives to do that.

16 And I don't think we should hold the mindset that a
17 representative does not have that ability, but they can
18 only be myopic and singular in their focus, or make
19 assumptions that because a particular group is there or
20 not there, that that particular group is somehow --
21 because to me, it comes from the -- some negative kind of
22 thinking that only a certain group of the group is going
23 to get taken care of. And I know how much history we
24 have on all of that.

25 But I just want us to be a little bit careful. I'd

1 like us to be a little bit more thoughtful and not be
2 presumptuous that it's a negative to have a community
3 like Century City in this particular district that's been
4 drawn.

5 I don't think I said it as quite as eloquently as
6 Commissioner Taylor did yesterday, but I did want to lift
7 that up. But I do support at the same time, keeping
8 Palms together for the reasons that Commissioner Vazquez
9 has so eloquently laid out. Thank you.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if it -- if it is a
11 trade-off between those two, I just wanted to get a sense
12 of your thinking on that.

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I think that Jaime just
14 said that there's a possibility, based on this other area
15 that was also added, that the trade-off might happen
16 along this Roxbury -- and I'm not sure what -- you know,
17 what populations did, but the -- the split might happen
18 there, right, in that little area, and put down in the --
19 the Shoreline, and then that way, whatever the number
20 was, like 3,000 -- I'm sorry, I wasn't tracking very
21 carefully, the population numbers in Palms that need to
22 be offset.

23 So I'd say look there. And again, if Century City
24 ends up being the one taken out, that's -- that's fine as
25 well. I'm not opposed to that. I just wanted to make

1 that point, that has more to do with a theme that I feel
2 like I keep hearing.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. No, that -- that's very
4 helpful to get that broad picture of your thinking on
5 this. Thank you so much.

6 Commissioner Taylor.

7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. And I thank you for
8 your comments, Commissioner Le Mons.

9 I would like to keep Palms whole. Again, I like
10 my -- my line of thinking is to keep as many communities
11 whole as possible. And yeah, I think we should lean
12 towards the -- excuse me for not being quite up to speed.
13 Do we have any COI testimony about keeping Palms whole,
14 or split? Are they willing to be split? Can we refer to
15 our -- to our support?

16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I don't believe there's any
17 COI testimony, unless it has come in. That being said,
18 data is -- data is data. Data is our community input.
19 Data is also what is publicly available. And so some of
20 my analysis is both lived experience, but also data that
21 I have been looking up around Palms in terms of, you
22 know, the income composition. Mostly single working-
23 class people, et cetera. So for me, I don't know that
24 it's a huge issue that we don't have specific COI
25 testimony supporting keeping them whole, when we have

1 access to data that indicates we may consider keeping
2 them whole.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

4 Jaime, you had, I believe, flashed up a community of
5 interest.

6 MS. CLARK: Yeah. Yeah. So it was just a COI that
7 was submitted through the COI tool, and it includes, you
8 know, Palms with Culver City, and also some of the
9 westside neighborhoods, so that's just one. I don't have
10 anything here that's more like specifically the shape
11 just of Palms that has any testimony included with it.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. CLARK: But that was the one that was called
14 Palms, that I would show it.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Perfect.

16 Commissioner Turner.

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I guess
18 what I'd want to say is that I feel a little
19 disadvantaged in that I'm not in the area, so I can only
20 rely on the testimony that's been received. And so the
21 testimony that I lifted up from the black census and
22 redistricting hub basically spoke of the particular
23 Century City area having always been associated and
24 counted on, then therefore in the Southern California,
25 Southern LA area as opposed to being moved out.

1 And so with that, I think the tradeoff then ended up
2 negatively impacting Palms, and it is not what I would
3 want to have Palms split, but if there is another
4 opportunity, I was still in favor of having Century City
5 be in on the -- toward -- not in the Shoreline.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just -- quickly
8 looking for -- since the question was asked, I saw one
9 piece of testimony that spoke to Palms being -- I think
10 that's the area that Jaime was showing earlier being
11 affiliated with -- sorry, it said -- I think it said
12 Temple Akiba. Hold on, I'm going to pull up the -- the
13 COI testimony again.

14 Temple Akiba of Culver City is the home of reformed
15 Jews from Culver City, Westchester, Marina Del Rey, Del
16 Rey, Playa Vista, Palms, and Mar Vista.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: And that is located?

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That is located -- well,
19 that's the area that I think --

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: In Palms?

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or it's -- it doesn't say
24 that it's in Palms. I guess is this particular COI
25 testimony is speaking to that grouping of communities, I

1 guess related to being in that sphere of influence of the
2 temple.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I'm looking for me.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To see if there's anything
7 else that says anything else.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Good.

9 Circling back, Commissioner Vazquez, did you have
10 anything else?

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Just one more thing. Just
12 wanted to note that I do agree with Commissioner Le Mons
13 and Commissioner Taylor, and it seems like Commissioner
14 Turner. I think -- I think it's important to think
15 about, sort of, community assets, and I do think Century
16 City is absolutely a community asset. And if it has been
17 historically, sort of associated with the self-LA
18 composition of communities, it makes sense for me -- to
19 me, for us to keep trying.

20 And maybe if, Jaime, you could quickly, sort of
21 visualize what you had suggested about taking portions of
22 this Beverly Glen area. So you'll also note Palms is
23 basically a donut hole of apartments and working-class
24 people surrounded by single family homes in Culver City
25 to the south, and South Robertson and Beverly Glen to the

1 north.

2 So if that's what it's looking like we're
3 protecting, yes. Like, I'm trying -- we're trying to
4 protect this donut hole that's surrounded by otherwise
5 pretty high-income, single-family homes on the westside.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. I mean, my inclination
7 would be to try to respect the community of interest,
8 which linked all of Palms to all of Culver City. So I
9 mean, that's where my thinking is on this.

10 Commissioner Fernandez, I apologize if I skipped
11 you. I thought your hand was still up from previously.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I -- well, I
13 was going to say something, then I wasn't going to say
14 something, and now I guess I'll say something. Culver
15 City is about 40,000, so if you were going to do a split,
16 you'd cut it -- I believe, Culver City in half. So I
17 definitely don't want to see that. I do like the link
18 with Palms with Culver City, and hopefully we can just
19 find a way to -- to work around that.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

21 Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner Taylor, we're not
22 hearing you.

23 Okay. Hand went down. Okay. So Jaime, would you
24 be able to walk us through what it might look like to
25 include all of Palms in the 10CORR District and where we

1 might find population to make that possible, whether it's
2 that area north of Palms or --

3 MS. CLARK: Yeah.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Or some other --

5 MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you. I was just kind of
6 zooming out the map and thinking about this also. So we
7 highlighted this entire area that was about 20,000
8 people. I do not believe that there's 20,000 people
9 right here to do an equal swap, but maybe if the
10 Commission doesn't mind, I can just highlight that area
11 to understand exactly how many people are there.

12 I'm just going to do that as quickly as possible.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

14 MS. CLARK: So that -- this is about 3,300 people.
15 So definitely not 20,000. It was kind of -- yeah, so I
16 guess this is -- this is what was involved in the 3 way
17 swap, for how we got here was including adjusting the
18 boundary of STHLA, and then also making Westchester
19 neighborhoods whole completely in Shoreline.

20 So potentially, you know, there would be some
21 adjusting that could be done there. Or if Palms was
22 going to be included in 10 Corridor, and then Shoreline
23 would be underpopulated by 20,000 people, so it could be,
24 you know, picking up West Hollywood or Mid City areas,
25 and then doing a swap here between Glen2BA and 10CORR.

1 Another question that I have is whether going all
2 the way to the 405 here for Palms is the goal, or if it
3 would be okay to use Overland, for example, as a
4 boundary, just to try and get more of Palms in with
5 Culver City and the 10CORR District.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I -- I mean, my -- my
7 inclination here would be to go ahead and switch Beverly
8 Glen out and then see how far out we can push Palms
9 towards the 405, understanding that we might not make it
10 all the way.

11 Commissioner Vazquez.

12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just -- I think
13 that's a great compromise. I think Overland is a very
14 large street, so again, I'm thinking about streets and
15 freeways being good guide posts for communities of
16 interest. I think going at least west to Overland would
17 be a good compromise.

18 I also just want to reflect on -- I still think
19 splitting Culver City for me is very much on the table.
20 The communities of -- within Culver City, again,
21 especially west of the 405, again, looking at public
22 data, looking at real estate listings in that area of
23 Culver City west of the 405, these are multimillion
24 dollar single family homes. Apartments for sale, condos
25 for sale are north of a million dollars in this area.

1 And so in terms of splitting a vulnerable community, if
2 the tradeoff is splitting Palms, or splitting pieces of
3 Culver City, for me, I would like to keep splitting
4 Culver City on the table.

5 I just don't think it's as vulnerable as Palms.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I believe I would support
7 you in that using the 405 as a -- as a boundary, could I
8 get some thoughts from other Commissioners on that? If
9 we -- if we moved both Beverly Glen and Culver City west
10 of the 405 out of 10CORR and used that to bring in as
11 much as possible of Palms, is that something that we
12 could support?

13 Commissioner Le Mons?

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I support that.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

16 I'm seeing head nods. Any objection?

17 Okay. Jaime, could you go ahead and do that then,
18 please, and show us how far Palms could be united?

19 Okay. Commissioner Vazquez or others, are there --
20 are there specific streets or landmarks in Palms that we
21 might want to look at as far as bringing this
22 overpopulation down?

23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Overland was a good one, so
24 bummer that that doesn't work.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I mean, we --

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Well, was -- yeah.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

3 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was thinking, actually
4 maybe stay closer to the -- keep the portions that you
5 just removed closer to the freeway. Or sorry, to Venice
6 Boulevard. I would -- they -- there's definitely even
7 tiers in Palms --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Closer to Venice, I would say
10 is probably lower income, cheaper apartments. So maybe
11 remove stuff closer to the 10.

12 MS. CLARK: Yeah.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So if we -- if -- yeah, if we
14 took Palms Boulevard over to Overland.

15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Uh-huh.

16 MS. CLARK: So this is not quite to Overland. It's
17 around Keystone. And this highlighted area would make it
18 so that 10CORR was 637 people underpopulated, so I'm
19 going to turn on the census blocks, and they do -- oh,
20 great. So we might be able to get --

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, if we can -- if we can get
22 those -- yep. That one more census block and then find
23 another place to -- or if you could show us other places
24 where we might balance that -- that deviation of 121, I
25 think we're -- we're in good shape.

1 MS. CLARK: Maybe in this area, which is around --
2 it looks like Burgen -- or Burgen and Beverly areas and
3 South Robertson could be a place to balance between
4 10CORR and Shoreline.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

6 MS. CLARK: Would you like me --

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Just -- yes, please. And then there
8 just above the 10, right -- yeah, just a little bit just
9 above where your hand was, there's a block that's 114, I
10 believe; is that that block right there?

11 MS. CLARK: Yeah. I can definitely look at that.
12 Sometimes, in my --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

14 MS. CLARK: -- experience, it's easier to try and --
15 you have, like, more wiggle room if you try and grab
16 smaller --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

19 MS. CLARK: I don't know.

20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I would recommend that as
21 well. There's a line of apartments, really that line the
22 10. I used to live -- that was where my apartment was,
23 where the Buffer Apartments between the freeway and the
24 multimillion-dollar homes to the north, so I would
25 recommend, in the spirit of keeping working-class people

1 in apartments together, Jaime is doing -- what Jaime is
2 doing is right.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect. Then let's give
4 Jaime two or three more minutes, we can wrap this up, and
5 then we can move onto our Senate work. We will continue
6 to come back to any small outstanding congressional
7 iterations first thing in the morning, try to dispose of
8 those before 11:00 tomorrow. On Thursday and Friday, we
9 start at 9:30, and I know that we have some larger
10 outstanding iterations for congress, and so my intent is
11 to address those during that first block on Thursday and
12 the first block on Friday.

13 (Pause)

14 MS. CLARK: So I found a way to balance to zero
15 population. It was a swap in between both District
16 Shoreline and 10CORR. This boundary is around Castle
17 Heights Avenue, and this is McConnell Drive areas. I'm
18 going to zoom out so everyone can see the larger
19 implication.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

21 Commissioner Toledo.

22 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Just
23 wanted to -- I was just going to speak to your comment
24 about tomorrow and Thursday about the schedule. Just in
25 particular, I just wanted to let you know that

1 Commissioners Akutagawa and I, and legal have reviewed
2 our Central Valley maps, and we'll be ready to present
3 whenever you need us to.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Whether it's any time in the
6 schedule in the next couple of days. Thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

8 Okay. Is this -- are we happy with these changes,
9 and can we shift our attention to Senate? No objection.
10 Okay.

11 Jaime, thank you so much for helping us through
12 this. That is now -- that can now be finalized for
13 sharing with the public, and we will turn our attention
14 to our Senate work.

15 Commissioner Akutagawa.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just for clarity, so is
17 Palms split?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Palms is split, but it is much more
19 whole than it started out.

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So here's a question, I
21 notice that as Jaime was showing where she balanced
22 population in that South Robertson neighborhood council
23 area, I guess I'm wondering if we would be better served
24 by taking even a little bit more from that particular
25 area that she took from because that -- those are single-

1 family homes also, and it's a pretty -- again, if you
2 want to keep Palms whole, I'm just wondering if that
3 would make for, you know, a more equitable split, if you
4 want to try to keep Palms whole at this point, if that's
5 where she took from.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

7 Commissioner Vazquez.

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I agree with you in concept,
9 Commissioner Akutagawa. That being said, I think there's
10 just so many -- there's so much population, even in this
11 little triangle north of that -- that split in Palms now.
12 There's so -- there's so many people in apartments there,
13 that I -- I don't know, even if we took all of, like, the
14 rest of South Robertson, I'm not sure that we could
15 balance population and still keep something resembling a
16 compact district.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And if we took the rest of
18 South Robertson, that would leave Century City
19 noncontiguous. So I don't see that we have room to
20 really maneuver too much here.

21 MS. CLARK: And just a quick note -- I'm so sorry to
22 interject. And actually, South Robertson is one of the
23 more densely populated areas in the City of Los Angeles
24 as well, so just a note.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

1 Mr. Becker, do you have any concerns to raise at
2 this point?

3 MR. BECKER: I do not, not about this area.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

5 Okay. So moving onto Senate. I just wanted to
6 point out that we have, essentially as it's laid out, we
7 have 16, 90-minute blocks, four per day, to work on the
8 Senate and the Board of Equalization. As I mentioned,
9 the extra 90-minute blocks, one on Thursday morning, one
10 on Friday morning will need to be dedicated to finishing
11 up those outstanding iterations on congress.

12 So I think we have a full plate ahead of us. As I
13 mentioned, the plan for today is to begin in Los Angeles
14 with VRA areas. After -- well, we'll start first with
15 the review of the November 10th drafts in conjunction
16 with the overlay of the current Assembly districts. It
17 is quarter of 12:00. We have until 12:30 in this
18 session. That could take us to the end of this first 90-
19 minute block, and then we would have three more today,
20 starting with the VRA areas in Los Angeles County,
21 continuing with Los Angeles County after the lunchbreak,
22 and hopefully being able to get into Southern California
23 VRA districts and the rest of Southern California before
24 6:15.

25 So Commissioner Akutagawa.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I saw that one of our
2 notetakers has asked for a recap of what the Shoreline
3 and the 10 Corridor districts will look like now for the
4 purposes of the notes.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Jaime, could you just
6 review that very quickly for us?

7 MS. CLARK: Yes. Without switching back for the
8 sake of time, so the changes in 10 Corridor were in the
9 Palms area and we're moving Cheviot Hills from the 10
10 Corridor District. The southern boundary to the east of
11 Westmont is at Manchester now. And in Shoreline,
12 Westchester neighborhoods are now included in that
13 district, and we move the split in Palms to Palms and
14 Overland, and everything sort of east -- or excuse me,
15 west of that in Palms. And additionally, Century City is
16 not included with Shoreline, but the Cheviot Hills area
17 is.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime, and thank you,
19 Commissioner Akutagawa.

20 Mr. Becker.

21 MR. BECKER: If it's appropriate, Chair, I'd just
22 like to make a couple of quick reminders as we're
23 entering into the Senate districts again.

24 First, these are huge districts. These might be the
25 largest districts in the country that I know of. They

1 are larger than a congressional district. So they are
2 going to cover large areas of land, particularly in the
3 less populated areas of California, including the
4 northern and eastern part of the state.

5 Second, just as you've been working on congressional
6 districts and had very little flexibility with regard to
7 deviations, you're back to a point where you have an
8 ability to deviate by population of plus and minus five
9 percent.

10 And then lastly, I'd just like to point out, while
11 nesting is the least important of all the criteria
12 listed, it is -- it is not something you need to have or
13 pay much -- there's going to be a lot of other
14 considerations well above it that should take precedent.
15 So as you're considering this, nesting is going to lose
16 out to every other consideration on the list of
17 congressional criteria. Or I'm sorry, constitutional
18 criteria. So keep that in mind as you're proceeding down
19 this -- down the homestretch here.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

21 Okay. So Jaime, are you going to take us on this
22 tour?

23 MS. CLARK: I will. I'll take you on a tour.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

25 MS. CLARK: So on the map right now, the Senate

1 draft is in black lines with black labels. And just for
2 the sake of space on the map, right now, it just has the
3 name of the draft district and the percent deviation of
4 the draft district.

5 The blue lines represent the Assembly iteration from
6 12/08, so your most recent Assembly iteration, and those
7 also are in blue with blue percent deviation associated.
8 As you can see, we did a first -- a first pass at
9 numbering these districts based on the 08 iteration, a
10 12/08 iteration, and so that's what the name is. It's
11 AD02-NCOAST, so this would be District 2 and it's called
12 NCOAST. We did that so that everyone could understand
13 the number, plus what we've been calling it and the
14 Assembly iterations.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 MS. CLARK: So --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: If I can stop you there. I just
18 want to confirm that what we have up on the map viewer is
19 consistent with what we are showing here live.

20 MS. CLARK: Yes. We have the Senate draft up on the
21 map viewer, as is the Assembly district iteration from
22 12/08, which is your most recent iteration.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you.

24 Mr. Becker. No? Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

25 MR. BECKER: Sorry, my bad.

1 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I -- thank you for that,
2 Jaime, but I'm looking at the Tahoe area, and I know that
3 the latest one that we're all working off of is not
4 actually that one, it's the one that has -- I guess it's
5 with Mr. Fornaciari's balance frozen, and I think that's
6 what we're calling it in that area, where the county line
7 splits Tahoe.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, I believe
9 that was for the congressional maps, wasn't it?

10 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh --

11 MS. CLARK: So right now we're looking at the Senate
12 and the Assembly.

13 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: And the Assembly, okay.

14 MS. CLARK: Yes. We're not looking

15 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you very
16 much. No, thank you. Thank you. Yes, you're absolutely
17 right.

18 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

19 So just an overview of the Senate districts. Right
20 now, for the north coast, you have a district that goes
21 all the way from Marin County up to Del Norte County,
22 including Trinity.

23 Some differences here, just -- and this is going to
24 be a very, very broad overview. All mappers will also
25 have the Assembly 12/08 iteration up, which is your

1 working draft at this point, so that everybody could go
2 over this again as needed.

3 But, you know, some differences here would be that
4 you have Lake County end with more inland counties and
5 Assembly. So if you wish to maintain this north to south
6 based district, it would be, you know, their -- that's a
7 difference in terms of if you're thinking about nesting
8 at all.

9 Similarly, the same district, the Lake County, Napa
10 County district, again, just with this north coastal
11 district would be unable to be nested.

12 And looking in Sacramento -- I'm not even going to
13 get into it too much here, but there is some significant
14 differences as you can see. This Tahoe area would be
15 able to remain whole, should you choose to look into
16 nesting.

17 Moving just a little further south through the Bay
18 Area, I think that there is options, should you choose to
19 look into nesting in this area, just based on what you
20 have for your Assembly districts right now.

21 Yeah, so -- and then again, in Senate, you don't
22 really have any east to west crossing of the bridges with
23 the Bay, in the Bay, and additionally, you don't cross
24 the Golden Gate Bridge here. So right now, the Bay Area
25 is sort of like East Bay, and then there's South Bay

1 where there's some, you know, wiggle room, and then also
2 Peninsula and San Francisco areas you don't have any
3 crossover.

4 Looking at the Central Valley, generally, using sort
5 of the mountain ranges as a general boundary, however,
6 in -- for San Bernardino County, do have that currently
7 going with areas of West Fresno County.

8 And moving further south, here on the eastern edge
9 of Fresno County and Tulare County, using the -- using
10 the Sierras or the ridge of the Sierras as a natural
11 boundary there, this boundary is shared, at least in
12 Tulare County with Assembly districts.

13 Similarly, moving further south down the Central
14 Coast, no east to west crossover in either version of
15 districts between Fresno or Kings County when we're
16 looking here at San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura
17 Counties, there's a line there.

18 Going to move into Los Angeles County. There are
19 significant differences here, right? So in your current
20 Senate draft, Antelope Valley and Victor Valley are
21 together in sort of a High Desert based district. Not
22 crossing over a ton, past Camarillo here in Ventura
23 County, and definitely, you know, all of Camarillo is
24 with Ventura County based districts in Senate.

25 Just for population purposes and also, you know,

1 based on your wishes, were not crossing Mulholland here
2 for Senate.

3 And additionally, some other just general
4 architecture kind of stuff -- and actually, for LA, I'm
5 going to remove the Assembly lines because the map is so
6 busy. So right now, just looking at the Senate lines, we
7 have the ports separate, and the Long Beach area going
8 north on -- around 710, to include some of these gateway
9 cities with Long Beach, keeping sort of this, like, South
10 and Central LA areas together in one district.

11 In the NELA based district, keeping East Los Angeles
12 and Boyle Heights together. This does include Eagle Rock
13 and other areas, you know, in -- in the City of LA and
14 South of Glendale that the Commission's been wanting to
15 keep together in District. Just kind of zooming out at
16 the 210 District, this has San Dimas, Claremont, Glendora
17 in with Burbank and Glendale whole.

18 And then moving towards San Gabriel Valley, having
19 San Marino, Monterey Park, Alhambra areas with cities
20 such as Pico Rivera and out to West Covina. And then
21 just out of south of that, the Walnut, Diamond Bar,
22 Hacienda Heights areas with Whittier, Downey, Bellflower,
23 Norwalk, and Artesia.

24 So then I'm going to put the Assembly districts back
25 on and look at Orange County for the Santa Ana based

1 district. Sort of a similar shape here, as with the
2 other versions, or the other levels of districts,
3 generally maintaining the line here between Orange County
4 and Riverside County, and continuing to zoom out, just
5 going to continue down the coast here through very
6 Southern Orange County and San Diego County. Again, just
7 kind of going to zoom in.

8 And this one difference is it's including this Chula
9 Vista based district with SECA to make one large
10 geographically large district, sort of combining East
11 County areas with Imperial and parts of the Coachella
12 Valley.

13 And then in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties,
14 sort of the rest of the Coachella Valley here in with
15 some of these other areas, just north of San Bernardino,
16 so this is like Yucaipa and Calimesa together.

17 Some areas with VRA considerations here, further
18 west in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, and then
19 kind of zooming back out again, this takes us to this
20 geographically large Antelope Valley and Victor Valley
21 based district, so general overview of sort of the
22 architecture of the Senate draft with your Assembly
23 lines.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime. We've got some
25 work to do. So I -- we are -- I wanted to take enough

1 time to make sure that we had a good understanding of
2 where we stand, and I think at this point, it would be
3 good to have a brief discussion about priorities that
4 colleagues see in the -- in the Senate plan as it
5 currently stand. And if we can identify any priorities
6 that we have moving forward between now and 12:30 so that
7 when we come back at 12:45, we can start off with the VRA
8 areas in Los Angeles County.

9 So Commissioner Andersen.

10 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I
11 believe our priorities on this one should be pinning down
12 the VRA Districts, and that's not just -- it was in Los
13 Angeles, it's in San Diego, in Orange County, San Diego.
14 It's also the Central Valley, and if it does go over and
15 include the San Benito and lot. Because if we know that
16 area, there's a great possibility of making some
17 iterations of the entire north and having it be willing
18 to be brought back to the -- to the group as a -- to
19 quickly go over and spend more time where we know we'll
20 have to do it live through the Los Angeles area because
21 there's some VRA districts down there. So I -- that's
22 why I would prioritize, so the VRA districts, the opinion
23 goes down. Thank you.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner
25 Andersen.

1 Commissioner Vazquez.

2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I -- my priorities are
3 the VRA districts in the Inland Empire, and particularly
4 the Rialto, San Bernardino, Fontana Region.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

6 Commissioner Sinay.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is not so much -- well, I
8 guess it will be part of my priority, but could we have
9 what current -- in our current draft, what no -- the --
10 how many VRA districts were we able -- you know, did we
11 keep in our current -- in our current draft, because I
12 think sometimes we forget -- I'd like us to start from
13 there. And then the number of minority and majority
14 districts that we have in the current draft.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jaime, is that something that
16 you can speak to at this point?

17 MS. CLARK: I don't have that number easily
18 accessible.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll come back to you on
20 that.

21 MS. CLARK: There's eight districts that have a
22 Latino CVAP at 50 percent plus.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I would like to start with the
25 VRA areas across the whole state.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani.

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I will join the chorus to
3 say, yes, VRA Districts. And to Commissioner Sinay's
4 point, yes, currently we have eight districts that are at
5 a range of above 50 percent Latino CVAP. That being
6 said, we have a number that we identified in the Assembly
7 as having VRA considerations that were not necessarily --
8 that -- well, in any case, that I think we should take a
9 closer look at, so I'll highlight a few of them.

10 One of them includes an Antelope Valley. Certainly,
11 Santa Ana in Orange County, which we know. That always
12 requires a lot of reconfiguration in Orange County.
13 Several in Los Angeles, including the gateway cities down
14 to the San Pedro Port is one of those. Inland Empire,
15 yes, and I think there's probably COI testimony that
16 we're going to want to play around with in those areas.

17 And then of course we've heard some testimony also
18 about the SECA district that we have in the San Diego
19 areas, which is spanning from San Diego all the way out
20 through Riverside and up to Needles, and what kind of
21 cleanup that we would probably need to, or want to do in
22 that area as well. Thank you.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
24 Commissioner Akutagawa.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I definitely agree

1 on let's -- let's really get comfortable with where we
2 are on the VRA district statewide. I think Commissioner
3 Sadhwani uplifted some of the VRA districts in Southern
4 California. I would agree with Commissioner Vazquez as
5 well, too.

6 One other thing that I know hasn't been brought up,
7 but we've had a number of conversations about trying to
8 keep Irvine whole, so I noticed that it is split, so I
9 just wanted to throw that in there as well, too. Thank
10 you.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
12 Commissioner Fernandez.

13 COMMISSIONER FRENANDEZ: Yes, definitely VRAs are
14 always a priority. I guess I -- this has nothing to do
15 with the priorities, but Jaime, having the overlay, that
16 versus the Senate, I guess I'm having a difficult time
17 figuring out how we're going to do the nesting, depending
18 on which map we're using.

19 So I think that's -- are we just -- are we using our
20 draft Senate maps? Or are we using our Assembly?
21 That's -- that's what I'm getting confused at right now,
22 because that -- in the last prior -- the last criteria is
23 nesting, so I can see us using our draft Senate, but then
24 how are we going to know if we're ever going -- if we're
25 going to be able to nest? It's just it's -- it -- that

1 whole overlay thing was the blues and the blacks were
2 confusing.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. You know, we spent the time
4 to come up with the Senate draft, so I think we need to
5 move forward with the Senate drafts. Nesting -- and I'll
6 ask Karin to step in and supplement what I'm going to
7 say, but you know, the Senate draft plan, we could -- we
8 could already take that and say we've been able to nest
9 to X percentage. So it's not just a question of these
10 two, these two, these two, but a Senate -- a Senate
11 district that contains, you know, most of one Assembly
12 district, and most of another is nested to a certain
13 percentage extent.

14 So Karin, would you like to explain that further?

15 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Thank you. Thank you so much
16 for that question, and also, I know that Mr. Becker is
17 here, so -- so he could weigh in on this.

18 Essentially, I think -- and I'm sorry that it was
19 confusing with the lines on there. We wanted to provide
20 you with a visual so you could see what the lay of the
21 land is right now, because it is one of your criteria.
22 And while we have talked about a lot of communities of
23 interest, of course, and you've seen the geographies for
24 communities of interest, and we've talked about the VRA,
25 and we've talked about all of the other criteria. This

1 is pretty much the CORRS 10 that you've seen this other
2 criteria on that you -- that is at the bottom of the
3 list, of course, as Mr. Becker explained in relation to
4 the Senate maps that you have created and that you will
5 be working off of.

6 What we have available to you is the ability to turn
7 these on and off. And as Mr. Becker said previously,
8 these really have to stand on their own. So you have to
9 go through all of the different criteria to construct
10 them, and then, you know, you get to -- you get to
11 nesting at the end, but if you want to use the Assembly
12 districts as a reference, you can do that.

13 And again, we -- you know, we can -- we can take a
14 look throughout the process, as you see fit, and just see
15 if there is potentially a line, and in particular, if --
16 you know, perhaps they're close and it doesn't really
17 matter to you whether you go over to the right or a
18 little bit to the left. There may be some natural
19 opportunities there in other scenarios, in other parts of
20 the state, perhaps, it's probably just not going to work.
21 So that's why we showed it, and I hope that answers the
22 question.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll elaborate a little bit further
24 on the question and then ask Commissioner Fernandez if
25 she wants to follow up.

1 I had -- I had described a situation where we would
2 have, say 80 percent of one Assembly district, and 70
3 percent of another Assembly district, or you know, some
4 combination of -- well, plus a piece of a third. Okay.
5 So we have -- we have that kind of configuration that
6 we're looking at in a Senate district. That could be
7 described as some percentage nested, correct?

8 MS. MAC DONALD: Chair Kennedy, I'm sorry, was that
9 a question for me? Or was --

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

11 MS. MAC DONALD: -- that a question for Mr. Becker?

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: For you. If a Senate district
13 consists of 80 percent of one Assembly district, 80
14 percent of another, and 40 percent of a third, so that
15 would give you all the population that you need, that --
16 that some percentage nested, if I understand it
17 correctly?

18 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. I would like to hand this
19 over to Mr. Becker because my understanding, and again,
20 I'm not an attorney, is that either you're nested or
21 you're not. So basically, nesting refers to, you know,
22 for example, taking two Assembly districts and then, you
23 know, nesting them together in one Senate district.

24 So of course, if you're almost able to do that, then
25 you could say that in your report. We tried to nest it

1 and it's almost there. Let's say it's to 90 percent
2 there, so -- but generally speaking, it refers to two
3 Assembly districts in one Senate district and then ten
4 Senate districts in one Board of Equalization District.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

6 MS. MAC DONALD: But please -- if Mr. Becker is
7 here, perhaps he could weigh in on this also. Thank you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: He's back with us.

9 MR. BECKER: Yes, I'm here.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: So Mr. Becker.

11 MR. BECKER: Hopefully you can all hear me. So
12 that's exactly right, what Karin just said. Nesting
13 is -- you either nest or you don't. There is -- there is
14 no almost nested. The nesting means literally that two
15 Assembly districts in their entirety comprise a Senate
16 district.

17 I'll also just state again, nesting is the very last
18 requirement. And I think one of the reasons that it
19 might be the last requirement is because if you decide to
20 nest, and likely that was a decision that probably would
21 have been -- had to be prioritized earlier, given the
22 timing right now, if you decide to nest, any change to
23 any nested district is going to affect two maps and
24 ripple through two maps, and that could be really
25 difficult, particularly under time constraints.

1 I'm not suggesting not paying attention to the
2 nesting criteria. I'm not suggesting that that criteria
3 doesn't exist. It does. It is just very intentionally,
4 I believe, placed at the very bottom of the other
5 criteria's that you're all considering. It loses out
6 when balanced against any other criteria, whether it be
7 compactness, COIs, political boundaries, VRA concerns,
8 equal population, et cetera. So just remember that as
9 you're considering how you're going to procedure.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Becker.
11 Commissioner Sinay.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just going back to the
13 priorities, so there -- you know, I want us to look at
14 the baseline for when it comes to, you know, a minority,
15 majority, and VRA districts, you know, what we can do.
16 The baseline is our draft. So if we can -- if we go up,
17 that's great. Not that we can go up on VRA, because we
18 know the VRA information.

19 The other -- the other piece is I would like to
20 explore further the VRA district that encompasses, you
21 know, the SECA and really look to see if we can create a
22 San Diego -- all San Diego VRA district because there are
23 communities, as we know. There's a significant Latino
24 community throughout the county, and I think that we
25 might be able to do that.

1 And that would allow Riverside and Imperial Valley
2 to have one that reflects more their population. So
3 that's one of my -- one of my priorities for exploration.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
5 Commissioner Toledo.

6 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. For me, section 2,
7 Voting Rights Act, would be the top priority where we
8 should start with. I would also encourage the -- us to
9 have a goal for the state on the number of VRA district,
10 as well as by region, so that certainly, of course, the
11 draft maps that baseline, but it's a baseline that's --
12 and in my opinion, it's probably on the lower end, but --
13 so I would encourage us to really think through all of
14 the -- all of the goals and what we actually want to
15 achieve in terms of Voting Rights Act compliance. Thank
16 you.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. Did
18 you have numbers in mind per region?

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, I mean, I think what --
20 what we've heard from the community is the baseline to
21 really compare our numbers to what the community maps are
22 suggesting, the baselines that we have there are eleven.
23 That may be too difficult to do because we have so many
24 COIs in some of these areas.

25 But taking a look at where we are; we're at about

1 eight at this point, if I remember correctly. So eight,
2 the highest number we probably can achieve is probably
3 that eleven, and figuring out by region what that might
4 look like if we were to get closer to the eleven.

5 But -- and I'm not saying hit the eleven, I'm saying
6 if we got closer to it, because I -- we do have community
7 of interest testimony that we have to work through,
8 especially in non-VRA areas, and so that would be my
9 suggestion. Thank you.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Well, and it would be in
11 the non-VRA areas because we know that in the VRA areas,
12 the VRA is the higher priority than the communities of
13 interest.

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Absolutely. Thank you.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

16 Commissioner Turner.

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, so
18 VRA, and I don't think it was noted, so also,
19 particularly I think we have VRA in the Central Valley
20 area. And then, I guess, so my other priority would be
21 for us from a process commission standpoint in this area
22 is as we're discussing changes, if there is a known
23 sticking point, we can perhaps name it and note it so
24 that once we settle, we won't have so many surprises
25 towards the end and have to continue to draw and redraw.

1 So it's fine to have different perspectives. But if we
2 know where the sticking points are going in, and maybe we
3 can get through this a little bit more expeditiously than
4 we have in the past.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you for that.
6 Commissioner Akutagawa.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Actually,
8 Commissioner Turner just lifted it up. I think there's a
9 lot of VRA districts in the Central Valley, and I'd like
10 to suggest that we perhaps start there. I know that the
11 Inland Empire also has VRA districts, but I think it's
12 the Central Valley that has been the most vexing for us,
13 I guess I'll say. And I think if we could try to get to
14 a place that we feel comfortable. And to Commissioner
15 Turner's point, you know, we know some of the sticking
16 points because we've been grappling with it with the
17 congressional maps as well as with the Assembly maps.

18 I think if we could get that in place then it would
19 hopefully make a lot of the other, you know, non-VRA
20 districts both to the north and to the south a little bit
21 easier, so I'd like to just suggest that.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

23 Ms. Mac Donald, could I consult with you on that?
24 The original idea was that we would start in Los Angeles
25 County with the VRA areas in Los Angeles County, and

1 perhaps move to non-VRA areas there, and then take up the
2 VRA areas elsewhere in Southern California.

3 Commissioners are suggesting that, A, we just run all of
4 the VRA districts before doing anything else, and
5 Commissioner Akutagawa has just suggested that we start
6 with the VRA areas in the Central Valley. So I wanted to
7 get your thinking on that.

8 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you so much for that. I
9 suppose our recommendation would still be to start with
10 Los Angeles and then work our way around, but if you
11 would like to just start with the VRA areas everywhere,
12 that's fine. That would work, we think, so we do still
13 think that LA is probably a good starting point. It just
14 generally lends itself for mapping a little bit better,
15 and I think we've seen, with our experience, that when we
16 start in LA, the rest of the state just flows a little
17 bit better, irrespective of the fact that we do spend a
18 lot of time in the Central Valley these days.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: All right.

20 MS. MAC DONALD: In the beautiful Central Valley.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So could you -- could you
22 describe for us what we might encounter if we -- if we
23 did start in the Central Valley, what problems we might
24 encounter as far as making the map whole?

25 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. So I haven't, honestly,

1 really thought this through perfectly because we have --
2 we have been planning on starting in Los Angeles, but one
3 thing is generally population bubbles because if you're
4 starting in the Central Valley, you are kind of -- you
5 know, you are again in that area where things are pushing
6 up from the south and from -- and from the north also, so
7 kind of working in the circle has been working pretty
8 well because you don't want to start in the Central
9 Valley and then you land in Los Angeles, where obviously
10 you have a lot of voting rights concerns, and maybe not a
11 lot of wiggle room in some of these areas, and also, you
12 know, going into the Imperial Valley and so forth.

13 And so I think generally, the way that the
14 population flows, it is -- it is a little -- practically
15 speaking, it's a little bit better to start, either from
16 LA and just kind of work our way around in a circle.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if we started in LA with
18 the VRA districts and then went to Orange County, San
19 Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernadino, also VRA
20 districts, then Central Valley, VRA districts, then
21 potentially Central Coast, and then went north from
22 there, would that be a workable way forward?

23 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. We think that that will
24 work, we just really need to stick with the circle to
25 actually really circle our way around so that we can keep

1 track of the way that the populations have flown.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

3 Commissioner Andersen.

4 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I
5 certainly see the idea of starting with VRA in LA because
6 I -- as I see it, there's so many VRA districts, that
7 that will -- essentially will be -- it's a redraw in
8 terms of can you nest? I don't think you can at all,
9 because you can't next VRA districts, they just don't
10 work that well, and then that destroys the areas around
11 them.

12 So in terms of nesting, I think kind of getting all
13 of that arranged, that entire area will give us a
14 framework.

15 Additionally, then I think, once we have -- okay, it
16 looks like right -- we have -- we can have some little
17 borders, as we did before, you know, like we know
18 where -- there's a line at -- in Ventura, here's kind of
19 a line in maybe Kern or Inyo, around that area, then I'd
20 say we jump to the Central Valley, do those very
21 districts because you can't do anything up north until
22 you really figure out is San Benito in the -- crossing
23 the Central Valley or not?

24 And then you can actually, the north, you can do a
25 fair amount of nesting. I would say clean up the

1 Assembly districts, the -- because we made a lot of
2 advances there. Quickly -- quickly do that right, and
3 then go nest, nest, nest around the Central VRA district.
4 I think that will all come together in that direction. I
5 think that's essentially what Ms. Mac Donald was saying.
6 Work out the Southern California, because that gives us
7 our lines, and then the Central Valley, where we can
8 actually kind of work around the north.

9 So I -- because I'm thinking we can actually --
10 that's what I believe Commissioner Fernandez brought up
11 the nesting, because the north area has a lot of non-VRA
12 areas, and it lends itself to nesting. The south does
13 not. It's that simple.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
15 Commissioner Sadhwani.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thanks. Just to
17 weigh in on this, to this conversation, agreed. When
18 Commissioner Fornaciari, and in particular the plan of
19 starting in Los Angeles and working south where there was
20 a method to our madness, so when -- I recall a few
21 moments ago, Commissioner Toledo had mentioned increasing
22 the number of districts and ensuring that we are meeting
23 our VRA requirements.

24 In Los Angeles alone, there are three districts that
25 are above 45 percent Latino CVAP. Those might be really

1 areas that we would want to look at.

2 In addition, there's a fourth in the -- in Orange
3 County. So you know, that alone, cleaning that up alone
4 could go a very long way to ensuring our -- that we are
5 meeting our obligations, which was really kind of the
6 thought behind starting in Los Angeles and working that
7 way.

8 Certainly, we're going to have our work to do in the
9 Central Valley. I'm not suggesting that we don't, but
10 from that regard, I think it's clean up as opposed to --
11 well, who knows, right? Who knows where we'll end up,
12 but I'm hoping that it's clean up as opposed to large
13 structural changes. We have fairly strong looking
14 districts already there. As you recall, we had built
15 four Assembly VRA districts in the Central Valley, and I
16 believe those were not entirely nested, but really built
17 out of the logic of those Assembly districts there.
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
20 Commissioner Toledo.

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I would agree with
22 Commissioner Sadhwani and certainly starting with the VRA
23 and starting in Los Angeles, I would also -- I mean, if
24 there's a way to ensure that our lines are -- because
25 ultimately it's the bottleneck, right? The -- we have

1 each line drawer, or those lines are in region, and so
2 making sure that we're able to distribute the work in a
3 way that allows us to get through the whole map in a --
4 in efficient manner, and sometimes that means going --
5 seeing a different part of the map to be able to get the
6 work to the appropriate line drawers and be able to
7 maximize our staff capacity because that is a -- that is
8 a limitation. It's a restriction on us.

9 And I mean, we have great line drawers, but there's
10 only so many of them and there's only so many hours of
11 the day. So just making sure that we are able to
12 maximize our ability to use our staff resource. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
15 Commissioner Sinay.

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. You know, a
17 lot -- I think Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner
18 Sadhwani met with the line drawers and did a lot of
19 thinking about our plans. We didn't quite necessarily
20 follow their suggestions. The last two plans, and
21 some -- and it didn't quite go the way we wanted it to,
22 so maybe we should listen to their original plan and try
23 it because we tend to go around and around and around and
24 end up usually -- you know, I just -- I'd like to see us
25 move, and I think whichever way we go is going to work

1 well, but I do want to respect the thought and planning
2 that went on behind the scenes before we started.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much for that.

4 Commissioner Fernandez.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just
6 wanted to respond to my initial question regarding which
7 maps. And I am glad that we're using the Senate, because
8 we did have -- we did spend a lot of time, and I -- and
9 then I guess response to Commissioner Andersen is even in
10 the north, I don't necessarily think, or believe that
11 that's for a nesting as well because when we did the
12 Assembly, we knew that there were certain areas we may be
13 cutting off and we thought, okay, maybe when we get to
14 the Senate, we could accommodate some of these bigger
15 communities of interest. So I am grateful that we're
16 using the Senate maps and that's what I was hoping and I
17 want to make sure that the public knew which maps we're
18 looking at right now, or using. Thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you so much.

20 Commissioner Fornaciari, and/or Commissioner
21 Sadhwani, do you want to just take a moment and remind us
22 of your initial planning for this?

23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I think Commissioner
24 Sadhwani kind of summed it up. We had planned on
25 starting in LA, starting with the VRA districts. Well,

1 starting in Southeast LA, I guess, but probably that was
2 more focused on the Assembly. And -- but in general,
3 just start in LA, move down through Orange County into
4 San Diego and then around and finish up the Inland
5 Empire, was the direction we were -- we had thought we'd
6 head. Is that -- did I capture that right, Commissioner
7 Sadhwani?

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that's right,
9 and you know, but I mean, when we started that in the
10 Assembly, it became clear that, you know, originally, the
11 intent was to work in one area for a day, send the
12 line -- the mapper off with very specific guidance. And
13 they could have a day to work on that and then come back.
14 And I think we quickly devolved to, you know, send the
15 member off for an hour and hope that they come back an
16 hour later and go work in another area of the state.

17 And I think that it's become very difficult to post
18 those iterations as well, which makes it complicated for
19 the public to follow along. So I think the, you know,
20 last week we had attempted to provide a plan. We --
21 yeah, we didn't present it, in which we would take two
22 days in each area for the Los Angeles and Southern
23 California, for example. So because it was very clear
24 that one day wasn't sufficient for the Commission in any
25 one area.

1 And so, but again, we I think we, you know, I think
2 we turn and move as is needed. And I think a part of
3 this is, you know, best laid plans. We have to be
4 nimble. We have to be able to move as is necessary. So
5 yeah, that was the initial thought process was sticking
6 to one area, trying to make as many changes as possible.
7 And what we've seen, right, especially, you know, working
8 with Jaime in Los Angeles and particularly the
9 interconnection between various counties, the small
10 little changes that folks want to see in one area then
11 leads to larger changes elsewhere. So it does become
12 complicated. I don't I don't know if there's another way
13 around that, but, you know, if -- yeah. However,
14 however, the chair would like to proceed. Thank you.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you. Commissioner
16 Sadhwani.

17 Commissioner Andersen, and then Commissioner
18 Akutagawa.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, I really like that
20 plan. One addition that we learned from last week is
21 when we're not getting a direction in an area, move to
22 the next area and let Commissioners really contemplate
23 what they'd like to do. And that's why I like starting
24 in Los Angeles. We sort of thought through scenarios.
25 We'll see a lot.

1 I think we can give some direction and then we can
2 possibly move to the -- to the Inland Empire, you know,
3 essentially Sivan's area, which Commissioner Toledo said
4 to be able to spread some of the work around. And our
5 emphasis -- we really need to make sure we're getting
6 direction, you know, we have a lot of thoughts. And yes,
7 we want to know why. But remember, lead with that goal
8 and how you think you get there and then why. Don't just
9 lead with why it never gets the goal of the direction.
10 So I just want to emphasize that and move through this
11 rather quickly, I think.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
13 Commissioner Akutagawa?

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you for that
15 explanation, Commissioner Sadhwani. And I see the logic
16 in starting in LA now, so I think I was just kind of
17 pulling from our experience last night looking at the
18 Central Valley VRA districts and thinking, oh, my gosh,
19 you know. But I see the logic and I appreciate and agree
20 with it.

21 I've been thinking about -- I guess one thought that
22 it's been kind of percolating for me and now I think,
23 given what you said, I'd like to make a suggestion for
24 process, perhaps. And I'm very guilty of this, as I'm
25 going to just say, perhaps all of us to some degree. You

1 know, we're trying to be responsive to public input,
2 especially as it's coming in. I'm wondering if that has
3 derailed us a little bit and that perhaps we just need to
4 allow our process to finish and not try to insert the
5 public inputs that we're getting real time as it's being
6 posted and as it's coming in.

7 And perhaps we just need to take a pause and look
8 through the entirety of all the public inputs that we
9 give so that then we do give -- we do allow the plan as
10 it's been laid out by Commissioner Sadhwani and
11 Commissioner Fornaciari to come out. And then that way,
12 then, the inputs will then be based on the collective set
13 of all the changes that we're making.

14 We allow the entire body of the public to make
15 inputs on the same set of maps instead of continuously
16 making these little changes. And then it might also make
17 the time a little bit more efficient. So that's just
18 the thought that we just, you know, look at everything
19 all at once together once we're done.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you for that.

21 Commissioner Sinay. And then we are up against our
22 break.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I definitely appreciate what
24 Commissioner Akutagawa just said. And at the very
25 beginning, we set up a process to be equal to all. And

1 we created a process of how people could access us. And
2 that was through our forms, our COI tools, and such. And
3 some people have our emails. Some people don't. Some
4 people have our Twitter handles. Some people don't.

5 I would like us really to use the database, our
6 Airtable. And so that way everybody has equal access at
7 the equal time to all the Commissioners. And that we
8 read -- we read comments from there along with the
9 public -- the public call-ins. I just -- the going to
10 our emails or going to Twitter, or going to tweets, or
11 whatever it might be -- I said that twice, sorry -- is
12 just not fair for the greater public.

13 And so I just want -- it's late in the process. I
14 know. So we may not be able to make that change, but
15 that's something I believe in.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much,
17 Commissioner Sinay. Thank you, all of you, for those
18 thoughtful comments. We will take a fifteen-minute
19 break. And when we come back, we will start working
20 through VRA districts in Los Angeles County with Jaime.
21 Thank you all.

22 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:30 a.m.
23 until 12:46 a.m.)

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
25 patience during our break, we are back and we are ready

1 to begin our review of VRA districts in Los Angeles. We
2 will be stepping out for a few moments for a very quick
3 closed session. I estimate that that's going to be on
4 the order of five to ten minutes.

5 But before we get that, and then while we're waiting
6 for everyone to get back into place, Jaime, could you
7 just go into a little more detail than the first time
8 around and show us what we're looking at in LA, focusing
9 primarily on the on the VRA areas?

10 MS. CLARK: I'm sorry, there's a little bit of
11 background noise, so for the -- specifically looking at
12 the VRA areas in this, or the overview of the total?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, overview of Los Angeles
14 County, but with most of the focus on the VRA areas.

15 MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you for clarifying. So I'm
16 going to start here in Antelope Valley and just kind of
17 zoom out. Antelope Valley is with Victor Valley and
18 areas in San Bernardino County. And the very northern
19 part of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga, as well as the San
20 Antonio Heights along the 210 corridor.

21 And then a bigger zoom out sort of with northern,
22 very rural San Bernardino County High Desert areas.
23 Santa Clarita Valley is intact and is with areas in San
24 Fernando Valley in the City of San Fernando, Sylmar,
25 Pacoima, Mission Hills areas out to Reseda. And then

1 here, the boundary in Van Nuys is at Oxnard.

2 In the rest of -- much of the rest of San Fernando
3 Valley is including sort of Granada Hills down to
4 Woodland Hills and out to Studio City areas, is included
5 with some communities in eastern Ventura County,
6 including Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks. The shoreline
7 district for your Senate maps includes Malibu, Westlake
8 Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Topanga. Palisades
9 with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Westwood, Santa Monica,
10 Venice, Marina del Rey, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach,
11 Redondo Beach, all of Torrance, southern areas in
12 Gardena, Palos Verdes.

13 Just going to head back north west of 110. This
14 includes Westlake, Pico-Union, South Central, Central,
15 Alameda. And heading west and south a little bit
16 includes Palms, Mar Vista, Del Rey, Westchester, LAX and
17 Inglewood. SPCC includes San Pedro, Carson in West
18 Carson, Compton, Lennox, Hawthorne, Lawndale, northern
19 parts of Gardena, Watts, and Westmont in some areas north
20 of 105 along the 110.

21 The district called 710TOWATER, this includes Long
22 Beach, Lakewood, following up the 710 to include some of
23 the Gateway cities, including Huntington Park, Walnut
24 Park, most of Florence-Graham and then Southgate and
25 Linwood are whole.

1 Looking at the SC60X605, this includes Walnut,
2 Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Whittier,
3 La Morada, Artesia and Cerritos with Norwalk, Bellflower
4 and Downey. SD10WE includes Azusa, Covina, West Covina,
5 Baldwin Park, El Monte whole, southern parts of Arcadia
6 split along 210 and includes San Marino, San Gabriel,
7 Alhambra, Monterey Park, Montebello and Pico Rivera.

8 The SDNELA district includes Bell, Maywood, Vernon
9 and Commerce with East Los Angeles, Boyle Heights,
10 downtown LA, El Sereno, up to Highland Park, including
11 Glassell Park out to Hollywood, West Hollywood, and East
12 Hollywood, and includes Greater Wilshire and Koreatown.

13 And finally, zooming out the map, the SD210 includes
14 much of this Angeles National Forest area, the boundary
15 on the eastern side is at the county line. It includes
16 Claremont, out to San Dimas and Glendora, Duarte,
17 Monrovia, Pasadena, and South Pasadena, Altadena, out to
18 Glendale and Burbank. And this district includes
19 Sunland-Tujunga area, Hollywood Hills areas as well.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much,
21 Jaime. We are going into a brief closed session under
22 the litigation exception. We anticipate being back at
23 1:00. Commissioners, we will see you in the closed
24 session. Thank you.

25 (Whereupon, a closed session was held from

1 12:53 a.m. until 1:03 p.m.)

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
3 patience. We're back from a very brief closed session,
4 and we are ready to start with Jaime on our VRA districts
5 in Los Angeles County.

6 MS. CLARK: Thank you. So the districts identified
7 by your counsel as VRA districts are the ST10WE and
8 SD60X605. I will read off the percent deviation and
9 percent CVAP for all groups, for both of these districts.

10 For SD10WE, the percent deviation is 1.96 percent.
11 Latino CVAP, 50.29 percent; black CVAP, 2.16 percent;
12 Asian CVAP, 33.05 percent; and white CVAP, 13.3 percent.

13 For SD60X605, percent deviation for this district is
14 negative 4.12 percent. Latino CVAP, 51.09 percent; black
15 CVAP, 4.34 percent; Asian CVAP, 22.93 percent; and white
16 CVAP, 20.45 percent.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we have any requests for
18 explorations in relation to either of these two
19 districts? Are these districts that we are happy to
20 support? Any questions? Shall we move on to the next
21 districts? Commissioner Sinay?

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Maybe we can look at all of
23 them and then come back to think through what we learned
24 in this process and see if there's different groupings we
25 want to see or whatnot.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We will -- for now we will
2 consider these as final. Jaime, are there other areas
3 that we need to look at specifically or shall we just
4 start going clockwise or counterclockwise from here?

5 MS. CLARK: Thank you. So the last information that
6 I have from your counsel is that these are the only two
7 areas in which there are specifically areas that would
8 require your attention in terms of the Voting Rights Act,
9 and otherwise, we could go anywhere that you wish.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then I would -- I would say
11 let's go counterclockwise, because then we would end up
12 at the Orange County Line at the end of this tour. And
13 then we can consider where we are.

14 MS. CLARK: The other counterclockwise.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

16 MS. CLARK: Got it. So here we are at SD210. The
17 eastern boundary of this is between Los Angeles and San
18 Bernardino counties on the county line. And then this
19 district includes much of Angeles National Forest and
20 spans across the 210 to Sunland-Tujunga and includes
21 Burbank, Hollywood Hills areas.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we just zoom in a little so
24 we can see the details of who's in and who's -- who's
25 been grouped with who? Thanks.

1 MS. CLARK: I hope this is sufficient, Commissioner
2 Sinay. If not, please let me know. So again, out from
3 the eastern boundary of -- or rather the boundary between
4 Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County. This
5 includes Claremont, La Verne, San Demas, Monrovia,
6 Pasadena, and South Pasadena, Hollywood Hills, North
7 Hollywood, Neighborhood Council, Burbank, Sunland-
8 Tujunga, and Foothill Trails areas.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I mean, are we giving
11 interest in changes at this point or we are just --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- taking a tour?

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. We've taken a tour. This is --

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. All right. Sounds
16 good. Yeah. I mean, in general, I'd be curious to hear
17 from other Commissioners. Definitely, we've heard a
18 little from the -- from communities in the Alhambra,
19 Monterey Park area wanting to be coupled with within that
20 210 corridor potentially.

21 So I'd be curious -- and you know, which would have
22 implications, of course, for how we approach our VRA
23 districts. So I just want to raise that and see where
24 other Commissioners are landing on those kinds of issues.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Any thoughts on that? Commissioner

1 Sinay?

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I was kind of in that
3 same area. I was -- is it -- my thought was if we could
4 put the Assembly iteration map over this one, since we
5 had so many conversations in this area, that might help
6 us or it might confuse us. I know that two lines are
7 tough, but I just -- I wanted to -- because I agree that
8 I think there's things we can do differently in the VRA
9 district and still keep that community of interest
10 together.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Do you have suggestions?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm still studying the map,
13 sorry.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any other colleagues?

15 MS. CLARK: So in blue, again, this is your Assembly
16 iteration, basically your working draft. Right? Your
17 most current Assembly lines, so the northern boundary of
18 that, the areas here in sort of -- in your Assembly
19 draft, the West San Gabriel Valley areas are included in
20 this district as it's drawn right now. Main differences
21 are that Glendora is not included, El Monte is whole.
22 And then Pico Rivera and Montebello are with this
23 district whereas in Assembly they are not.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez, followed by
25 Commissioner Fornaciari.

1 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So sorry, I'm wondering if
2 Commissioner Sadhwani could repeat what she's looking for
3 here.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, you know, in most of
6 our other maps, and that's not to say we necessarily have
7 to do it here, but you know, it -- especially in our
8 Assembly map, we actually have an Asian American VRA
9 district. In our Congressional map, that same region is
10 actually coupled with the 210 kind of corridor.

11 Here, we have it as a part of -- as a part of a VRA
12 district for, you know, in which the protected community
13 is Latinos. So I'm trying to gauge the interest to take
14 that portion out, put it into 210, and reshape and
15 reconfigure our obligations for the VRA district.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: And just if you can specify which
17 areas you're referring to as --

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, sure. Monterey Park,
19 Alhambra, East San Gabriel -- East San Gabriel, Temple
20 City, El Monte potentially -- or El Monte might be able
21 to be in there, too, in the VRA district.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and if you pull those out,
23 what would your thinking be as far as what population to
24 pull in?

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I mean, potentially I

1 think there's a couple of different ways to look at it,
2 right? I mean, so we have on the other side the POF
3 district. So it could be going further east out to
4 Pomona that direction. It could be, you know, connecting
5 throughout El Monte down to Montebello and Pico Rivera.
6 It would be a fairly sizable architectural shift there.
7 But I think that there's options in which way we want to
8 go.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime, do you have any sense
10 of whether we would be able to maintain the CVAP figures
11 if we moved, if we shifted that district to the east?

12 MS. CLARK: So as it is configured right now, it's
13 50.29 percent Latino CVAP. Shifting this to the east, I
14 think it depends on how far east we're talking. And
15 also, this would be getting into areas where there are
16 VRA considerations in western San Bernardino County. And
17 it's sort of coming up on, like, a cluster of area -- an
18 area where there's sort of a cluster of VRA consideration
19 areas.

20 So it is difficult to say the overall impact not
21 only to this district specifically, but also like the
22 total VRA area -- or the total number of districts, I
23 guess, in which there are VRA considerations.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
25 Fornaciari, and then Commissioner Turner, Commissioner

1 Vazquez, Commissioner Toledo.

2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was -- I was just
3 kind of thinking of exploring the same thing that
4 Commissioner Sadhwani brought up. So can you do me a
5 favor, Jaime, please, and just turn off the Senate
6 districts and turn on the Assembly districts so we can
7 see where our VRA districts are?

8 So EASTSGV is -- the West San Gabriel Valley was the
9 Asian VRA district. Right? And then, going down the 85
10 corridor was a VRA district. And that was another VRA
11 district? Okay. Thanks.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
13 Commissioner Turner?

14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Okay. So
15 the question I have with how we're going already in
16 wanting to just kind of switch, move areas -- and I
17 understand the why, I'm not against any of that. I'm
18 just wondering, with the Assembly work that we did, we
19 worked also in Senate for drafts. With the Assembly work
20 we did, it was grueling, trying really hard to respect
21 COIs, and honor public comment, et cetera.

22 We landed in like areas that we believe would have
23 best representation. So the question is, is do we
24 actually -- is it going to work out at some point for the
25 Senate maps that we're actually going to choose something

1 different than we chose? I mean, in Assembly, it feels
2 like we're taking what we have and going to start trying
3 to force fit in or at least -- not force it, maneuver it
4 to make it look like Assembly -- our current Assembly
5 instead of starting with Assembly.

6 I don't know how different to say it, Chair. I
7 don't know how you can answer that. For me, it just
8 feels like we're going to go through a process to try to
9 get it -- that we -- to a process, to get to the point
10 where we like it as well as we did with our last
11 iteration of the Assembly maps based on all of the
12 conversation and testimony we had. And it seems like
13 it's going to be a longer way to go around it. I don't
14 know.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean, my sense of what the
16 Commissioner Sadhwani is raising is the possibility of
17 conceptually shifting the Senate district so that instead
18 of the West San Gabriel Valley Assembly district being
19 combined with major parts of the East San Gabriel
20 Valley --

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Assembly districts, that it would
23 kind of shift over east by one Assembly district. I
24 mean, obviously not -- or not obviously, but at this
25 point, not necessarily being perfectly nested. But at

1 least conceptually, moving the center of population of
2 that Senate district one Assembly district to the east.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, and so -- and that makes
4 sense. And I agree with that. And it's because looking
5 at it now, based on what we did before in the Senate,
6 after all of the conversation, it looks like it should go
7 this way instead of the other way. And I'm just
8 wondering if that's -- if we have a sense of if that's
9 going to be repeated, where we continue to move to look
10 like the old which then would -- might suggest we start a
11 different direction instead of reshifting all of them.
12 Let's -- yeah, I'll stop there.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean, I think that
14 Commissioner Turner is right in that the Senate maps
15 represent a lot of work, a lot of effort, a lot of
16 thought that went into them. And you know, I'm certainly
17 happy to entertain suggestions for shifting things. But
18 we should keep in mind how much thought went into
19 creating these in the first place.

20 And if there's good reason to change them, then we
21 can -- we can look at changing them. But let's make sure
22 that we have a fairly well-developed sense of where we
23 want to go with any changes so that we can use the time
24 as efficiently as possible. Commissioner Toledo?

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I am -- I think

1 I'm in support of Commissioner -- what Commissioner
2 Turner was saying. I mean, I look at these -- at this
3 particular district and its -- there's a lot of time and
4 energy that went into developing this district and
5 keeping some of the COIs here together.

6 And so I mean, I think -- I'm not opposed to
7 exploring, but I think this is also a very -- as we've
8 seen through all our maps, this is a very complex -- as
9 is all parts of California. A complex area with many,
10 many overlapping COIs and -- I mean, this district
11 doesn't look, I mean, I think it does a good job of
12 balancing the interests at this point. But of course,
13 I'm not opposed to exploring if there's a way to maintain
14 the balance that we have here. Thank you.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
16 Commissioner Sinay?

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I tend to be
18 in -- agree with Commissioner Turner. And I -- and part
19 of it is we put a lot of work into the Senate map. But I
20 feel like we've gone through master classes since
21 December 10th when we approved the Senate maps. And
22 we've gotten so much more information that if we -- maybe
23 there's a way to look -- start at the Assembly map and
24 think through. Okay, what have -- what do we want to see
25 in the Senate? And then, go to the Senate and know where

1 to change it.

2 But I'd rather be more concrete and say, you know,
3 what we did right -- what we liked here and what we'd
4 like to see in the Senate is these parts of these two
5 districts together because we've done so much thinking.
6 Especially when it comes to all of it -- I mean, VRA and
7 others. I feel like going back to the Senate maps is
8 reminding me, you know, you can write a book report on
9 Lion, Witch, and the Wardrobe in sixth grade. And that's
10 going to be very different than a book report that you
11 write in college, you know.

12 You get different understandings. And we really
13 have gotten a lot of input, a lot of thinking, and a lot
14 of analysis on all of our parts. And I would like to
15 start from the Assembly and build the Senate. And I
16 don't think we're going to be throwing out what we
17 learned because all the way through we keep going back to
18 what we've learned and what we've seen.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
20 Commissioner Andersen?

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I agree with what has
22 been said lately. And just as an exercise, I propose
23 that we look at the Assembly maps. And we just -- just
24 as an exercise, combine them. Like, quote-quote, do a
25 little, like, oh, I'm going to put those two together,

1 and those together, those together. And then take a
2 picture of that and compare that to the Senate map.

3 I think it might show us areas that we might want to
4 add here, delete there, and maybe not. But it might give
5 us the area -- it might really show us -- because if we
6 look at the Assembly right now, there's so many lines,
7 we're getting a little confused. So I'd propose that.
8 Or as we're looking at one district, turn the Assembly
9 lines on and if -- to the best of our ability, only look
10 at those lines, which I think that might be a little
11 harder.

12 But -- yeah, as we did -- we did a lot of rethinking
13 as -- you know, in the Assembly from what matched this,
14 you know, from the November 10. Just an idea.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
16 Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, I'm kind of
18 going along those lines, too. You know, yeah, we put a
19 lot of work into the Senate map. But we've also spent a
20 lot of time on those Assembly maps and learned a lot.
21 And thought about how we could group them, and that's why
22 I wanted to, you know, turn the Assembly maps on.

23 And I guess, I'm going to throw something out there
24 because it makes sense to think about loosely nesting,
25 you know, the West Covina, Baldwin Park, Irwindale

1 district with the district below it. And then the kind
2 of Norwalk, La Mirada, Le Habra district with the
3 district to the west of it, in the Senate -- in the
4 Senate and get potentially stronger districts that way.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I'm not
7 being too much attitude, but I do want to respectfully
8 disagree that we did not spend a lot of time on the
9 Senate maps. On the visualizations, so every week we had
10 a -- or every two weeks, I can't remember now, we had
11 different visualizations. They were always different.

12 And then the last week before we approved our
13 drafts, that was the first week of live line drawing.
14 And like we normally do, we ran out of time. However, we
15 have spent a lot of time on the Assembly. So it would
16 make sense to look at the Assembly, as my fellow
17 Commissioners have said. But I just want to say out loud
18 that we did not spend a lot of time on the Senate maps.
19 And we intentionally said we'll go back to it.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and as Jaime has demonstrated,
21 she's able to turn lines on, lines off, as we wish. So
22 let's be -- let's be ready to tell her to switch back and
23 forth or overlay, whatever is going to work best for you.
24 Commissioner Turner?

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And so Chair, in

1 thinking it through a little bit more, what I think I'm
2 at least want to do -- at the very least, is for us to
3 see if we cannot come to some agreement of our approach
4 that we're trying to take, because it will make a
5 difference and will seem like we're pulling together in
6 the same direction instead of conflict.

7 So are we trying to utilize the Assembly maps
8 whether -- regardless if we've named it or not as
9 individuals, you know. Is that what we're trying to do,
10 or are we trying to stick with the work that was done in
11 the Senate? And I think if we start from a kind of
12 consensus there, an agreed upon place. At least we'll
13 know what we're working towards instead of looking at the
14 map saying, oh, yes, I remember we did this area in the
15 Senate and felt good about the -- you know, whether it
16 was long time -- term or short term, felt good about it.
17 And then someone else is but let's change this, let's
18 change.

19 It's like, what are you trying to get at? Well,
20 what I really want to get at is getting a different shape
21 based on the last Assembly maps that we've done. And so
22 let's just know what we're trying to do and then we can
23 do it together.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So I agree with
2 everything everyone said. Right? Like, we have Senate
3 districts. We also put all this work into the Assembly
4 map already. We've been thinking about the COIs.

5 I agree with you, Commissioner Fernandez. I
6 actually don't think that we've put in tons and tons of
7 work on the Senate map. I think that there's definitely
8 work to be done here.

9 So just in terms of process. Right? Initially, the
10 thought was we can -- we can do a little live line
11 drawing, but if there's big architectural things, then we
12 need to name it. Hopefully write it down ourselves.
13 Agree to it, have some general consensus that everyone
14 likes that direction. And then we can ask, you know,
15 Jaime or the other mappers, can you go back and work on
16 this?

17 When I'm seeing this map, I'm thinking, oh, there's
18 a lot of things I would like to change that are kind of
19 big. But I -- before I say them, I kind of want to talk
20 about it with everyone because we haven't really had that
21 chance yet. So I'm wondering if Jaime, maybe, would be
22 able or willing to weigh in here as well, or Karin.

23 I mean, does that sound like any kind of reasonable
24 in which we can toggle back and forth between these
25 districts as well as our Assembly districts? Be --

1 hopefully be very specific, and that requires all of us
2 being very specific and clear about what that direction
3 is, what we want to see.

4 So for example, here, perhaps it's nesting what was
5 that Assembly district with -- more so with the 210
6 district as opposed to the -- sorry, the West San Gabriel
7 Valley cluster with the 210 district as opposed to the
8 East San Gabriel Valley. That in and of itself is a
9 massive change. Right? Probably not something we're
10 going to do here live right now.

11 So instead, that's something if everyone is in
12 agreement, we can kind of bullet point and could come
13 back to us in a day with -- or so with changes. And so
14 I'd love to just hear Jaime and Karin weigh in on that
15 and see if that's a reasonable way to proceed so that we
16 can toggle back and forth between what we have and those
17 Assembly districts that we've spent a lot of time working
18 on.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
20 Jaime, Karin?

21 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much for that
22 question, Commissioner Sadhwani. I think considering
23 that it is 12/14 and I think you are planning on being
24 done with these maps in, I believe, three days. Big
25 architectural changes and things that can be done offline

1 and then be evaluated, would most certainly have to
2 really be agreed upon, I would say, by the Commission.

3 Because while Jaime is working on those or while
4 somebody else is working on them, they are not live
5 mapping with you. So you know, I think we have to be
6 very careful in looking at the time line and the fact
7 that you presumably want to be done sometime in the next
8 few days with this. So that would be my input on it.
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Karin. Commissioner Yee?

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, so generally agreeing with
12 everyone, especially the observation of how much we've
13 changed, and learned, and grown since putting together
14 this draft Senate map. You know, the big variable is the
15 VRA districts. If carrying Assembly VRA districts yield
16 VRA Senate districts we're happy with. And so we go down
17 that route -- and I think it is worth trying -- I think
18 we could really focus on the resulting VRA districts and
19 really decide, you know, pretty quickly and pretty
20 certainly how happy we are with them.

21 And if we are, if that's looking promising, go
22 forward from there. But if not, to then, you know, to
23 abandon pretty quickly and go back to plan -- what was
24 plan A.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

1 Commissioner Akutagawa?

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I agree with what
3 Commissioner Yee just said. I guess for me, I thought we
4 were just going to start on the VRA districts and try to
5 get those in a good place that we want, because obviously
6 it impacts everything else around it. Just on the larger
7 process question, I guess I'm still trying to understand
8 what the goal is that we're trying to achieve by making
9 these changes. And I think that would be helpful.

10 And we've said that multiple times before and then
11 we kind of forget and we just go to the changes. So I
12 think it would just be helpful, I think, to Commissioner
13 Turner's point about being able to pull in the same
14 direction.

15 If we all understand what the goal is and we're in
16 agreement with it, then I think it makes all of our
17 comments a little bit more additive than perhaps -- not
18 conflicting, but perhaps we might think this is the
19 direction which we're trying to go. But it may not
20 actually be that and therefore it may end up being more
21 confusing and conflicting in terms of the direction that
22 we give to the line drawers.

23 And I think as we get closer, I'm also becoming much
24 more conscious of our shortening time frame. And so I
25 think we just don't have as much time as we did with both

1 the Assembly and the -- and the congressional. And not
2 that we want to shortchange the Senate, but I think we
3 just need to be much more focused now. And especially
4 given our experience that we've had, we can hopefully
5 bring that to this process so that we can be more
6 focused. Thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. So we are looking at a
8 VRA district or a cluster of VRA districts or districts
9 that we might somehow improve or we're trying not to lose
10 where we've -- where we've achieved that. And
11 Commissioner Sadhwani has proposed a general direction
12 for this particular district that we might look at
13 combining the West San Gabriel Valley district with the
14 210 district, and the East San Gabriel Valley area with
15 an area to the east.

16 Again, that that sets off a whole series of changes
17 that we need to think through and determine whether it is
18 something to be pursued, because it is going to take a
19 good bit of time. And even if it's done offline, it's
20 going to take a good bit of time. I think we're at a
21 point where we need to be very specific about changes and
22 reasons for changes.

23 A general sense of what we've learned from the
24 Assembly districts, you know, the only -- the only option
25 that I see there is just almost ignoring the Senate maps

1 and saying we start with the Assembly maps. We go these
2 two, these two, these two, and make modifications from
3 there. But is that is that our best way forward?

4 Commissioner Toledo?

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, I think we have a
6 draft. We have strong draft maps, I think, in this area
7 at least. But what I was going to say was that if we're
8 going to make changes, we should align them with our
9 goal. So you know, what our goals in this area? And
10 making sure that we're that we're not inadvertently
11 having, you know, not reaching our goal by making
12 changes.

13 And so I mean, we just need clarification on our --
14 on our goals for this area in terms of districts you want
15 to unify, or communities of interest we may to unify,
16 majority/minority seats, whatever the goals are. Right?

17 And then -- and then -- and work with that in mind,
18 because otherwise we may be disrupting our COIs, which we
19 put together very carefully and it did take us quite a
20 bit of time to get here. So that -- those are just my
21 thoughts.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you.

23 Commissioner Turner?

24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I would love to pick these
25 two, these two, these two as far as Assembly. But in

1 addition to some of the areas -- some of the COI
2 testimonies that we tried to accomplish in Assembly and
3 just didn't work out there. And so where we come across
4 those areas, perhaps making some changes, you know, if we
5 can, for the for the Senate that we couldn't for
6 Assembly.

7 So I don't know, I think -- and then once we do
8 that, that seems to be a quicker process. Not that
9 that's the way to go, but it'll let us know where all of
10 the problem areas are and where that -- maybe there's
11 some natural fits. And we can then count that area
12 accomplished and then move to areas that, you know, we're
13 having a little bit more difficulty in.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me -- let me offer a
15 suggestion, that we do a pilot. That we take Los Angeles
16 County, that we start from the Assembly districts. That
17 we look at which Assembly districts to pair. We see, you
18 know, this is -- this is a relatively finite number of
19 districts.

20 We see how that goes for us. And we determine
21 whether that's an approach that we want to continue with
22 through the rest of the state.

23 Commissioner Toledo?

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And my major concern is --
25 with that is around the VRA districts. Right? The VRA

1 districts, you can't put two VRA districts together
2 and -- I mean, they'll all have to be crafted to ensure
3 their effectiveness. And that may mean that they may
4 have to look -- so just -- that's just my concern.

5 I mean, I'm not opposed to moving in that direction
6 or doing that. I just think with the VRA districts, we
7 just have to think differently than maybe other nonVRA
8 areas. Thank you.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. And nothing is
10 saying that, you know, this is -- that the goal here is
11 one hundred percent nesting. The goal is to build areas
12 that we are comfortable with and then massage them to
13 where they work, including making sure that we are
14 meeting our VRA obligations to the best of our ability.

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Other comments?
17 Commissioner Andersen?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, because that's exactly
19 what I had proposed. But what -- I did want to make sure
20 that I was indeed talking about looking at the Assembly
21 map, Looking at any -- any of the districts that are --
22 we consider already VRA or are close to our VRA
23 districts, you know, that are, like, close to the VRA
24 area. Look at those.

25 Don't worry about all the rest of it out and around.

1 But look at those, and go, okay, I kind of like that
2 because they're not together. Create a, quote, Senate
3 map and compare it. And see, do we like that? Because I
4 don't -- I think we're going to -- even if we do that,
5 like Commissioner Sadhwani said, well, I kind of want
6 this one going up. And then modify those, fix those.

7 And then, we'll actually have VRA for the Senate.
8 And we can adjust -- and this is something that Jaime
9 could certainly do. Then, make suggestions to create
10 the, you know, kind of draw from here and put around here
11 to fill out LA County.

12 And I think that is a very doable thing. And I
13 think that's going to be -- it might actually be the
14 fastest thing we could possibly do. But I would like to
15 hear Jaime's comments on these couple of suggestions.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay. Jaime or Karin, either
17 one?

18 MS. CLARK: Hello, hello. So the proposal is to
19 just start nesting?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: The proposal is to -- is to start
21 nesting within Los Angeles County. We're going to do Los
22 Angeles County as a -- as a pilot and see how this goes
23 for us. See if we like the results when we compare it to
24 the existing Senate draft. And then we make a
25 determination at that point if that is a course we want

1 to follow for the rest of the state.

2 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Before we begin, I will save
3 a snapshot of where we're at now. So just one moment,
4 please.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. That -- I'm not saying
7 nest everything. I'm actually saying, because we need to
8 do a very first and I think we should concentrate on see
9 if we, quote, nest those -- any of the -- any of the, you
10 know, like, I'm looking at this one, you know. SD --
11 well, the Assembly. Anything within Assembly districts,
12 within the areas that would be VRA consideration.

13 Look at those. So here we go, the SGV or WESTSGV,
14 those areas, and includes ones not just VRA districts.
15 And then and look at -- and see (audio interference). We
16 like those; nest that area. That's what I'm proposing,
17 because then, that's the area that we have to work out.
18 And then we could see now what other Jaime could -- who's
19 look at this all the time, she could say now, you're
20 going to run into trouble here or there on the outer edge
21 of that. Not just start, like, in the corner and work
22 in.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, no, no. We're going to -- we're
24 going to start with VRA areas. Thank you.

25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think -- I think I'm
2 in agreement with Commissioner Andersen here. When I
3 look at the map, when we pull out, it's not just about
4 Los Angeles County. Right? Like, the VRA areas are very
5 much connected from the eastern portions of Los Angeles
6 County into Imperial -- excuse me, into San Bernardino
7 and Riverside counties.

8 No, we cannot completely nest. But can some of the
9 logic of our Assembly districts be used to help us build?
10 So for example, if we were to decouple what is in our
11 Assembly district, the western San Gabriel Valley from
12 the eastern San Gabriel Valley, more so with AD53PCO --
13 is that what that is? Yes. Right.

14 Clearly, you're going to have to take more than
15 steps in doing this. Isn't that a complete nest? Right?
16 There's going to be -- need to be some changes there.
17 But perhaps, like, that would be a general direction that
18 I would be really curious to see. And then I know that a
19 lot of those Assembly districts in Riverside and San
20 Bernardino are also -- are also VRA districts. I'd like
21 to see some combination of them.

22 I don't even know to what extent that even aligns
23 with what we have in our current Senate draft for the
24 Inland Empire. But we know that we did a lot of work on
25 the COIs throughout there. And so I'd like to see where

1 that puts us. That's not to say that that's going to be
2 our final, final district because we'll have to make sure
3 we're hitting the CVAPs that it would be able to perform
4 That the protected community -- the communities we're
5 trying to protect can actually elect candidates of their
6 choice.

7 But to me, that would be kind of the general
8 direction. I'd like to see our Senate map move in and
9 then kind of come back and clean up. I think we can
10 clean up a lot within the Los Angeles area once we have
11 those VRA areas locked in.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
13 Sadhwani.

14 Commissioner Toledo?

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I would -- I would want
16 legal to weigh in on this approach, just to apprise us of
17 any potential risks that we might encounter along the
18 way. I mean, I'm also thinking, right, because VRA
19 really is about people, not geographical locations. And
20 as we start moving the lines, we potentially could be
21 shifting the VRA districts and putting in -- just like we
22 did in the Assembly, putting in nonVRA areas with VRA
23 areas makes a brand new VRA district. And so potentially
24 does -- and it could be -- I would just want some advice
25 on that and some clarifications. Thank you.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker, you're back with us, I
2 believe?

3 MR. BECKER: Yeah. And I'm going to need -- I
4 literally came back on as Mr. Toledo was just speaking.
5 So someone's going to need to summarize the process that
6 is at issue, because I had to hop off for about fifteen
7 minutes.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the idea is that we take
9 our Assembly districts, which represent a lot that we
10 learned in the process of developing those Assembly
11 districts, and we look at combining Assembly districts to
12 give us a general concept of what a potential Senate
13 district might be. That we look at that potential Senate
14 district and make whatever modifications to it we believe
15 are important to make. And we can compare that to what
16 we have in the current Senate plan.

17 But the idea is that if we -- if we do this -- if we
18 go through this process focusing on Los Angeles County,
19 and that doesn't -- that doesn't mean that we can't cross
20 county lines at all. I think that we would want to limit
21 crossing county lines to districts that have a presence
22 in Los Angeles County just so this doesn't get out of
23 hand as far as the scope of it. But if we -- if we see
24 that that approach works for us in Los Angeles County,
25 that we could then generalize it to the rest of the

1 state.

2 MR. BECKER: So my thoughts are primarily process
3 oriented and not necessarily legal. There's no legal
4 reason you couldn't do that. But I will say, and I defer
5 to the line drawn on this as well, I heard Karin Mac
6 Donald make this point. You are thirteen days away from
7 the deadline, the legal deadline, and less than that with
8 regard to the target deadline.

9 If you're to do that, it's likely that it could have
10 a rippling effect with regard to populations and already
11 considered inclusion of communities of interest and other
12 aspects that came into the drawing of both these lines
13 and the Senate lines. I'd also say that, you know,
14 generally when nesting is a higher criteria, there are
15 states like that.

16 Alaska, for instance, where nesting is a higher
17 criteria and they nest by definition the Assembly --
18 their House districts within their Senate districts.
19 They start drawing the House districts with the idea that
20 they are going to nest. That has not been done here, I
21 don't believe. And so you could end up with a -- with a
22 very significant domino effect that would cause the
23 reconsideration of a variety of lines that you've already
24 drawn.

25 So that's my that's my advice. Again, it's process

1 oriented. There's no legal reason you can't do that.
2 But I think it might -- it might create significant
3 problems and considerations with regard to why the Senate
4 draft -- maps were drafted the way they were in the first
5 place.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you elaborate on that last
7 point?

8 MR. BECKER: Well, you can -- you -- you've authored
9 you put out some draft Senate maps for public comment.
10 You gave two weeks for public comment. This is a major
11 change from that. Those Senate maps did reflect
12 considerable consideration of criteria that are above the
13 nesting criteria, communities of interest, political
14 geography, equal population, VRA, et cetera. It is --
15 you know, I think there is some -- there's some pros and
16 cons of nesting.

17 Again, this is a process type of point I want to
18 make. There are pros and cons of nesting. It is in
19 there is the least important criteria in California. But
20 generally, if you're going to nest, it's something you
21 need to consider very early on so that you can draw the
22 lines knowing that you intend to nest rather than put out
23 draft maps that are not nested for public comment. And
24 then go back to it to a very, very low rated criteria
25 later on. That's basically what I mean by that.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

2 Commissioner Turner, did you have a further point?

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. I did. Two things.

4 Number one, I wanted to be clear that from my
5 perspective, nesting is not the point. From my
6 perspective, it -- we worked hard on various communities
7 of interest and we made adjustments as we went along in
8 the Assembly to ensure we were incorporating all of the
9 public comment that we're getting. No, move further to
10 the east, west, south, and north, et cetera.

11 And so I think they reflect what we intended to be
12 kept together. And so not just for the sake of nesting
13 because of the work that was already done, that was very
14 different than some of the work that we did in Senate.
15 Number one.

16 The other piece is -- as I wanted to understand, I
17 think Commissioner Toledo said -- you'd mentioned
18 something about it being a problem for putting two VRA
19 districts together. And I totally don't understand what
20 that problem would be. For sure, if that's the direction
21 we went in, we would, if it was in a VRA area, be looking
22 at the CVAP numbers, and you know, and adding and taking
23 away population so that we can keep it, you know, high or
24 whatever. But it seemed like you were indicating that
25 there was a problem just in combining the two. And if

1 that's the case, I want to understand that.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo, would you like
3 to respond?

4 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I mean, when it comes
5 to VRA, it's not necessarily geographical standpoint.
6 People, and people are maybe in, like, three districts
7 rather than two districts that -- because the -- in order
8 to maximize their -- the opportunity for -- maybe
9 maximize is the wrong word. In order to ensure that
10 the -- that the protected class has the opportunity to
11 elect candidates of their choice. So you're really
12 looking at it -- I mean, it -- just nest -- and maybe
13 it's because we're using the word nesting. And maybe
14 that's the issue.

15 But by combining to two VRA districts don't
16 necessarily create -- two Assembly VRA districts don't
17 necessarily create, in my opinion, a Senate district that
18 may -- that it may be adequate to meet the needs of --
19 just because every area is so different, so you have to
20 look at them individually as opposed to. So that was my
21 take, but I appreciate legal to weigh in on this as well.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

23 MR. BECKER: So it's just unclear, I mean. Just
24 because you have two Assembly VRA districts doesn't mean
25 you haven't created -- you've created a proper Senate VRA

1 district by combining the two of them. The electoral
2 dynamics might be different. There might be packing in
3 districts or not.

4 Which is not to say it can't be okay. It can be
5 okay. It's just it's not automatically okay. That's
6 basically what I'm saying. So we'd need to be -- I mean,
7 it's not that combining the two of them automatically
8 raises VRA concerns. It also isn't that combining the
9 two of them automatically satisfies the VRA. We have to
10 consider them all fresh and new.

11 And then you have the other variable of what if you
12 can combine the VRA district of nonVRA district, which
13 could be done. And there are areas where there are
14 significant minority populations, and whether that
15 comprises a VRA, a compliant area. These are all -- we
16 can't answer these questions in hypotheticals. They have
17 to be done. But on the other hand, it would also be
18 starting, basically, an entirely new plan from -- for
19 consideration.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

21 Anything further, Commissioner Turner?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, thank you.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. And sorry, my
25 Wi-Fi has been a little unstable today, which is why I

1 keep my I'm keeping my camera off a little bit more here.
2 You know, I appreciate all of this conversational
3 process. And I agree with Commissioner -- the first
4 point Commissioner Turner made was we're not talking
5 about necessarily nesting in the traditional sense. But
6 how do we build on the work that we've done?

7 So you know, yes, the process piece, I'll just go
8 back to the first thing that raised. In our current
9 Senate map, we have roughly what we've developed in our
10 Assembly map as the West San Gabriel Valley with the East
11 San Gabriel Valley. My general direction then would be
12 to remove that portion of -- that is the West Gabriel
13 Valley in that district, which we've identified has a VRA
14 application or only at 50 percent Latino CVAP.

15 So by removing it and rethinking our approach in
16 that area, which, yes, would go eastward and would set
17 off some additional changes in our Senate map, would
18 improve the CVAP. So that's, for me, the goal. We don't
19 need to necessarily do -- actually the rest of the LA map
20 to me -- for me personally, and we haven't really talked
21 about it, it's about some minor tweaks around the edges,
22 actually.

23 So I don't necessarily need to start with the full
24 Assembly review, necessarily, but that one change
25 alone -- if we wanted to do it, and we haven't arrived at

1 whether or not that is something that the full Commission
2 wants to do or not, would set off additional changes to
3 the rest of our VRA districts. And that's why I raised
4 it. Right?

5 I think we could take any number of approaches to
6 get there. But that's my concern, is that we have a VRA
7 district that actually, when you look at it, it's two
8 different VRA districts that we've created in the
9 Assembly for two different communities. Is there a
10 better approach to doing that? That's ultimately what my
11 concern was.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I guess my question at this
13 point would be, you know, didn't we try to create a
14 better one when we were developing the Senate map?

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think we only spent a day
16 on the Senate map, so I'm not so sure.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm -- Commissioner
19 Turner said exactly the right thing. This was not to
20 nest. This was to look at a comparison and realize that
21 it was to -- it was to give everyone a framework to try
22 to move forward. If this is -- it's just too -- no, that
23 doesn't work, drop that idea. Look at our Senate map and
24 bounce back to these and go, yeah, yeah.

25 And move one out, put the other one over because we

1 need to move along now. And I think we all have the good
2 idea of we really want to make tweaks to the Senate map.
3 We want to absorb what we learned from the Assembly map,
4 because we did. We actually made a lot of changes. But
5 we've also done a few other things now because we worked
6 on the congressional map.

7 So I don't believe that if we just went to tried to
8 put these Assembly maps together into Senate maps, we
9 want to tweak that as well. So let's not do the step
10 of -- let's just do the comparison. Have Jaime bring up
11 the lines. I think that's going to be probably the
12 easiest way for us to move forward.

13 Because if -- and talk and say, yes, I'm thinking
14 about removing, you know, Alhambra, putting it up here,
15 and grabbing Moda, such, and such, and such. Let's
16 verbalize what we actually are thinking so we can say,
17 yep, don't like that idea. I like adding Pico Rivera to
18 Whittier, something like that, so we can get some
19 direction and move forward.

20 Okay? So I think I would -- I would say look at our
21 Senate maps, pull the Assembly maps underneath them, and
22 say, this is what I'm thinking. And people say, yes, I
23 like that. Say yes, I don't, or -- and suggest the next
24 thing.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

1 Ms. Clark.

2 MS. CLARK: Thank you so much. If this is a
3 direction of the Commission overall would like to go in,
4 this is just a suggestion on how to do this as quickly as
5 possible. And it would potentially be, you know, some
6 online work and then some offline work.

7 So I can't -- right now, what's on the map is the
8 Assembly districts. And I could -- the Commission could
9 discuss which districts they would generally like to
10 pair. I could fill those in with -- you know, so say
11 that you wanted to put the eastern Gabriel Valley
12 district with PCO. I could fill both of those in red,
13 for example, and then move on.

14 And the Commission could sort of look at what the
15 pairings could be, assuming or maybe knowing that there
16 would definitely be adjustments just based on, you know,
17 moving half of a district out of one of the districts, or
18 roughly the population of half the district out of any of
19 the districts will definitely cause big changes
20 throughout this area.

21 So then the Commission could kind of look at what
22 pairings could occur. And then also give direction on
23 what, you know, A, see if that's even something that
24 they're interested -- that you are interested in doing
25 after, you know, looking like really in terms of pairing

1 districts. And then also if that's something that you
2 even like, then giving direction on what to remove or
3 what not to remove.

4 Knowing, for example, I'm just going to use El Monte
5 as an example. In your Assembly draft, it is split.
6 Whereas in the Senate map it's not split. And you know,
7 looking at pairing -- the pairings that have been
8 discussed so far, it's replicating that split potentially
9 unnecessarily or in a way that the Commission isn't --
10 doesn't want to replicate. And that would be true across
11 the map across the state.

12 So that's just a suggestion for moving forward and
13 thinking -- just thinking about your deadline, thinking
14 about time right now.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

16 Commissioner Toledo?

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was thinking about -- so I'm
18 trying to understand the conversation a little bit,
19 because I'm hearing two different things. One is, I
20 believe what my understanding --and Commissioner
21 Andersen, correct me if I'm wrong and -- or others can,
22 is -- is that we would be nesting so that we can evaluate
23 the maps that we have. So it's more evaluation, trying
24 to compare our maps -- the draft maps that we have now to
25 to the -- to nest, for lack of a better word, the

1 grouping of the -- of two Assembly seats and trying to
2 find opportunities for improving our draft maps. And so
3 it's more of an evaluation tool rather than a reworking
4 of the districts. And I don't know if that's what I'm
5 understanding or if I got it all wrong. But I'm just
6 trying to understand at this point.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And Commissioner, can I
9 answer that one? Yes. That's exactly what I was saying,
10 put them together and then, put them up underneath it. I
11 think that that's going to be more complicated than -- I
12 don't really recommend doing that. I kind of -- I like
13 kind of the idea of putting it up underneath it.

14 I think that might help move forward faster. I
15 think if we do this step. It might get confusing. And
16 it'd be like a whole another step involved. And so I'm
17 trying to get the group to move forward and I believe
18 Commissioner Sadhwani had an idea of let's look at what
19 we have. And you know, like, she's saying, let's take
20 all Alhambra out. We're actually going to start to shift
21 this over a little bit. And I think going back and forth
22 between our Assembly districts with our Senate map might
23 move us along the fastest.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we pull up the Senate map?

1 This is just for an example. Sorry, the Senate draft.
2 So if we look at the -- at the Senate district that has
3 Long Beach in it. You know, right away, I'm sure all of
4 us were like ooh, because we did so much talking about it
5 in the Assembly district. And so what we could -- you
6 know, for me, I just kind of looked at that one and said,
7 okay.

8 I know we wanted to, you know, if we can Long Beach,
9 you know, shouldn't be in this one and we can move it,
10 you know. We learned from just a day or two ago what
11 might work in this area. I've got two screens up and
12 I've got the Assembly and the Senate map. And I think as
13 much as we can have two screens or 2 tabs, you know, a
14 tab open to look at them.

15 But I think we're ready. We've had enough
16 conversations and I think we've landed on we need to --
17 we need to start with the Senate -- the Senate drafts as
18 the base. But looking at our Assembly and saying what we
19 liked about the Assembly maps that we would like to see
20 in the Senate maps.

21 And how we do that, having both sets of lines gets
22 confusing. But if that's how people want to go, we can
23 go that way. But I think -- I think we're all agreeing
24 at this point.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So let us -- Jaime, if you

1 can back out just a little bit. Okay. So Commissioner
2 Sadhwani, you would like to remove Alhambra and I forgot
3 the other one -- Monterey Park from --

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would actually say
5 Arcadia, Temple City, East San Gabriel, Rosemead, South
6 San Gabriel, San Marino, Alhambra, Monterey Park.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. To --

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Keeping El Monte, South El
9 Monte.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- to the -- to the SD210?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I recognize that's going
14 to throw off our deviations just a little bit.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We're going to need a plan.

17 But I think shifting -- you know, this is a VRA
18 district -- it is meant to be a VRA district and we're
19 currently at fifty percent Latino CVAP. So finding ways
20 to boost it by going further eastward, to me, seems like
21 a pretty good idea. That could long term mean that
22 Montebello, Pico Rivera go elsewhere. We can figure that
23 out as we go.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. But we're -- going
25 we're going to include Montebello and Pico Rivera in what

1 we're moving out right now.

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would actually keep it in
3 for now.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Keep it in for now? Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: So this --

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This could be the case that
8 maybe, you know, from a compactness standpoint, maybe it
9 goes better with, you know, either to the east or to the
10 west or something as we continue to rearrange.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the area in red is the
12 area that you're proposing to shift to the SD210?

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jaime, let's go ahead and do
15 that.

16 Okay, so now we need population. Commissioner
17 Sadhwani, go ahead and talk us through where you'd like
18 to see the population coming from.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Minimally, you are going to
20 need San Demas to connect us to Pomona. And then I, you
21 know, here again, and I -- this is a -- this is a
22 question for mappers. What is the best way to proceed
23 here? And I think pulling out and including Ontario and
24 Chino. Certainly those are areas that we have covered in
25 other VRA districts. I mean, Montclair would have to be

1 in there to.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And this is being moved into
3 SD10WEST, correct?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's --

6 MS. CLARK: And just a note is that this -- the
7 pop -- the deviation of SD10WE would be fifteen percent
8 overpopulated. So not all of this area could be
9 included.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Understood.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Understood.

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, that's right. You
14 know, to me, starting in El Monte going east, this
15 becomes more of a, you know, semi-suburban sort of area,
16 which is where I -- I'm kind of left wondering if
17 Montebello and Pico Rivera end up going elsewhere. But a
18 part of a part of answering that question -- I mean, we
19 can again question for mappers. How do you want to
20 proceed?

21 We could take them out and leave them hanging. We
22 could keep them in and cut back Ontario. You know,
23 certainly SD210 is way overpopulated. So we're going to
24 need to have shifts in this population moving through the
25 map. In which Montebello, Pico Rivera might come back

1 into play.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Akutagawa?

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, this might help
4 minimally, but I noticed that North El Monte was also
5 taken -- or I think taken out or left in, I don't know.
6 I think taken out of this current district. So you might
7 want to put it in just so that all the El Montes will
8 stay together, so that might be small. Yeah.

9 Also, I would agree Montebello and Pico Rivera may
10 be better going -- if we're going to do this, I think
11 they'd be better going with some of the gateway cities.
12 I think, or at least with Whittier and, you know, Downey
13 and all those cities. So that may also be a way to
14 ensure that some of the, I guess in this case, either
15 Chino or Ontario can possibly stay a little bit more
16 whole.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
18 Do we -- Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to propose
19 removing something from the selected area before we --
20 before we make this change to get the deviation down from
21 where it is?

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, what I -- not from
23 the selected area.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with Commissioner

1 Akutagawa. And I think by taking Montebello, Pico Rivera
2 out, there were districts not far from there that, you
3 know, while they may not have been VRA districts
4 necessarily. For example, I'm looking at NELA. Right?
5 What happens to that NELA district if we start putting in
6 Montebello, Pico Rivera, and potentially -- do we have
7 West Hollywood in there?

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right? I mean, I think that
10 there are some -- these are some of the kinds of shifts
11 that I'm talking about within the LA map that could lead
12 to some, you know, more natural pairings of communities.
13 And however the line drawers want to work through this.
14 If we want to do it live, if we want to give general
15 direction, I'm fine either way.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would say commit this and
18 the, you know, I know we'll be overpopulated and our
19 Latino CVAP is now quite high. Right? But I think
20 that's going to change once we take out Montebello and
21 Pico Rivera.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So let's go ahead and --
23 Jaime?

24 MS. CLARK: Thanks. Yeah, I was just going to say
25 that I think that these are going to result in such big

1 changes to the map overall that I think it is something
2 that probably is in the Commission's best interest to
3 make these changes live. So then the -- what, you know,
4 so then you understand the -- understand, I guess, the
5 trade-offs in these locations of making these changes.
6 And I'm going to commit this change right now.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. And then, as
8 Commissioner Sadhwani had suggested, let's move
9 Montebello and Pico Rivera to the NELA district for now.
10 They may go elsewhere eventually, but let's look at what
11 that does for us. Okay. Thank you. So if we -- if we
12 pull out, and let's look at where we are on deviations
13 right now.

14 MS. CLARK: So the deviation of the SD210 district
15 that would become 3 percent and the Latino CVAP would be
16 58.84 percent.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

18 MS. CLARK: And of course, the NELA district will be
19 overpopulated. That would be seventeen percent
20 deviation.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And where do we need the
22 population right now? Do we need that in 210 or where do
23 we need it?

24 MS. CLARK: So yeah, eventually -- well, 210 is also
25 overpopulated. So we need population for the rest of

1 this -- for the rest of this district. It's called POF,
2 this is with a Jurupa Valley, Fontana, parts of Rancho
3 Cucamonga, that's negative forty-seven percent deviation
4 right now and -- yeah.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So it would -- it would
6 involve or could involve shifting population through
7 SD210 to that? Can we --

8 MS. CLARK: This is also an area where -- I believe,
9 where there are VRA considerations. So I don't know that
10 it would be possible to maintain or to meet your VRA
11 obligations through moving population, either through 210
12 or through what now is Antelope Valley and Victor Valley
13 together. I think you would maybe have to go through --
14 I'm just kind of going to zoom out a little bit.

15 I think you would have to go through parts of San
16 Bernardino County, Riverside County, and then through
17 Orange County, and then this more central part of LA.
18 And essentially, it's moving about half of an Assembly --
19 or excuse me, half of a Senate district at a time. So
20 about 500,000 people shifting throughout.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me pause a minute and
22 call on Commissioner Andersen.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you very much,
24 Jaime, for that description. And Commissioner Sadhwani,
25 I really like where you're headed here and how you're

1 headed. I see a couple of things that would help us here
2 is maybe if we put that the Gingles, the three condition
3 map that shows the entire area that we're looking at,
4 just reflect quickly over that to say what areas we --
5 essentially, what's our -- what areas are we looking at
6 that we need to cover which might give us a limit in
7 terms of how far we can push to one area without losing
8 it.

9 But I also like the idea is, when you're grabbing an
10 area you'd like to switch -- move that just to have kind
11 of consensus over. Is that -- does anyone else have --
12 oh, no, I really want that area in, because then we won't
13 have to revisit.

14 We can sort of do this as we go. And do it all
15 together as a group. I think that might, you know, we
16 don't want to get into the just one person doing
17 things -- which I don't think was going on. But just a
18 little bit of -- a little bit of facilitation there, I
19 think, might really create this a little more quickly,
20 because I did see other Commissioners have their hands.

21 And this is an area where a lot of people have
22 worked on this quite a bit. So it just might help a
23 little bit if we did those two things, kind of did the
24 overlays. We know how far out we don't want to get -- go
25 beyond, and what areas we have to make sure we include.

1 So if we could maybe pull that map up. But that's -- I
2 don't know if other people think that's a good idea, but
3 I think I'd certainly help me to know what areas we're,
4 you know, we don't want to leave out.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Jaime, do you have that as a
6 layer? No? Okay.

7 MS. CLARK: No, I do not.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

9 MR. BECKER: There we go. So we -- so that I've got
10 the map, but I -- and I can show it, it's not very
11 granular. I don't think it's going to be necessarily --
12 it's not zoomed in and it's not going to necessarily help
13 that much. What I can do is, whether it's appropriate to
14 do an open session or closed session, I can advise you on
15 areas where VRA concerns are relevant.

16 I think we've had a lot of discussions along those
17 lines already. So that should be fresh in your mind.
18 And we can certainly, if you draw certain lines and there
19 are legal concerns, we can discuss them in either open or
20 closed session, whichever is appropriate at the time,
21 given kind of a nonhypothetical boundary, but an actual
22 boundary.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Commissioner
24 Sadhwani. And then it will be time for our lunch break.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think just going

1 back to the wisdom that Commissioner Turner lifted
2 earlier, especially in this area. And I know that
3 Commissioner Vazquez had to step away. We spent actually
4 a lot of time redoing this area in the Assembly maps.
5 Again, not a straight nest, of course, but it might be
6 helpful just to remind ourselves what we did.

7 We had a long conversation about Rancho Cucamonga,
8 about Fontana being paired with Rialto, about the value
9 of keeping Redlands or not keeping Redlands, or portions
10 of Redlands, of Grand Terrace and some of the portions
11 that are currently underneath the data view box that I
12 can't exactly see. But I'm pretty sure if we started
13 pulling in some of those areas -- again, not a complete
14 nest, but we could build off of that to build out this
15 VRA district that clearly needs to be built in this area.

16 And then beginning to equalize the population here.
17 Right, I mean, we have a clear sense of where the VRA
18 obligations are going to be. There's going to be one in
19 the San Bernardino area, one in the Riverside area. And
20 we have those as at least a guidepost to start building
21 them off of and readjusting some of these. Right?

22 And I think that the positive of this is now we do
23 have this VRA district in the eastern San Gabriel Valley
24 spanning out into San Bernardino that is at a higher
25 CVAP.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So please be thinking of how
2 to build out and balance these districts during lunch.
3 And we will be back at 3:00 p.m.

4 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:16 p.m.
5 until 3:00 p.m.)

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
7 patience during our meal break; we are back with you. We
8 are currently exploring ways that we might strengthen our
9 Senate plan, beginning in Los Angeles County.

10 Commissioner Sadhwani had initiated an exploration
11 of doing some recombining of elements from our latest
12 Assembly districts, and so we are currently looking at
13 what our next step is.

14 So Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have a suggestion
15 of where you would like to go next with this exploration?

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I guess that question
17 that I have is one: are we all in agreement in making
18 these change, right? I mean, I think the real focus here
19 that we said going into this is strengthening our VRA
20 districts. And at minimum, taking out this region in a
21 VRA district and extending it eastward, has done that.

22 Certainly, I see a path forward to continuing that
23 work in the Inland Empire. That being said -- and right
24 now, the changes that we've made are leaving a lot of
25 population hanging around, right? Like we're over in the

1 210, we're under in the POF, et cetera.

2 So my question to, maybe to Jaime, is do -- I mean
3 Jaime is focused in the Los Angeles area. Do we leave
4 what we have done here and start looking at the other VRA
5 districts in LA, so that we can rework the Inland Empire
6 with Sivan; or do we continue on?

7 So that's a question for Jaime, and for the full
8 Commission. I mean, I'm not hearing anyone's response on
9 these changes. So I think I just need some confirmation
10 if this is definitely the direction folks want to go.
11 And I think the focus for me is how do we improve and
12 strengthen our VRA districts. I see this, you know, the
13 removal of this Asian American COI that we've heard a lot
14 about, that makes up or comprises an Asian VRA district
15 in our Assembly maps. I see that reflected in almost all
16 of the public testimony that we've received, but I'm not
17 hearing a lot from other Commissioners. So if this isn't
18 the full direction that the Commission wants to go in,
19 then we should probably pull back, right, because no
20 point in continuing to explore if this isn't what
21 everybody else is actually wanting to do. Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
23 Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Toledo, and
24 Commissioner Sinay.

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Huge apologies, because I had

1 to step away for the entire process of getting from there
2 to here. So acknowledging that on its face, I am not
3 terribly thrilled with the district as visualized right
4 now, particularly the huge portions of the Inland Empire
5 that are now paired with the west -- sorry, the East San
6 Gabriel Valley. I can envision me getting comfortable
7 with that; again, I wasn't part of the conversations, so
8 if someone could walk me through sort of that, I can see
9 me getting there. I do think Pomona is probably, like,
10 that transition point between the two areas, where Pomona
11 definitely has, I think, shared interests with both the
12 East San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire. So again,
13 I can see a world where this makes sense, but just sort
14 of on its face, not super thrilled by this.

15 I am in agreement, for sure, to keep sort of the
16 west San Gabriel Valley sort of whole and together; and
17 strengthening the west -- strengthening the East San
18 Gabriel Valley's VRA commitments. I just don't know that
19 I am sold that this is the way to do this.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.
21 Commissioner Toledo?

22 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

23 I'm in support of strengthening the VRA districts up
24 in Los Angeles, and one way to do that, and I think if
25 probably given when I zoom out and look at where the

1 population is that we can draw in, while maintaining the
2 VRA districts, it's really from the Inland Empire,
3 because that's where much of the population growth has
4 occurred. And then rotating it through over the northern
5 part of Los Angeles and then to more of the rest of Los
6 Angeles to populate our VRA districts that are on the
7 lower end of the CVAPs.

8 So there's -- I think we tried this also in the
9 Assembly and it was just difficult to do, because it is a
10 complex rotation of appellation through these districts.
11 However, so VRA comes first, and I think we have to
12 solidify these districts before we start shifting the
13 other districts. And I think that's the concern I have,
14 is, you know, how much time will this take. I mean, of
15 course, we want to get our VRA right and we have to
16 solidify that and so I'm trying to process how to do this
17 in the most efficient manner possible.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean the time question has
20 to be paramount because, you know, from my perspective,
21 above the VRA, above the equal population, is finishing
22 these maps on time. You know, everything will have been
23 for naught if we are not able to complete this task in a
24 timely manner. So my question is, to Commissioners, is
25 do we believe that we can make changes this extensive,

1 potentially throughout Southern California and the
2 Central Valley, recognizing that there aren't VRA
3 concerns in large portions of the state but there
4 certainly are in this portion of the state? Or are we
5 better off trying to make the best changes that we can,
6 but more of a marginal nature without major architectural
7 changes? So I just wanted to put that question out.

8 Commissioner Sinay?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, and you know, I hear you
10 and I think that that's something that goes in our heads
11 and every time we say, okay, let's just move forward,
12 then something nudges us because we didn't do -- we
13 didn't make what was good, better, or what was better,
14 best. So when it comes to VRA districts I just think
15 that they do need to be the best. It's for ten years,
16 and they're really critical for those communities.

17 I also believe that things take a while. You know,
18 the taking things apart and putting things -- take a
19 while, but all of a sudden, in five minutes we may have
20 four districts.

21 You know, I'm a firm believer, because I'm a
22 facilitator and all that, that you have to trust the
23 process and just rush us, but trust the process -- not
24 rush us, but nudge us, but we will get there and we will
25 get to best.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

2 Commissioner Sadhwani?

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, sure. You know, I
4 mean I know in the congressional maps we took some time
5 to review some of the testimony that we had received. We
6 had specifically looked at, like, maps from the Black
7 Hub, from MALDEF, from Advancing Justice, Equality
8 California, et cetera, many of these groups that have
9 submitted full map plans.

10 I'm just wondering, Chair, if it might make sense to
11 just take a look at how some of these other groups might
12 be visualizing some of these areas. You know, I think
13 many of them were certainly cognizant for VRA obligations
14 and perhaps advocating for the strongest possible, you
15 know, VRA districts; and perhaps that could help as a
16 guide.

17 Not to say that we would adopt any one version of
18 those, but perhaps just taking a moment to reflect on
19 what we have seen, and certainly coupling that with all
20 of the community testimony that we have received.

21 I don't know if Jaime has any of that loaded, but if
22 it's reasonable to you, Chair, it might make sense; and
23 maybe can help us answer just how doable this work is and
24 if we actually want to go down such a path.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.

1 Jaime, do you have any of those available to us?

2 MS. CLARK: I have Senate submissions loaded in for
3 Advancing Justice and MALDEF, and I just received
4 shapefiles from Black Census and Redistricting Hub.
5 They're not loaded into my map yet, but it would take
6 just a few moments to load them.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Would you like to load them
8 while we discuss a little bit further?

9 MS. CLARK: Certainly.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

11 Commissioner Fernandez?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

13 Yes, definitely our VRAs need to be strong. And I
14 guess, I just caution; we have VRA districts and then we
15 keep trying to get them stronger, and stronger, and
16 stronger. So I think we need to get to a point where we
17 just have to cut it off because then we're just spinning
18 our wheels. And at the point where our VRA attorney is
19 comfortable with it, and then maybe at that point we need
20 to move on. Just because we do seem to be going back to
21 the VRA districts and changing them. And as we've seen,
22 then they have the ripple effects to other districts that
23 we've already somewhat finalized but no longer are
24 finalized because of the ripple effect.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My sense -- and I've lost

1 track of whether Mr. Becker is with us right now or
2 not -- is there --

3 MR. BECKER: I am.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: You are? Okay. Do you have a
5 general sense of being okay with where the Senate maps
6 are before any changes, or --

7 We're getting background from someone. Commissioner
8 Yee, is that your mic, or I don't know whose --

9 Thank you.

10 MR. BECKER: So I think we've already been over my
11 judgment on some of these districts in the LA area, so
12 I'm not going to rehash that. I don't know if you're
13 asking for what my view of SD10WE is under the adjusted
14 configuration. I don't think --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, no, not yet.

16 MR. BECKER: -- there are any VRA concerns about
17 that, okay.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, no. Okay.

19 Someone's hand had gone up. Can we scroll back to
20 the top of the -- thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just have a question. I
22 guess since we're starting now from -- in a sense, I
23 don't want to say from scratch, but if we're going to be,
24 you know, readjusting these VRA districts. I know that
25 there's been an effort to try to keep the changes

1 localized, but I think my concern with this kind of large
2 change is that we have to -- if we're going to do this,
3 we just have to be open to all of it; because I think
4 there's going to be ripple effects to the Inland Empire,
5 which then ripples to San Diego. And you know, I
6 guess -- or if we're going to go up towards Central
7 Valley. I'm not sure which way, once we get into the
8 Inland Empire, if we're going to go left or we're going
9 to go right, I guess, in a way.

10 So I think if we do this, I just want to say I
11 think, you know, we just got to not try to keep it
12 localized. I think we just got to let the ripples kind
13 of work itself out and see what happens. I know it's
14 going to -- there are probably people that are probably
15 just thinking, oh, my gosh, what are we going to do? But
16 I think if the goal is to create, you know, stronger VRA
17 districts. If we're, you know, through this exercise,
18 clearly you know there's some dissatisfaction, you know,
19 or perhaps more of a desire to do better, not
20 dissatisfaction.

21 But it's a desire to do better, then if that's the
22 case then, you know, I think we just need to try to see
23 what that's going to mean for the other districts and not
24 try to constrain ourselves to just like, let's just keep
25 it to LA County, because that may not be workable. So I

1 mean if we're going to do it, let's do it right, at this
2 point.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

4 So Jaime?

5 MS. CLARK: Hello.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi.

7 MS. CLARK: I was able to load some. I was able to
8 load the Black Hub's proposal into the map. I am happy
9 to just kind of look at all of these together. I have
10 not had a chance to assess or evaluate any of these,
11 really.

12 So one moment; I'm going to turn off the
13 Commission's districts and turn on -- who would you like
14 to see first? I have MALDEF, Advancing Justice, and
15 Black Census and Redistricting Hub.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: I think, given what we're working
17 on, let's look at MALDEF first.

18 MS. CLARK: I'm sorry; could you please repeat that?

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's look at MALDEF first.

20 MS. CLARK: Okay. So their lines are here in
21 purple. I'm just going to zoom out.

22 So I think essentially what it would do is redraw a
23 lot of your -- you know, redraw a lot of the area. So I
24 think that would just have to -- would be something that
25 the Commission would have to be comfortable with, if

1 you're going to move in a path forward. So they do
2 include some of these areas in the Inland Empire with the
3 East San Gabriel Valley areas.

4 And see, I'm just looking around everything. It
5 looks like they have Long Beach in three districts and
6 they also have Long Beach with some of the gateway
7 cities. And then in -- I'll turn on the Commission's
8 lines again, just to see some of these differences here.
9 It looks like some significant, maybe, differences, in
10 sort of Riverside and San Bernadino Counties. And they
11 have the Victor Valley and Antelope Valley separate from
12 each other.

13 Would you like me to move onto a different plan?

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, if you could go to the Black
15 Hub's maps?

16 MS. CLARK: Okay. So here their lines are in red.
17 It looks like in more like the city of Los Angeles and,
18 you know, southern and central Los Angeles is pretty
19 similar to the Commission's current maps.

20 Here they have Long Beach in one district but
21 gateway cities and have the ports separate; and
22 including, excuse me, some of these cities like Hawthorne
23 or Bernadino, Compton, et cetera, with San Pedro. It
24 looks like they have some differences here in the Santa
25 Ana area.

1 They include La Habra, and it looks like at least
2 part of La Mirada, with Santa Ana, and this western
3 portion of Anaheim. They also include Pomona, Ontario,
4 Chino, with some of these Eastern San Gabriel Valley
5 cities.

6 They have part of Victor Valley with Antelope
7 Valley; and additionally, it looks like there's a split
8 here in Santa Clarita.

9 And then in Riverside and San Bernadino, I'll turn
10 on the Commission's maps. So also sort of -- yeah,
11 there's differences here too.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'll just observe that I
13 like -- I mean I see that they have gone over into San
14 Bernadino County as we are looking at doing. They then
15 are able to have a San Bernadino-based district and a
16 Riverside-based district, without combining those two.
17 And I certainly see a lot of positive in that.

18 The district wrapping around from Cabazon, Banning,
19 Beaumont, around to Norco. I, you know, I can see that
20 making a fair amount of sense. I can see, I mean, the
21 SECA district looks very similar to what we currently
22 have. The configuration of the -- we'll say the Central
23 Desert District, including Coachella Valley, Joshua Tree
24 National Park, Twentynine Palms Marine Base, et cetera.
25 You know, I can see some sense in that.

1 One of my concerns in this would be trying to better
2 balance population between Victor Valley and the Antelope
3 Valley; if we are going to cross that line. I've
4 consistently said I would like to see population as
5 balanced as possible between the two elements of a
6 district that crosses that line in that area. Just some
7 of my thoughts.

8 Commissioner Vazquez?

9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thank you. This was
10 helpful. Still not super thrilled. I don't think this
11 composition makes as much sense in terms of putting like
12 communities together, as what we have drawn. That being
13 said, if the rest of the Commission is interested in
14 pursuing this, I think that I am happy to go that way.

15 For me, a priority, then, if we're going to make
16 major changes, is in the Senate map. I would very much
17 like to see us keep the Antelope Valley and the Victor
18 Valleys whole and separate, since we had to combine them
19 in the Assembly. I would prioritize keeping those
20 separate, more like, I think, the MALDEF plan that we
21 just saw.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

23 And so Jaime, can we see that third plan that you
24 have available?

25 MS. CLARK: This is the Advancing Justice plan. So

1 just a quick overview is, again, sort of in like southern
2 LA County and eastern LA County, pretty similar to
3 Commission's Senate plan. And then moving here towards
4 San Gabriel Valley. Yeah, some of the differences the
5 Commission is discussing right now as well.

6 Moving into Pomona, Ontario, Chino here in this
7 district with East San Gabriel Valley, this looks similar
8 to Black Hub's, and it looks like an identical,
9 potentially, sort of split with Black Hub, which is
10 having Victor Valley split with Antelope Valley; Santa
11 Clarita split, and then having some of the San Fernando
12 Valley areas and areas along 210, included with this
13 Antelope Valley District.

14 I'm going to turn on Black Hub's as well. Yeah, it
15 looks like it's the same submission in terms of shape.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

17 Commissioner Sadhwani?

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just want to say
19 thank you Jaime for showing s that. I really appreciate
20 it. And I hope folks see where I was coming from in
21 trying to remove the Asian American COI that we've heard
22 a whole lot from. It is reflected in all three of these
23 maps as not being a part of a VRA district, a strong VRA
24 district that can perform for the Latino community, who
25 is the protected community in this district.

1 And I definitely understand the concern of putting
2 together communities that aren't similar, and we've
3 talked about this before in the Senate map. We're
4 putting together a million people. So it's going to
5 happen that there's going to be pairings that are people
6 that are different, right? I mean that's the nature of a
7 humongous map, humongous districts that are like this.
8 And you know, we can debate whether or not there should
9 be such large districts, but nevertheless that's the job
10 that's in front of us.

11 So you know, again, I'll just pose the question, is
12 this the direction that the Commission wants to move in?
13 And if not, we can revert and just accept what we've got.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My sense is that for
15 improving representation in this VRA area, specifically,
16 I am happy to continue along this line. I would think
17 that we would generally try to limit the ripples to a
18 reasonable extent. I mean, if we completely obliterate
19 the map we're starting over, and I really don't think
20 that's the best way to go on this.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may?

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with you completely.
24 To me, you know, from the get-go I've kind of said, to me
25 a lot of the stuff happening in LA is generally good, and

1 it's like moving around this one district does setoff a
2 lot of ripples that we'll then have to work out. It will
3 allow us to make some of the changes in LA to meet some
4 of our other goals, right, we talked about earlier.
5 Commissioner Toledo had mentioned, you know, the number
6 of districts that, you know, center around working-class
7 Latino communities. I know that that was an interest for
8 some. I think some of these changes can allow us to get
9 to that place. But yes, it will have ripples, and I
10 think a lot of those ripples are going to be, you know,
11 in the Inland Empire and further down the map. But as we
12 see from a lot of these other maps from community groups,
13 are LA maps are fairly similar actually to what other
14 folks are drawing. I think the key piece for me was that
15 we continue; we have that Asian American COI that we've
16 heard a whole lot of testimony from, paired within one of
17 these VRA districts. And so pulling that out was a
18 priority that I wanted to raise.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. I thought there was
20 another hand, but maybe that was your hand earlier.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think it was Commissioner
22 Turner.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, it was Commissioner Turner.
24 Commissioner Turner?

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. So we saw

1 the three maps; thank you, Jaime, just now. I think
2 there are other maps that's coming in as well. That I
3 just don't know if we are resistant to starting there and
4 lining up, or taking hours and lining -- I'm looking for
5 shortcuts that still accomplishes everything. And so I'm
6 not supportive of starting from scratch. I'm not locked
7 into our map versus their map. We know a lot more today
8 than we did a couple of weeks back.

9 I really do want to say if there is any iteration
10 that we've seen, and I really don't care who sent it. If
11 there's any iteration that we've seen that gets closest
12 to what we're trying to accomplish, I would love for us
13 to start there and then make our adjustment based on what
14 we've heard.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

16 Jaime, do you recall having seen anything that goes
17 in this general direction? Do we have any previous
18 iterations for Senate maps, for example, that do what
19 we're trying to do?

20 MS. CLARK: The Commission had never requested
21 seeing these areas paired together. Like having Pomona
22 and Ontario, for example, paired with East San Gabriel
23 Valley, so that is sort of the basis or, I guess, like a
24 pivot point for the Commission, then no, we don't. We
25 haven't -- none of the Commission's iterations have

1 grouped these cities together in a Senate plan?

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Excuse me.

3 Commissioner Toledo?

4 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I guess the question would be
5 also, like, what are we trying to do? I mean, yes, we're
6 specifically trying to raise this elapse in the Los
7 Angeles region, but these -- and solidify our VRA maps.
8 Right? To really solidify our VRA maps and increase the
9 CVAPs; potentially increase the number of Latino majority
10 seats. The only population that can rise to that level
11 of a million people or more. And so those would be the,
12 I think, the three criteria that we're looking to while
13 trying to solidify the VRA maps. And so as we look at
14 the community maps, you know, I don't know if Jaime has
15 an assessment of which ones go in that direction, right?
16 Or actually meeting all three or most of the three
17 requirements.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner, and then Jaime.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So we have on the screen now
20 this proposed shift that we seem to like, but the concern
21 is this may take a long time and shake a lot up. What
22 I'm asking is, Jaime, of all the maps that we've seen and
23 ones that's coming in right now, do we have any that has
24 this direction that we can now say and this is what else
25 they have that we can move in? So it does not line up

1 with -- because we had a different direction. We had
2 something; the map kind of going in a different way
3 earlier. But based on what we want to do now, what can
4 give us, you know, a good start?

5 MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you. So I'll just kind of
6 show the three maps again. And actually I'll put these
7 on top of each other. So there are some differences
8 between what MALDEF has submitted and what Advancing
9 Justice and Black Hub have submitted. These, I think,
10 would be more minor changes overall than compared to the
11 Commission's map, right? So these are more similar to
12 each other than either of them are to the Commission's
13 map.

14 And back to Commissioner Toledo's questions, if I
15 have an assessment of accomplishing these in the VRA
16 areas; I have spent about as much time with them as the
17 Commission has at this point. So I don't have -- and I
18 think that would also maybe be a question for legal.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime.

20 Commissioner Andersen?

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for all
22 this; it's very helpful. Would it be helpful to say,
23 like, to proceed as -- here Commissioner Sadhwani said,
24 okay, like, I want these, these, these together. I'm
25 thinking, well, why don't we go this direction. Then

1 say, and someone could take notes on this, say I'd like
2 to see, you know, Chino Hills with the La Brea, such --
3 you know, I'd like to see duh, duh, duh, duh, duh, dah.

4 You know and then say, well, you know, I want Vernon
5 and Commerce and, you know, whatever they are, say some
6 combinations like that. So we can kind of have a grasp
7 of, oh okay. You know, if it takes us a while to move
8 things and we stop and we talk about it, why don't we
9 kind of spin a few scenarios? Someone write then down
10 and then go, oh, I like that scenario, and then go with
11 it.

12 Commissioner Sadhwani was doing a great job here;
13 and we're okay, here and here, realizing that okay, what
14 about these other areas? And then if someone else could
15 say, well, you know, I don't want to take all that out,
16 I'd like to see -- we keep this area, keep whatever's
17 northwest of the red drawing we have right now. I want
18 to see that still in there, but I'd like to see, you
19 know, the areas down in Downey, Norwalk, et cetera, et
20 cetera. So I want to see all of those together. And
21 then maybe we can spin a couple of scenarios. So we
22 have, you know, we know how many. Are we doing three,
23 are we doing four in this area? And then create them and
24 then draw them.

25 Would that help, because people. You know, I think

1 Commissioner Sadhwani clearly has an idea and now she
2 wants someone else to kind of pick up the ball and run
3 with it a little bit more, I'm feeling.

4 You know, and someone else says, well, you know, I
5 really want to see this, this, and this. And if we just
6 write that down, we can try it. Because I think we saw a
7 bunch of different ideas here. Now, let's spin some
8 scenarios and go.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.
10 Commissioner Turner?

11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, so one more. So a new
12 comment that come in, and I want to say this particular
13 one, they're again maps of, you know, the area's
14 potential nesting Southern California, et cetera. But
15 the point I want to get to in this public comment, it
16 says: "This proposal was created in three steps. It
17 used our initial nesting of 128CRC Assembly iteration.
18 There was an adjustment for contiguity, and then
19 adjustment for Voting Rights Act." And it talks about
20 the resulting plan that creates twenty-three center
21 districts, of which ten are one hundred percent nested,
22 so forth and so on, et cetera.

23 It talks about it increases the Latino majority
24 Senate districts, et cetera. This is a fourth kind of
25 way to think about it and if it's utilizing our

1 iterations that we started with, and then just being able
2 to make some suggestions. Again, for me, looking to see
3 what can we do, instead of recreating or starting over,
4 it seemed like it would be, to me, a good place to start.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: It does seem to be a good place to
6 start. It is starting with the Assembly map, not our
7 Senate map, just so we're all clear on that. But yes,
8 that does sound like a useful starting point.

9 Commissioner Sadhwani?

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm at a loss here.
11 Honestly, I think -- I mean, do we want to do this or
12 not? I think I'm still waiting; I think I'm hearing
13 people say yes. And then if yes, then how, right? So we
14 can work on it now; we can give some general direction.
15 And as we've done in other maps, we could work offline.
16 I'm happy to volunteer to help with that if it's helpful;
17 happy to let someone else do it. It doesn't really
18 matter. But I think it doesn't sound like we're landing
19 anywhere as a Commission in terms of do we want to move
20 in this direction and if so, how?

21 I think, Commissioner Kennedy, when you were looking
22 at one of the maps it was really helpful because you
23 identified -- there is a VRA district that spans from
24 Eastern Los Angeles into San Bernadino. There's one San
25 Bernardino-based one, there's one Riverside-based one. I

1 mean, maybe some general guidance like that if we all can
2 agree upon it, could then be (audio interference).

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Commissioner Sinay,
4 while we're waiting for Commissioner Sadhwani's internet
5 to catch up.

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Answering Commissioner
7 Sadhwani's is, yes, I would like to move forward with
8 this in LA. I thought we were piloting LA, seeing if it
9 worked, and then we might look into other ways of doing
10 it. But like everyone else, I'm nervous about wasting
11 valuable time, and I thought we had already landed on
12 let's pilot this here in LA and as we learn, we may bring
13 in other things.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Other methods.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think I'm hearing that
18 there's willingness to explore, but to do it -- but it's
19 the process that I think we're needing to figure out.
20 How to do it in a constrained manner so that we are able
21 to finish our job in a timely manner. So I think it's
22 more of a process and time management, and how we go
23 about doing it, and do we do it in live session, during
24 our public meeting, do we work on some of this offline?
25 I mean, at the end of the day we have to solidify our VRA

1 map. So I'm in agreement with Commissioner Fernandez.
2 Once we got them into -- once we start our goals, based
3 on VRA counsel advice, and we're able to get them to that
4 amount, then we finalize those and then we work around
5 them.

6 But that will take a little bit of time to get
7 them -- to be able to get them to that amount,
8 potentially, unless they already are there. And I'm not
9 a hundred percent sure they are. So it's the process I
10 think that we need to just clarify a little bit more and
11 think about a little more.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
13 Commissioner Fernandez?

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I had taken my hand
15 down, but I'll go ahead and give my comment. I'm willing
16 to go forward with it, but I think we need to agree upon
17 what the basis, like, what the first district's going to
18 look like, right, because that's going to impact
19 everything else. So I think once we have that -- I also
20 think that this is going to take a few hours to do,
21 because it's going to impact so many other districts; and
22 then it's going to impact other VRA districts too. So we
23 might be able to start the line drawing here and then at
24 some point may need to cut it off and provide direction.
25 But I think it's good to start with a base and maybe have

1 a district that everyone kind of agrees with and then go
2 from there.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you so much.

4 So then along those lines and thinking about what
5 Commissioner Sadhwani had mentioned earlier as far as my
6 response to one of the maps from stakeholder groups,
7 could we then try to solidify this one district, the
8 SD10WE? So we have approximately sixteen percent
9 overpopulated at this point. If we can go ahead and
10 finish this and then talk through general direction for
11 the rest of this area. Then we could allow Jaime to take
12 off and work on something to come back to us with and we
13 could start working with Sivan on Orange County and San
14 Diego.

15 Commissioner Fornaciari?

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So let's see. It looks
17 like based on what we're looking at here, we need
18 Montebello and Pico Rivera -- just sort of generic saying
19 what I think needs to happen here. Montebello, Pico
20 Rivera goes south. Jaime, if you could zoom out a little
21 bit?

22 Then SD -- whatever. SD60 is going to be
23 overpopulated, so we're going to need -- but it should be
24 a strong VRA district, but we're going to need to move
25 some folks out. I would propose probably south into IOC,

1 and then move that population to the east and around to
2 meet up with the other population so we don't have to go
3 through LA. But you know, I have no idea what that's
4 going to look like and what the gory details are until we
5 get into it. But roughly, I mean, you've got roughly
6 150,000 people you're going to have to march around.
7 Then we have the POF district. Somehow that district
8 probably gets combined with the Rialto, San Bernadino
9 district to make another VRA district there. It looks
10 like the SBRC is already pretty strong. But you know, we
11 spent a lot of time -- so I mean if we do something like
12 that then Fontana, Rialto, San Bernadino will be
13 together, which is what we wanted before.

14 Maybe we can unsplit Rancho Cucamonga; we've heard a
15 lot about that. That would be good. But then, you know,
16 then there's just this marching this population around to
17 zero it out. Am I on the track?

18 I mean, so I was just trying to -- what's the big
19 picture of what's going to happen here? But where would
20 we wind up? We'd wind up with this six -- SD10WE being,
21 you know, probably, we hope, a stronger VRA district.
22 SD60 being a stronger VRA district as POF and SBRC. So
23 we'd have four VRA Senate districts, you know, between
24 the LA and Inland Empires. I mean, is that what our goal
25 is?

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you Commissioner Fornaciari.
2 I think that that looks good. Colleagues can chip in if
3 they see other areas. I think if we go ahead and move
4 Montebello and Pico Rivera south for now, then we do in
5 fact have SD10WE within deviation.

6 Can you highlight SD10WE instead of SD60? The
7 statistics are on SD60.

8 MS. CLARK: Maptitude didn't like that direction.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we're at 3.09. We have a
10 Latino CVAP of almost fifty-nine percent. And I think
11 that's a good starting point. I agree with Commissioner
12 Fornaciari that POF at this point would probably mostly
13 go into the San Bernadino district, some might go into
14 the Riverside district.

15 I had indicted before an interest in seeing if we
16 could achieve separation between a San Bernadino-based
17 district and a Riverside-based district. So I would give
18 that as general direction. And then we'd be looking at
19 how to balance out population. Yeah, we have
20 overpopulation in SD210 right now. We'd be looking at
21 making Rancho Cucamonga whole.

22 So let's take a few more steps. So Jaime, can you
23 take the population currently in POF and put most of it
24 with San Bernadino? Jurupa Valley would go with
25 Riverside; and then let's see what we need to balance.

1 Okay, Commissioner Toledo, and then Commissioner
2 Vazquez, and Commissioner Fornaciari.

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I'm in support of
4 the changes and the direction. I also just wanted,
5 because you know, we were talking about regional impact,
6 the Santa Ana district seems to be needing population.
7 So if we could figure out how to move some of the excess
8 population in San Diego down to the Santa Ana VRA
9 district, that might also help; because I think there's
10 very few places to get population to that area at this
11 point. But you know, we'll do one step at a time.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay, thank you.

13 Commissioner Vazquez?

14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, yes. Jaime, could
15 you just confirm for our -- our current Senate versions,
16 is the Antelope Valley whole, or is -- did we end up --

17 MS. CLARK: The Commission's Senate map, I'm going
18 to zoom to this area, which we haven't made any changes
19 to today. The Antelope Valley is whole and it's with the
20 Victor Valley whole.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it, okay. Thank you;
22 that's helpful.

23 MS. CLARK: So this, what is highlighted on the map
24 is everything in SBRC that is in San Bernadino County.
25 Combining it with POF would make the percent deviation of

1 POF to negative 12.51 percent. And the Latino CVAP would
2 be 56.33 percent.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That sounds like progress.

4 Commissioner Andersen?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was just going to say
6 should we -- would having the heat map help at all in
7 these situations?

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, would that be helpful to you?

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well --

10 MS. CLARK: I think that right now, the most -- you
11 know, I think right now understanding what areas the
12 Commission wants to be together would be the most
13 helpful. And then, you know, then I think fine tuning,
14 understanding, okay, what areas have VRA concerns and
15 then being able to adjust CVAP as needed, if needed, for
16 those once these big changes have kind of been made.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I've got to say
19 Commissioner -- Chair.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Andersen.

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was saying that for --
22 when we were giving directions to say, can you put these
23 or those areas, it might help in terms of cities or
24 something that Commissioners might pick. It was not for
25 Jaime's benefit. I have full confidence in her, thank

1 you.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

3 Commissioner Sadhwani?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, a couple of things, I
5 mean. So as we're doing this, I completely support this
6 change. We've definitely received testimony to take in
7 more of Rancho Cucamonga. And then this is, again, where
8 I feel like we could go back and just take a peek at our
9 Assembly lines. We had worked -- I know Commissioner
10 Vazquez had gone through a lot of the COIs in this area
11 and maybe it makes sense to pick up some of that; maybe
12 not, right? But it could help to just be a guide as we
13 continue to flesh out this district and get it closer to
14 equal population or within the range.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, great.

16 So Jaime, if we could go ahead and make this change;
17 moving that population into POF, and then we'd be looking
18 at expanding POF to take in the rest of Rancho Cucamonga,
19 as well as the northern part of Upland and San Antonio
20 Heights.

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, could I say something
22 about --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- Cucamonga? The reason
25 why we drew it like that in the first place, early on we

1 got a lot of comments to say there's a north section of
2 Rancho Cucamonga, it wants to be with the forest and
3 they're different than the rest of Rancho Cucamonga. And
4 that's why it was originally drawn that way.

5 Now, since then, and recently we've been getting,
6 you know, all of Rancho Cucamonga needs to be together.
7 But there was that portion, and it was that -- I think
8 our Assembly district was leaving that northwest portion
9 with the forest. So that was why we originally drew it
10 that way.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

12 Commissioner Sadhwani?

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry, I didn't realize I
14 had my hand up. But I was just going to say, I think
15 adding all of these areas might actually lower the Latino
16 CVAP, is what it -- if I'm looking at that correctly. It
17 may be, and I don't know if Commissioner Vazquez is still
18 on, that we pull in some of the COIs that we had brought
19 in in the Assembly districts, on the eastern edge, that
20 top part. Remember we had looked at the top part of
21 Redlands, and I think a portion of Loma Linda, that that
22 might be -- maybe it's some of this area but not all of
23 it. And as well as more on the eastern edge as well, to
24 maintain the, you know, that range for this district.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So instead of making this

1 change, the suggestion is that we look towards Highland
2 and Redlands, at least part of Redlands, so that we don't
3 strand Lomo Linda? Right.

4 So if we took in that portion of Redlands that's in
5 the Assembly district, the northern part up against
6 Highland and then portions of Highland.

7 Commissioner Vazquez?

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, some of this area was a
9 bit of a compromise, just based on population, et cetera.
10 So I would start with Redlands and then -- yeah, I would
11 just start with Redlands, then I would move to Highlands,
12 then I would move to Mentone. That would be my order of
13 operations in terms of grabbing population. But
14 definitely would stay certainly south of the 10 in order
15 to keep the VRA numbers -- sorry, north of the 10, to
16 keep the VRA numbers appropriate.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, so and right now we're just a
18 bit over -- sorry, no we're at 8.35 under still in POF.
19 So our next move would be to incorporate portions,
20 significant portions of Highland?

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, correct.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's go with that.

23 Okay, so we are now at negative 2.57.

24 Commissioner Vazquez, thoughts on this?

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I personally feel like

1 keeping Highland more whole rather than a more, probably
2 more of a fifty-fifty split is probably better. So --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Done.

4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. So that would be --

5 MS. CLARK: Yeah, now all of Highland would be
6 included.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: And so Jaime, the pink between
8 Mentone and Highland, is that Yucaipa?

9 MS. CLARK: It looks like this is a noncontiguous
10 piece of Redlands. Would you like me to add this?

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: We call that portion Mentone
13 anyway.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. As well as those two
15 unincorporated sections.

16 MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

18 MS. CLARK: And it looks like there's also some
19 noncontiguous little census blocks in Mentone, that are a
20 part of Redlands and I can just remove those.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

22 MS. CLARK: So just so the Commission's aware this
23 is a city split because of this little, tiny
24 noncontiguous pieces of Redlands.

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I might actually

1 suggest -- so two things, and I'm open to neither.
2 Potentially bringing in more of Rancho Cucamonga. So
3 raising the line, I think to the 210, based on community
4 of interest testimony for this area. And I would walk
5 back some of that -- the Redlands edition, that Redlands
6 are considered Mentone anyway. I would walk that back
7 and maybe try to get more of Rancho Cucamonga.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: And Commissioner Vazquez, you had
9 also said keeping the Redlands changes north of the 10?

10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Correct.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: So we would first drop that section
12 of Redlands that's south of the 10?

13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I think we can grab the
14 south of the 10 if we need it for population, but may
15 want to leave it out for now.

16 This makes sense to me; thanks, Jaime.

17 MS. CLARK: So then to remove this area south of the
18 10, from Redlands; is that correct?

19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think so, yes. Let's
20 remove it and then I think my priority would be to try to
21 get more of Rancho Cucamonga in.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Census blocks may not cooperate, and
23 Jaime, some of the census block issues can be handled
24 offline. We're trying to look at the big picture here.
25 Okay.

1 So now let's look at what we could bring in from
2 Rancho Cucamonga -- and that is the 210, yes. So south
3 of the 210 in Rancho Cucamonga, if we could look at
4 bringing that in.

5 Commissioner Fornaciari, you had your hand up?

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just going to
7 say we're above fifty-four until we grabbed that part
8 below the 10, and then it plummeted. We could also maybe
9 consider going back and grabbing that other piece of
10 Redlands. What happened is, when it got grabbed, we
11 grabbed below the 210 and that really knocked the CVAP
12 down.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Below the 210 or the 10? I
14 thought --

15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Below the 10, sorry.
16 Below that.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: I thought that was raising the CVAP.
18 I thought it went from fifty-three something to fifty-
19 four something.

20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, it went from fifty-
21 four to fifty -- well, it's fifty-four now. When grab
22 below the 10, it went down to fifty-three.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Mr. Becker is away for
24 the next hour.

25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just as we continue to
2 explore here, I support this change of bringing more
3 of -- this, just the Rancho Cucamonga, up to the 210.
4 And I believe when we worked on this in the Assembly, we
5 had included Loma Linda in a VRA district. So I just
6 wanted to offer that as a possible area as well, because
7 I agree with Commissioner Fornaciari that additional part
8 of Redlands, it seemed to drop the CVAP. So I'd be
9 curious what happens if we tried Loma Linda.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So right now in POF, we are
11 at 1.72 percent deviation with a Hispanic CVAP of 53.53.

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Does that include the Rancho
13 Cucamonga change? Yes? Okay.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner Vazquez?

15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I'm open to trying to
16 see if we can add Loma Linda. My guess is that might
17 lower the CVAP. But I do -- if it doesn't lower the
18 CVAP, let's -- I guess, yeah. There may be portions of
19 it, although I imagine not much; but I do think Loma
20 Linda has -- to our conversation this morning, has an
21 incredible asset of Loma Linda University Hospital. Loma
22 Linda is also a blue zone, which is, like, a World Health
23 Organization, I think, designation for being, like, one
24 of the healthiest areas in the world.

25 And so I just think it's a really great asset to

1 include in this VRA district if possible.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So including that much of
3 Loma Linda our deviation is up to 4.36 and the Hispanic
4 CVAP is down to 52.79. Do we want to reconsider bringing
5 in that portion of Rancho Cucamonga, so as to bring in
6 more of Redlands? Commissioner Vazquez?

7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think we could, as you
8 toward the hills, as in many communities, you sort of
9 shift the demographics. So maybe that eastern portion of
10 Highland. Highland's sort of a bifurcated city like
11 Redlands in that you have sort of folks in the center
12 which are more like working-class, immigrants, et cetera,
13 and then as you get toward the hills you get sort of
14 wealthier areas.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: So for example we might continue
16 that line coming up from the western boundary of
17 Menifee --

18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and divide there?

20 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yep.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, let's try that.

22 MS. CLARK: I will try that. And just to note,
23 because the Commission was discussing it, I removed that
24 area of Rancho Cucamonga and Loma Linda is whole, as is
25 Highland. So with this the deviation will be negative

1 .17 percent and the Latino CVAP will be 53.8.

2 And I will look into removing this area of Highland
3 now.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And then after that, my
5 understanding is that we would be looking at adding back
6 in as much of that area of Redlands south of the 10 as
7 possible.

8 MS. CLARK: I'll just keep clicking on some of the
9 census tracts here, just let me know when to stop.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, did we -- is this
12 still including that extra portion of Rancho Cucamonga?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. That was removed.

14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think I would like to
15 include that, potentially even at the expense of Loma
16 Linda.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that a -- that's a --

18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: That portion of Rancho Cucamonga is
20 more similar to the area south of that?

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Correct.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And our CVAP numbers were
23 headed downwards as we added portions of Redlands.

24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so now we are almost seven

1 percent overpopulated.

2 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. And then I would
3 remove all of that Redlands portion from south of the 10.

4 MS. CLARK: And keep Loma Linda?

5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And keep Loma Linda.

6 MS. CLARK: Yeah, I agree with that.

7 So this is generally the area. For the sake of
8 time, maybe this is something that Sivan and I could work
9 on to smooth out, okay.

10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, and if I could just
11 give additional direction, Jaime. That portion of south
12 of Mentone, that portion of Redlands, I believe, south of
13 Mentone, could also I think potentially be removed. That
14 did help the CVAP a little bit. So yeah, this feels like
15 it's moving in the right direction.

16 I think we probably need to keep an eye on that CVAP
17 and maybe remove more of North Highland. I'd probably
18 feel most comfortable with a higher CVAP.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: And we did have -- it was at fifty-
20 four something at one point during this exploration.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think the Loma Linda
22 piece might be challenging.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Highland doesn't seem to be
24 affecting it much.

25 MS. CLARK: Yeah, if I may, I think when it was

1 highest was when Highland was whole and that part of
2 Rancho Cucamonga was not included.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

4 Commissioner Fornaciari?

5 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just going to
6 suggest that maybe we could work these details offline.
7 But because I think there's going to be some overall
8 major architectural shifts that we all would want to just
9 kind of roughly see the major architectural shifts and
10 see if we're all comfortable with going that way.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So at this point for
12 purposes of pulling back and seeing where we go next,
13 let's go ahead and commit these and we can come back and
14 undo them later. But let's go ahead and commit them and
15 pull the map back and see where we are.

16 MS. CLARK: Absolutely. And really quickly, I
17 wanted to note that this little portion of Eastvale is
18 split from Eastvale, and is still assigned, I think, to
19 POF. So I'm wondering if you would like Eastvale to be
20 whole or if I should move that little area in Jurupa
21 Valley?

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez, do you have
23 any thoughts on that?

24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, can you repeat that?

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: The small portion of Eastvale along

1 the western edge of Jurupa Valley is still assigned to
2 the POF, so it's noncontiguous. So do we want it with
3 Jurupa Valley or with the rest of Eastvale? West of the
4 15.

5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I would put it with
6 Eastvale, just because again, freeways really do mark
7 bright lines in communities. So I would put it with
8 Eastvale.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.
10 Commissioner Fernandez?

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Agree. That's what I was
12 going to say, thanks.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

14 Okay, so let's pull back and recap where we are on
15 deviations and we can --

16 MS. CLARK: Yep. So SBRC is now negative thirty-
17 five percent deviation. MCV is negative twelve percent.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

19 MS. CLARK: SD210 is 30.38 percent, and then the
20 SD60 is 8.68 percent. So yeah, those are the districts
21 now that are not within the plus or minus five percent
22 deviation.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So the next step in my
24 mind would be looking at the Victor Valley and seeing
25 what population we could pass through there from SD210

1 into MCV and eventually SBRC. Does that make sense,
2 Jaime?

3 MS. CLARK: If I may?

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

5 MS. CLARK: I think that that would depend on
6 whether the Commission wants some of these areas in LA
7 County, along with 210, to be included with either
8 Antelope Valley or Victor Valley or either of those
9 areas? If not, then I would maybe suggest passing
10 population through San Fernando Valley to be able to
11 balance that a little bit better.

12 And again, that's completely up to the Commission.
13 Some of the submissions that we just looked at did have
14 areas, like La Crescenta and parts of Pasadena, I think,
15 with some of the areas north of the forest. That it just
16 depends on the wishes of the Commission.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani could I
18 ask, if we were to move population out of SD210, where do
19 you see that population coming from?

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would see it --

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Where would you recommend it come
22 from?

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I would see, as Jaime
24 recommended, shifting it through the San Fernando Valley
25 up that way.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And so we're talking Sunland
2 area --

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that area west of Glendale?

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

7 MS. CLARK: And I would imagine it's going to be
8 more than just that area. It's thirty percent
9 overpopulated. So it's a significant amount of
10 population and we could just go for it and see how much
11 we need.

12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: If we recall in our Assembly
15 maps we had had Glendale, Burbank, and that whole area
16 paired with the San Fernando Valley in general. So I
17 don't think it's unnatural to pair them, necessarily.
18 Yeah, it could work.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So now SD210 is at 1.35
20 percent. And we would move this, we would shift this
21 into SCSCV and then continue balancing from there.

22 MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's correct.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, did we -- okay, so we've
24 taken a chunk of Glendale there above the -- is that the
25 134?

1 MS. CLARK: This is the 210. Oh, yeah, and this is
2 the 134. So I'll remove all of the areas of Glendale.
3 We can see -- you would still need to remove some.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

5 MS. CLARK: So -- and that was just grabbing a big
6 chunk with the census tract, so happy to look at a more
7 sensical or more intentional split in Glendale or you
8 know, again, that's something that the Commission could
9 sort of iron out after making these big structural
10 changes.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani?

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, am I seeing further
13 down that the SD210 includes Las Feliz and Hollywood
14 Hills and Atwater Village?

15 MS. CLARK: Yes, it does.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, those are areas that I
17 feel like potentially we could be working down into the
18 map as well. Rather than into the San Fernando Valley as
19 we move forward.

20 MS. CLARK: Yeah. I, just from like a logistical
21 perspective, I would suggest just making these big
22 changes and then, you know, because this is the Senate
23 district, it's almost a million people. That type of
24 change is so much less significant just in terms of
25 population swaps, that maybe just kind of nailing down

1 the general structure first and then making more of,
2 like, the smaller changes once population is relatively
3 more balanced.

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I hear that. So what are
5 you suggesting? Like, put those areas with San Fernando
6 Valley right now?

7 MS. CLARK: I would suggest just getting SD210 to
8 within plus or minus five percent. That could include
9 those areas or it could include, you know, some kind of
10 split in Glendale. Knowing that for all of this, you
11 know, the Commission will be able to come back and give
12 more, like, fine-tune direction, once things are just
13 balanced, period.

14 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, and I guess my
15 question would be what is the population of those two,
16 because I'm noticing the SHORELINE district next door is
17 underpopulated. And to me it would just make sense that
18 those generally stay within the Los Angeles area as
19 opposed to they're a part of the City of Los Angeles as
20 opposed to going into the San Fernando Valley.

21 So that's why I was wondering if rather than sending
22 them to the San Fernando Valley, we can get closer to
23 balancing SD210 by putting them in, perhaps in SHORELINE
24 for now.

25 MS. CLARK: Okay, yeah. So those were like two

1 percent of a district, so they could go either way. I
2 didn't have them included before in moving into San
3 Fernando Valley. If you wanted to move them there for
4 now, then SD210 would still be overpopulated. So at this
5 point it looks like there does need to be split in
6 Glendale somewhere.

7 So given what you just said about not having these
8 with San Fernando Valley, I'm just going to remove those
9 areas again, and then we should look at a split in
10 Glendale.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Maybe I'm confused. I was
12 thinking commit this change and see if it got us to 5.12
13 percent; so we weren't too far. There's another little
14 portion of the City of Los Angeles there right next to
15 Glendale, and that was what I was wondering if that
16 together would get us to closer to five percent. That
17 one right there, yeah.

18 MS. CLARK: Yeah, so I could add all of this to
19 Shoreline. This is part of Regent Park, I think. And
20 moving, like, this is Hollywood Hills areas.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

22 MS. CLARK: Moving that with SHORELINE for now; is
23 that what you would wish?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, that was my thought,
25 because that gets us to like 4, 4.38 in the SD210; is

1 that correct?

2 MS. CLARK: Yes. Okay, so I'll commit this change
3 and then we can look at continuing to move this
4 population that's in the really overpopulated district in
5 San Fernando Valley.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: While we're at this, would we be
7 looking at shifting the excess population from NELA
8 district south? Do we need it to the south? Or we could
9 leave it as it is, okay.

10 MS. CLARK: Yeah, I didn't -- I apologize, Chair
11 Kennedy, I didn't understand the question.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, never mind.

13 MS. CLARK: Okay. Okay. Let's keep working here in
14 SCSFV. Just looking at the geography of this district
15 right now, I think it make sense to move sort of Santa
16 Clarita Valley in with the Antelope Valley. Is that the
17 direction the Commission would want to go?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm happy with that. Any
19 objections? No.

20 So please proceed.

21 Okay. If you can back off that last one.

22 MS. CLARK: So I'm going to --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so we're at --

24 MS. CLARK: -- and this change of moving the Santa
25 Clarita Valley out of this district would leave the rest

1 of the district at a negative 4.6 percent deviation.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So any objection,
3 Commissioner Sadhwani?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't object yet, but I
5 don't have a plan as to how we will balance things out, I
6 will be honest there.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So please go ahead with this.

8 MS. CLARK: Yeah. And then just kind of looking at
9 where we still need to balance. So we just moved that
10 population, and instead of combining areas in SD210
11 directly with Antelope Valley or Victor Valley, we moved
12 the population through San Fernando Valley. So now this
13 Antelope Valley and Victor Valley, these district is
14 again overpopulated. We need to balance between the
15 Antelope/Victor Valley districts, which is almost twenty-
16 five percent overpopulated. We need to increase the
17 population in MCV, which is negative twelve, almost
18 negative thirteen percent deviation. We need to increase
19 the population in SBRC, which is negative thirty-five
20 percent deviation. And we still need to deal with this
21 eight percent deviation in SD60. So (indiscernible) --

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

23 MS. CLARK: -- still need to be -- yeah.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: The SD60 could conceivably balance
25 with what we were looking at earlier, what Commissioner

1 Toledo called our attention to is the negative deviation.

2 Yes, they're in SAA.

3 MS. CLARK: Yes, and if I could add to that, please?

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

5 MS. CLARK: So right now, the ones that are
6 overpopulated, so it's like the Antelope and Victor
7 Valley one, MCV, and SBRC, those I guess, like, right now
8 kind of it could look like MCV almost being absorbed into
9 these -- no, not being absorbed. Picking at some of this
10 and then shedding population in Riverside County, joining
11 with SBRC and then potentially, yeah, those could be
12 combined or somewhere else. Yeah.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So let's look at --
14 Commissioner Vazquez and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. Here's for
16 me where my priority is and has been really, since the
17 start of this. I would really like to keep the Antelope
18 Valley whole and within -- contained -- the district it's
19 in contained within LA County. So agree with sort of the
20 general direction that Jaime pointed out of sort of
21 shifting population clockwise. But I disagree with, I
22 think, a couple of our submitted and reviewed maps that I
23 don't think we should take a portion of the Victor Valley
24 into the Antelope Valley. And I'd like to follow more
25 closely with the MALDEF lines.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So if -- Jaime if we could
2 look at what is the population of the Victor Valley?
3 Looking to move it into MCV.

4 MS. CLARK: Absolutely. So if it will be helpful, I
5 could even just look at what the percent deviation would
6 be if we added all of San Bernadino County, that's in the
7 Antelope Valley/Victor Valley based district into MCV and
8 then that, I think, will bring these two districts that
9 need to be kind of consolidated and move population,
10 they'll be right next to each other and it will be easier
11 to see sort of what would need to happen there.

12 Does that sound agreeable to look at adding
13 everything that's remaining in San Bernadino County into
14 the MCV, just to see the population?

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: If that's easier for you, then yes;
16 that's fine.

17 We're five minutes from our next break.

18 MS. CLARK: One moment, please, while the computer
19 is thinking.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, Jaime are you -- yeah, you're
21 muted.

22 MS. CLARK: Oh, I am muted. Now I'm unmuted.

23 So the total population of the highlighted area,
24 this is everything that's currently in San Bernadino
25 County and assigned to the Antelope Valley/Victor Valley

1 district is about 525,000 people. Adding that to the MCV
2 district would bring the percent deviation of MCV to
3 forty percent deviation. And then that would be able to
4 be balanced with the SBRC, which is negative thirty-five
5 percent deviation. So that's where sort of the balancing
6 could happen and maybe some more adjusting.

7 Oh, but this would be negative twenty-eight percent,
8 okay.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

10 MS. CLARK: Okay.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: And so if we look back at that and
12 Commissioner Vazquez's desire that we make the Antelope
13 Valley as whole as possible. Is there population
14 anywhere else that we need to pick up that could be added
15 to that Antelope Valley district?

16 MS. CLARK: I think if the request is to keep it
17 all in Los Angeles County --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

19 MS. CLARK: -- I think then that would be looking
20 back at adding more population, either from San Fernando
21 Valley or -- this is probably why some of these maps that
22 we just looked at crossed into sort of the 210 corridor
23 cities.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

25 Thoughts on this, Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think it makes more sense to
2 cross Antelope Valley into San Bernardino than it does to
3 go into the 210.

4 I know, Commissioner Vazquez, you're not happy with
5 me saying that, but I think there's more similarities and
6 it'll -- but I'm open, always.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jamie, could we -- before we
8 go to break, could we just look at the Victor Valley
9 and -- and get a read on how much population that is?

10 MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

11 (Pause)

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's -- that's
13 essentially -- the Victor Valley is, give or take,
14 400,000 people.

15 MS. CLARK: That's correct.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need to take a break
17 for the next fifteen minutes. We will leave it there.

18 Jamie, if you have any thoughts on how we -- how we
19 handle this, we'll look forward to hearing those in
20 fifteen minutes. We are on break until 4:45. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:32 p.m.
22 until 4:45 p.m.)

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Back with you.

24 Jamie, what did you conclude as far as looking
25 around and seeing how to resolve this population issue?

1 MS. CLARK: Well, I -- I think kind of as I
2 mentioned before the break, unless you want to cross into
3 San Bernardino County to pick up some population from
4 Victor Valley, either dipping into San Fernando Valley
5 for population or crossing over the forest to pick up
6 some of the cities or communities along 210.

7 Additionally, the commission has gotten some COI
8 testimony about keeping California City Edwards Air Force
9 Base areas with Antelope Valley. That's not a
10 significant population when you're talking about, you
11 know, a million people, but it's some population. So
12 those -- those are my suggestions.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani, did
14 you have any further thoughts on this?

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I mean, I think it's
16 not ideal to dip into Victor Valley and dipping into
17 across the county borders, but that being said -- and I
18 think the ultimate goal of all of these changes is to
19 improve our -- our VRA districts down below. And I think
20 that we are in that general direction of doing that.
21 Certainly, we've already seen the improvement to the -- I
22 forget the name of it. The first -- first one we started
23 working on.

24 So in that sense, I would be inclined to balance
25 these districts using -- you know, pulling from or

1 grouping communities in the Victor Valley with the
2 Antelope Valley. I know that, you know, that's, less
3 than ideal. That being said, certainly we -- we do do
4 that in -- in our Assembly maps as well. And I know
5 we've gone back and forth on -- on the extent to which
6 these communities are or are not tied, but I think given
7 all of the other considerations, I think that would be
8 the way to go.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jamie, the -- so we know that
10 the Victor Valley is approximately 400,000 people. What
11 is the Antelope Valley, not including Acton and Agua
12 Dulce?

13 MS. CLARK: I will pull that up right now. I
14 believe it's pretty similar population.

15 (Pause)

16 MS. CLARK: So -- yeah, that --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: It's almost exactly identical.
18 And -- and if that were all we had to do, put together
19 400 and 400, you know, I think that's definitely
20 something that I could support.

21 Jamie, were you going to say something else?

22 MS. CLARK: Well, just a note is that, although in
23 the Sen -- or in the -- in the Commission's draft maps
24 for this area, although Santa Clarita Valley is also
25 included in that district, that's essentially what the

1 draft maps are. And making that change would definitely
2 have some big population bubbles that would need to be
3 resolved, including, you know, basically, Agua Dulce,
4 Acton, and Santa Clarita Valley would need to be moved
5 into a district.

6 And then also just a note that this area along --
7 north of 210 -- Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, et cetera --
8 currently, we're not really talking about where that
9 would go. Just some suggestions or a suggestion is that
10 could go into 210 with furthered -- you know, we would
11 have to remove other population here in SD 210, but just
12 to note that we can't -- we can't forget about those
13 guys.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right, right. Okay. Thank
15 you.

16 Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. Sorry I was a little
18 bit late.

19 Jamie, if you could refresh me, if we moved all of
20 the rest of San Bernardino County into MCV, how short
21 were we in -- yeah -- in --

22 MS. CLARK: I think we were about twenty-eight
23 percent short then in the northern LA area.

24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Because I'm -- you
25 know, I'm seeing that we're -- well, we got the northern

1 part of Rancho Cucamonga, we got, you know, whatever that
2 is next to it, we could maybe go that -- go west with.
3 We're four percent here, we're three percent there, were
4 a few more percent. I mean, is there enough floating
5 around in LA to kind of get it in close, do you think,
6 or?

7 MS. CLARK: You mean by crossing the forest?

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, by continuing to go
9 through the San Fernando Valley.

10 MS. CLARK: Yes, I -- I think that that would be --
11 you know, there would need to be some significant
12 adjustments in L -- the rest of LA County to accommodate
13 that change. But --

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, zoom in -- if you
15 can zoom in a little bit there. I mean, maybe -- so we
16 can see all the labels. So we got four percent at SD --
17 I mean, technically we have ten percent at SDNELA. We
18 have nine percent in SD210. We're a little short there,
19 but we -- in SCFV -- then we add another three percent or
20 probably eight percent somewhere nearby. I don't know.
21 That might --

22 MS. CLARK: So just to clarify your question, it's
23 about, like, using the plus or minus five percent to try
24 and absorb some of that? I see. Maybe? I think.

25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: This is probably a

1 question that requires more thought than we have time to
2 do live.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?

4 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, I would find it hard
5 to absorb a population through the Los Angeles area and
6 not reduce the CVAPs though. I think that's -- so I
7 think we might be able to absorb it, but -- but it would
8 potentially reduce the CVAPs in that areas, based on just
9 looking at the demographics of -- in this area versus
10 where -- where the population's going to be pushed into.
11 I mean, I could be wrong, but that's what it -- at first
12 glance that's what it looks like.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm -- I'm seeing we've
15 got eight percent in SD60. You know, instead of going --
16 maybe we can go to the west -- the west with that and
17 bump up the CVAP there and -- and then move up. I mean,
18 I don't know, because it's probably going to break a
19 bunch of COIs, but might be something to think about.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo and then
21 Commissioner Sadhwani?

22 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I -- I can see that
23 going south. I can also see that going -- portions of
24 that -- that SD60 going into SAA to help us bring that up
25 to a fifty percent minority district, given that it is

1 VRA. And so -- and an area that we'll need to focus, so
2 I can see it going this way. I can also, you know --
3 that one does worry me because it's -- it's below the
4 forty-five and I don't see a lot of -- any -- other than
5 Los Angeles, I don't see other places to get the CVAP
6 to -- to get it to the forty-five -- I mean to the fifty.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you Commissioner Toledo.
9 Commissioner Sadhwani?

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So two things. One,
11 yes, I think that eight percent that's hanging out there,
12 I mean, even when we drew that district during the draft
13 maps, we drew it in such a way as to localize the changes
14 in Orange County. But we had actually said it would
15 probably make sense to bring Le Havre into this district.
16 So I think that would actually pull from SD60X605, and
17 pull it into SAA. So I think I'm -- I'm less worried
18 about that.

19 And I just wanted to recenter us because I think
20 where we actually were -- were focused was on this
21 question of the Antelope Valley, which at -- at present
22 we have a lot of population to shift. And I think the
23 key question on the table for the commission is whether
24 or not we feel comfortable grouping a portion of Victor
25 Valley with the Antelope Valley in an attempt to push

1 this -- this population through the map and eventually
2 down into Riverside so that we can populate that VRA
3 district that's further down, which is currently at a
4 negative thirty-five. Right? I just wanted to keep us
5 focused on that goal because all of this was really to
6 create stronger VRA districts.

7 And so -- so I think that that's the key question
8 right now, is the appetite to do that. And if that's not
9 the appetite, I don't know what the solution really is to
10 resolve this massive population imbalance that we have
11 right now. Because as we looked at, the Victor Valley
12 was what was -- what was it, Jamie -- like, close to
13 500,000 people or something?

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: 400.

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: 400. Right. So I think
16 that we need some decisions to be made on that. So
17 again, so that we can just nail down the architecture
18 here and continue -- continue moving. Thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
20 Commissioner Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I -- I think that's what
22 Asians Advancing Justice and the Black Hub do, right? I
23 think in their community maps, they placed the population
24 towards the San Bernardino into -- into the Riverside
25 area. I think those are the two -- the Black Hub and the

1 Asians Advancing Justice maps do that. And the question
2 becomes whether we want to adapt -- adopt that
3 architectural approach, not necessarily their maps, but
4 the architectural approach to -- to achieving population
5 balance. I'm not -- I am not opposed, as long as it
6 helps us further our goals.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you, Commissioner
8 Toledo.

9 Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Yee.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I wasn't trying to
11 say I was opposed to doing that. I was just trying to
12 find a way to minimize it, that's all. I think we should
13 carry on. I think we should -- we should make this --
14 finish this experiment and see what happens.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

16 Commissioner Yee?

17 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I support carrying on. In
18 the -- you know, crossing the county line is regretful.
19 You know? We really wish we didn't have to do it. We've
20 heard all the unhappiness about doing it, but -- but we
21 have limited choices, and so I think we'll have to do it
22 again.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

24 Commissioner Vazquez?

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. A helpful

1 suggestion that -- that just came in that will be posted
2 to public comment from -- no, I'm not even sure because
3 my inbox is a mess. The -- the suggestion is to consider
4 taking what we left in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland and
5 adding that to CD210, which I think in one of our maps we
6 have -- we've, like, moved the county line below the 210
7 in order to preserve the county line north of that in
8 Antelope and Victor Valley.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Is that the first step in
10 a -- in a --

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, and --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- multistep process?

13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I think there -- there
14 was some discussion about taking that eight percent in
15 the SD60 and -- and pushing, I believe, that north wood
16 (sic) -- northward.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Anderson?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm sure there's another way
19 of doing this. I have not seen it yet, which is why I've
20 been really quiet. And I -- I think we should finish
21 this off roughly so we can see if it -- if we can even
22 get there, like Mr. Fornaciari said.

23 I still think it -- it looks like we should --
24 there's probably another way we can do this, and I just
25 haven't come up with it yet. So if anyone, you know,

1 let's -- let's keep on thinking outside the box, but I
2 think we should pursue this to -- so we have it, that it
3 would work.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then our next step would
5 be to take the Antelope Valley and bring in what we need
6 from the Victor Valley to tie that up as a district.

7 MS. CLARK: Thank you. So if I may, I think I might
8 start including some of these other areas into MCV, and
9 then we can keep an eye on the Antelope Valley, Victor
10 Valley percent deviation to understand where that
11 district is at in terms of population.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

13 MS. CLARK: And are there specific areas that the
14 commission would like to -- or I guess specific cities
15 the commission would like to try to include with the
16 Antelope Valley or -- any preferences there?

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: My initial reaction is to say, you
18 know, to try to mirror Assembly and or congressional maps
19 as far as what has been grouped together.

20 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Oh, so I'm taking too much.
21 Okay. So I'm going to just try to keep everything
22 contiguous here, clean up some of these lines really
23 quickly. Now, I'll try and include Oak Hills so that
24 it's whole. There we go. Okay, so I'll zoom out. This
25 would be including -- including this portion of 210, it's

1 including whole and intact Pinon Hills, Adelanto,
2 Victorville with the Antelope Valley.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Can we check, Jamie, if Victorville
4 is indeed whole?

5 MS. CLARK: Yes, I just -- I just made it whole.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

7 MS. CLARK: And this area in Rancho Cucamonga and
8 Upland is still included in the Victor Valley-based
9 District.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

11 MS. CLARK: And so all of this would become part of
12 MCV.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

14 MS. CLARK: Should I make this change?

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

16 MS. CLARK: One moment, while it's updating.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that a part of -- okay. I -- I
18 was just trying to see if that was a part of Apple
19 Valley. No, that's Spring Valley Lake, okay.

20 MS. CLARK: So now, balancing MCV is also
21 overpopulated -- or is -- is currently overpopulated,
22 SBRC is significantly underpopulated, and then SD60X605
23 is still overpopulated.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I'm not seeing -- I'm not
25 yet seeing a way to balance this. If -- if -- if SBRC is

1 roughly 350,000 people under, and MCV is roughly 125,000
2 over, we're still way off.

3 MS. CLARK: So we could, you know, definitely use
4 some of this eight percent here to work with that, and
5 then, you know, can -- you can use your percent
6 deviations here to pull population to this area.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Are we at a point,
8 colleagues, where we give general direction and ask Jamie
9 to work on this offline and then we begin working with
10 Sivan on Orange County, San Diego, Imperial? Okay. So
11 general direction.

12 Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have anything to start
13 with?

14 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So I see a couple
15 lingering issues -- and I apologize, I -- I think I
16 wasn't hearing what people were -- were suggesting
17 earlier about the parts of Rancho Cucamonga that are
18 hanging out out there. But yes, I -- I would agree
19 with -- I think what people were saying -- and please
20 confirm if this is what it was -- of -- of pulling that
21 into SD210 and again, shifting more population around.
22 And then, yeah, I mean, I think that the SBRC is -- is
23 our VRA district.

24 And so it's about creating that district and -- you
25 know, Chair, earlier you had talked about having it

1 mostly Riverside-based, which I really liked. We have a
2 lot of COIs in this area as well. We've worked on it a
3 lot in the Assembly. So I think the general direction is
4 building out that district for -- to equalize the
5 population and -- and build as strong of a VRA district
6 as we can, generally following the guidance of the COIs
7 that we had worked so hard on in the Assembly maps, where
8 possible. Right? And at the end of the day, it's a VRA
9 district, so if we can't get them all, we can't get them
10 all.

11 And then from there, I mean, I -- I think that
12 there's swaps in the Los Angeles area that we're going to
13 need to contend with. I don't know if we want to give
14 general direction on that now or take care of this
15 architectural piece and then come back and work on those
16 smaller swaps that -- that might need to be made. There
17 were a number of districts, for example, where, you know,
18 some small shifts in NELA, for example, you know, or --
19 or in some of the other districts -- the SPCC -- could
20 shift the nature of some of those districts.

21 And you know, I think that's -- it sounded like that
22 was a general direction that the commission wanted to
23 move in. But I'm not sure if we want to wait and kind of
24 take that on after this architectural piece is done or if
25 we want to just name that now and then we can work on it.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I think we want to name as
2 much as we can right now. And -- and that should give
3 Jamie, you know, a better understanding of where it is
4 that we're -- we're trying to go and how we're trying to
5 get there.

6 Commissioner Toledo?

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I would agree with
8 naming it now so that as she's rotating population, as
9 she -- she'll have to rotate population throughout Los
10 Angeles and throughout this whole region to have the --
11 she's able to at least get us something that we can opine
12 on and -- and, I mean, we may end up making additional
13 shifts.

14 But -- but I would name maintaining and expanding
15 the -- of the minority majority districts when -- where
16 possible, and increasing CVAPs for the VRA and VRA
17 districts as -- as population allows throughout this
18 area, especially in the Santa Ana area. But even in
19 the -- in the Los Angeles districts as -- as -- as
20 possible. Because I mean, we're talking about a million
21 people per district. So it's going to be tough.

22 But as we work -- as we rotate populations, there's
23 a way to shift those, so that would be part of that --
24 that'd be important. So that -- that's additional
25 guidance I -- just, and I think it reconciles nicely with

1 what Commissioner Sadhwani had -- had said.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
3 Jamie?

4 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Just a note about this
5 offline work, this would be general direction for Sivan.
6 These are Sivan's areas and she's, you know, has been
7 working with them throughout this process. She's very
8 familiar with the COIs and tradeoffs in these areas. So
9 of course, I think she's been watching and we will, you
10 know, pass on all of the direction that you've been given
11 to try and meet your goals.

12 And in terms of direction, in LA County -- yeah, I
13 definitely welcome as specific as possible as commission
14 can get, giving direction. And I can work on that
15 offline to try and make all of your dreams come true for
16 LA County and work Sivan to see that all the populations
17 here balanced.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. I guess one -- one
19 just further, quick and easy bit of the exploration that
20 I would like to see is if we went ahead and -- and made
21 the city of Riverside whole in SBRC, what does that do
22 for our deviation? Because that would be -- that would
23 be, theoretically, you know, the main -- the main point
24 of having that district is to have Riverside whole.

25 MS. CLARK: And that's -- that's certainly something

1 that I can pass on to Sivan and ask her to explore.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani and
3 then Commissioner Fornaciari.

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, so just -- just to --
5 to be a little bit more specific then, I think some of
6 the areas -- you know, for just some general swaps and
7 changes as we're -- as we're making some of these
8 changes, we've certainly heard a lot from some of the
9 working class communities and essential workers in that
10 SCSFV district in -- in the San Fernando Valley. So I --
11 I think we have some additional swaps probably to make
12 there if we bring in the Rancho Cucamonga and those other
13 pieces from -- from northern San Bernardino. So to the
14 greatest extent possible, keeping those -- those
15 communities together.

16 Also in NELA, I think a couple of us have already
17 mentioned that. I mean, I think, you know, looking at
18 NELA, I -- I would, again, I think it's an interesting
19 place because we're pairing, you know, working-class
20 communities of East LA and Boyle Heights with, I think,
21 parts of West Hollywood. So -- so that might be just
22 a -- if possible, a small swap there to -- just to
23 preserve kind of the character and nature there.

24 And then I'd be curious, I believe portions of 710
25 to water are -- are those VRA-protected areas as well as

1 potentially portions of SPPC. So perhaps just working
2 with council on that to -- to make sure that we're
3 meeting our -- any and all obligations that we might
4 have.

5 And then I do actually have a general question. I
6 totally hear you and agree that the Riverside components
7 are Sivan's areas. How would you -- how would you and
8 Sivan like to work? Because we do need to clean up the
9 SS -- SAA district. And my thought on that is by
10 pulling, you know, pulling some of that population out of
11 SD60. I don't know where everyone lands, but certainly
12 when we were working on this at the draft stage, we had
13 talked about La Habra in particular. So I just wanted to
14 see if that's a swap that we should make with you or with
15 Sivan, and what's -- you know, what is your preference
16 in -- in terms of how to work.

17 MS. CLARK: Yeah. Is that something you would like
18 to try right now?

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm certainly open to it,
20 but I also see Commissioner Fornaciari has his hand up,
21 so he might have some more specific directions as well.
22 But yeah, I'm -- I'm happy to do that.

23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was just wanting to get
24 specific clarity on this point for -- for the -- for the
25 line drawers on what we wanted to do, and I think you

1 just gave it to him. So thank you.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
3 Commissioner Toledo?

4 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would just add that I think
5 People's Redistricting Alliance did send some -- some --
6 some guidance on how -- not guidance, but some
7 suggestions on how to -- how to do this. And I think
8 it -- it goes along with what Commissioner Sadhwani was
9 saying around the La Hambra, some of the -- some swaps in
10 LA County that will help us get to the fifty percent
11 mark. And so that might be helpful just to take a look
12 at it, if Jamie and -- it's in our -- it was sent through
13 public input and -- and certainly if -- it is
14 specifically around this Orange County area, so might be
15 helpful.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: So in this -- in this next step,
17 would be -- would we be looking at bringing La Habra, La
18 Mirada, Artesia, and Cerritos into SAA?

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't think we have enough
20 population to do that. I think it would be La Habra and
21 kind of pulling through Fullerton.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, okay.

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But again, we should check
24 the -- the population there.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I think the alliance is
2 La Habra, Whittier, South Whittier, East Whittier, and
3 the portion of -- the southern portion of Fullerton
4 that -- that is a little bit more diverse into -- or
5 maybe diverse is the wrong word, a little more Latino --
6 and into the Orange County. And then they do shave off
7 around the sides to get it up to the fifty percent mark.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

9 MS. CLARK: So Commissioner Toledo, are -- are those
10 the areas that you would like to include in SAA, and if
11 so, could you just review that one more time for me,
12 please?

13 And you're -- you're muted, Commissioner Toledo.

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sorry. So those are potential
15 areas; there might be better areas, but -- you know,
16 Whittier, South Whittier, East Whittier to -- are some of
17 the areas that they look at, as well as the southern
18 portions of Fullerton. And they bring those into -- into
19 the district to get to the fifty percent mark.

20 MS. CLARK: And is that connected to this SAA
21 district through Fullerton or through --

22 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Through Fullerton.

23 MS. CLARK: -- Alameda?

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So yes, they connect the --
25 the western side of Fullerton into -- they have a little

1 neck in -- right there, yeah.

2 MS. CLARK: Which I think that we've had COI
3 testimony in the past that there's a Korean American
4 community in that region.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: In that area that -- that spills
6 over into Buena Park. So then the question becomes --
7 well, I guess -- I guess we have them whole in there if
8 we have that portion of Fullerton with Buena Park. Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And they do split Buena Park
10 in -- in the Alliance's -- in the People's Redistricting
11 Alliance's map. We -- we probably would want to take a
12 look and see what makes sense for us, but --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- that's how they do it.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Just -- just another observation.
16 We're -- we're significantly underpopulating SD60 now and
17 not along the edges, we're -- we're right in the middle
18 of it. So I just wanted to get thoughts on whether that
19 is the best place to do this or whether there are other
20 options. Do we want to see the heat map?

21 Commissioner Fornaciari?

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I'd be interested in
23 letting Jamie explore this. I mean, my recollection --
24 yeah, I mean, it's not very hot right around there,
25 right? And so that's the challenge going from this part

1 of Anaheim into LA, you've got a lot of area that's --
2 that's not densely populated.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean, as far -- as far as
4 CVAP, you know, I can certainly see there's -- there's a
5 bit of a dividing line in Whittier there. There is some
6 population in South Whittier and La Mirada. The -- the
7 western part of Fullerton would be to keep the Korean
8 community united, but isn't going to do -- isn't going to
9 contribute to our -- our CVAP.

10 MS. CLARK: Does this --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?
12 Jamie, go ahead.

13 MS. CLARK: I was -- I was just going to note that
14 this is something that we can definitely take a look at
15 offline. And just some suggestions as I'm looking at it
16 now is, you know, maybe not having a direct, to like,
17 district to district based swap, but maybe also working
18 with some of these other areas surrounding to, you know,
19 remove population here, add population there. And yeah,
20 we'll -- we'll, of course, collaborate with your VRA
21 counsel on this.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And we've -- we've heard
23 some public input about significant Latino population
24 east of Euclid in Garden Grove. So I don't know whether
25 that's an area to be explored in this -- in this

1 exercise.

2 Commissioner Sadhwani?

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, sorry, my internet
4 froze again. Yes, I agree, I think there's exploration
5 to be done here. I was also looking at -- it might also
6 mean taking out Cypress. Maybe keeping it in, maybe
7 keeping it -- I think it depends. But I -- I definitely
8 agree perhaps that that eastern portion of Garden Grove,
9 possibly shaving off on the opposite side of Orange. So
10 I think there's -- there's things to explore here.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner
12 Sadhwani.

13 Commissioner Toledo?

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm fully comfortable
15 with having Jamie work with legal counsel to get us a
16 compliant district in -- in this area. And so -- and I
17 also wanted to clarify the -- that the Alliance did --
18 only takes a portion of Whittier or South Whittier or La
19 Mirada. And so it's not the whole thing. And they --
20 they did send -- send some shape files as well. So those
21 are available to us should they be helpful.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

23 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank -- thank you. I've been
25 informed that it will take approximately fifteen minutes

1 to shift from Jamie to Sivan, so unless we have further
2 instruction, Jamie, are you okay going off with this?

3 MS. CLARK: Yeah. And that -- that break would just
4 be so that Sivan could also be working on the most recent
5 version of the maps, since there are such significant
6 changes.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right.

8 MS. CLARK: Unless you wanted to start, for example,
9 in San Diego County where you -- we haven't really
10 touched and the changes that are being proposed aren't
11 necessarily going to bump up against San Diego County.
12 So if you wanted to start there, we could do a much
13 quicker shift.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: I actually don't at this point.

15 Commissioner Sinay has had to go take care of a --
16 an emergency matter here in town, so I would be reluctant
17 to proceed at this point.

18 Pardon me?

19 Oh, she's -- she's -- oh, she's arriving. Okay.

20 So yeah, we could -- we could go for a shorter
21 changeover and work on San Diego Imperial, and the SECA
22 District in general. Thank you.

23 MS. CLARK: All right. Sivan will be sharing her
24 screen shortly.

25 MS. TRATT: Hi, everyone. Just one moment while I

1 get set up here.

2 Hello, everyone. We are looking at Senate in
3 Southern California. So would you like to begin by
4 looking at SECA?

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: If you could -- if we could stand by
6 for about two more minutes, we can -- we can proceed.

7 If you could, Sivan, as Jamie had done earlier, if
8 you could just remind us what we have currently as far as
9 draft Senate districts for San Diego County and then
10 remind us what we have in the SECA District.

11 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. So as far as San
12 Diego County goes, obviously a large portion of East
13 County -- so this is what we would be looking at. Let me
14 turn the Assembly lines on. So SECA includes the large
15 portion of that eastern San Diego Assembly district, as
16 well as the sort of South Bay, Chula Vista district. So
17 it combines those with obviously other VRA areas in
18 Imperial County as well as the Coachella Valley and
19 Riverside.

20 Then just north of that is this district, which goes
21 from Coronado on the coast, includes part of the central
22 city of San Diego, and then wraps around to include the
23 cities of La Presa, Spring Valley, Jamul. Also brings in
24 Lemon Grove, La Mesa, all of El Cajon. Keeps all of
25 these cities whole.

1 And then to the north, we have this district, which
2 goes again from the city of San Diego and then stretches
3 all the way north to the county border to include
4 Rainbow, Fallbrook, Vonzell, as well as all of Escondido,
5 and all of Poway.

6 And then finally, we have our coastal San Diego,
7 south coastal Orange County district, SOC-NSD. And that
8 goes as far south, again, picking up areas on the coast
9 of the city of San Diego, going as far inland as San
10 Marcos and Vista, and then going up to Dana Point in
11 Orange County.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Sivan.

13 Commissioner Sinay, I understand that you would like
14 to have a bit of discussion on this?

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, ideally, it would be
16 great to have a VRA district just in San Diego, but I
17 don't -- I don't think it can be completely done. But I
18 would like to see if we can explore keeping, you know,
19 the South Bay and -- and City Heights, you know, as much
20 of that second district that we created -- Assembly
21 district that we created that went east to El Cajon, see
22 how much -- if we can put -- how much of it, you know,
23 could continue to keep the Latino see that pie. And then
24 move -- and then see if we can connect -- because this
25 was an area where we just kind of quickly did it -- if we

1 can connect more along the border with Imperial Valley,
2 leaving some of the East County communities not in the
3 VRA district.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the first step then would
5 be to define the area along the border going towards
6 Imperial County that we wanted to keep together with
7 Chula Vista, San Ysidro. And then are there -- did you
8 say there are other areas in the -- in the South Bay in
9 southeast San Diego that you would like to add to that?

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I think we have most of
11 the South Bay, but looking -- if we could connect the --
12 City Heights, maybe going through Golden Hill in that
13 way.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could -- could you --

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But -- yeah, I was going to say
16 Mr. Becker has his hand up, so --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

18 MR. BECKER: Yeah, thank you. I just want to
19 highlight the fact that as with all the maps, the area of
20 Chula Vista, San Ysidro, South San Diego, is part of --
21 of VRA concerns and it is included in a -- it -- that
22 area only meets the Gingles 1 precondition if included
23 with Imperial County. It would make -- it would raise
24 concerns if portions of that area with -- with
25 significant Latino populations were excluded from -- from

1 the SECA district, which right now, I think quite nicely
2 unifies or keeps the Latino community that is protected
3 by the VRA together so they continue to have the
4 opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you clarify that? If what
6 were excluded from SECA?

7 MR. BECKER: If there were Latino -- currently Chula
8 Vista, San Ysidro, kind of that south San Diego area.
9 Thank you. That is a VRA area, has been a VRA area in
10 every map. Similarly, the Imperial Valley area is a VRA
11 area in every map. If you remove significant Latino
12 populations from that VRA area in South San Diego,
13 that -- that would otherwise be protected by a map like
14 this, that could raise Voting Rights Act concerns.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: The -- the idea, as I understand it,
16 would be to -- to connect Chula Vista, San Ysidro, that
17 area to Imperial County.

18 MR. BECKER: It -- it -- is -- am I wrong? That
19 isn't -- that isn't already what's -- what's happening?
20 Am I reading this map wrong?

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, it is happening, but it's
22 also doing it with a lot of predominantly non-Latino
23 communities in the East County. And there's some Latino
24 communities within the city of San Diego that have not
25 been included. So --

1 MR. BECKER: Okay, I -- I heard talking about the --
2 the Chula Vista, San Ysidro, and the area around the bay.
3 If you're talking -- the East --

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, we're --

5 MR. BECKER: -- County area --

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- keeping it all together.

7 MR. BECKER: -- is not an area of significant VRA
8 concern, you can do some population swaps as long as -- I
9 just wanted to warn before you started this that the --
10 the area of South San Diego, including Chula Vista, San
11 Ysidro, is a VRA area of concern.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right. We do understand
13 that. So the -- the idea is -- is better stated as
14 better grouping the -- the other East County communities,
15 Borrego Springs, Julian Pine Valley, Descanso, Alpine,
16 Ramona, with more similar communities. And pulling them
17 out of SECA.

18 So could you, Sivan, what's going to be easier to --
19 to move those out of SECA first?

20 MS. TRATT: Well, I -- I was just going to ask what
21 would be connecting it. So it would basically be like a
22 hardline down at the Imperial San Diego County border and
23 then kind of just like a little -- or a -- I can't think
24 of my shapes -- rectangle to connect --

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I mean, last time we

1 found a road and we -- a long, long time ago, we found a
2 road and we wound that road up and down. It wasn't the
3 8, it was -- it was another one. We could -- I think
4 potentially, we could use the 8 to the 94, but I think a
5 rectangle connecting it works -- will work fine. And
6 then if we can then connect, you know, some of the Latino
7 communities, especially City Heights, because City
8 Heights asked to be with the VRA and I think that that
9 would help. So City Heights, Golden Hill. You know,
10 some of those communities, but I think that should be a
11 good start for you.

12 MS. TRATT: Okay. I do -- sorry. I do think that
13 that swaps -- sounds like it makes sense. I think what
14 might be the easiest way to go about this would be to
15 unassign some of this area, also just so we know how many
16 people we can move in from the city of San Diego, because
17 obviously that's going to be a lot more densely populated
18 than this East County. So I would just worry about, you
19 know, grabbing too much and then not having enough folks
20 to move around up here.

21 So I'm happy to start visualizing that if
22 Commissioners would like to keep discussing just so
23 there's not a silence while you all watch me do this.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

25 Commissioner Toledo?

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm just worried --
2 maybe worried is the wrong word, but just what was --
3 just wondering about the potential of packing given that
4 we're looking at City Heights, which, if memory serves
5 me, was a pretty population-rich area with significant
6 Latino community, and putting it into district that's
7 already almost fifty-seven percent CVAP. So just -- just
8 curious about that in terms of potential risk, in terms
9 of packing.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

11 MR. BECKER: So I think it would depend on the -- on
12 the makeup of the district that you're removing the
13 Latino population from. I mean, these are -- these are
14 districts that are not covered by the VRA. These are
15 districts where the percent of Latino CVAP is not
16 particularly high. It would be a question of whether it
17 could be perceived as -- as -- as intentionally packing.
18 I think the risk of that is very low.

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

20 (Pause)

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. For -- for -- for a start,
22 that's fine.

23 MS. TRATT: So it looks like -- whoops. Let me just
24 adjust this view. So the unassigned area has about
25 80,000 people in it, which would also be -- nine-ish

1 percent of a district, so not very much. And then,
2 obviously, I think we should -- well, this isn't,
3 obviously, a very good indicator of what the final Latino
4 CVAP will be, but currently removing this population
5 would put SECA at 61.6 percent.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay, the next
7 step then would be to bring what into SECA?

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So should we accept this --
9 this change first or --

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, this is just unassigning it.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: So we can -- we can --

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. I just wanted --

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- easily accept this.

15 MS. TRATT: And then I'll zoom into San Diego --

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: That'd be great. Thank you.

17 MS. TRATT: -- so you can take a closer look.

18 Absolutely.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And my thought was, similar to
20 what we did in the Assembly. I believe it was Assembly
21 district that we connected City Heights to South Bay.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And so I think it's --
24 including that piece probably -- you know, southeast San
25 Diego, you know, this the -- the pieces that just lead up

1 to there altogether.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Towards Benita?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Yes, sorry.

4 MS. TRATT: So I think -- just strategizing where we
5 would like to add population -- I think --

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: That it's going to be more than
7 ninety. Yeah, you're right.

8 MS. TRATT: I do think so. And I think we're also
9 going to have to take kind of a narrow -- a potentially
10 roundabout way -- you know, breaking up neighborhoods in
11 the middle in order to grab that City Heights
12 neighborhood.

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Where's the 94 right now?

14 MS. TRATT: Yeah, let me turn the major streets
15 layer on.

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because I'm thinking we may
17 just -- we may just want to start with connecting
18 everything that's under the 94. And that alone may be
19 that populated, I don't know.

20 MS. TRATT: Yeah, let me start selecting population
21 and we can see how populated it is.

22 (Pause)

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I also wanted to check with my
24 colleagues what thoughts they had, because I know
25 Commissioner Sadhwani, you had talked about the SECA

1 District, so I just wanted to see what were -- what
2 thoughts you were having on it.

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't have any specific
4 thoughts. I'm happy to be along on the ride. I think
5 my -- my bigger concern is, you know, SECA, of course,
6 goes up into Riverside and we have that other district
7 that we're building out. So I think for me, that's kind
8 of where my mind is, is how do we still build that out
9 while maintaining this. So that's -- yeah, that would be
10 my concern. My bigger concern.

11 MS. TRATT: So sorry, I -- just trying to remember
12 what the number we're looking for?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ninety.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: I believe it was seventy-nine?

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, I had 90,000.

16 MS. TRATT: So that'd be 9,000 (sic)? Yeah.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

18 MS. TRATT: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know why -- I'm --
20 sorry. I just ran -- literally.

21 MS. TRATT: So would it make sense --

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'm wondering, if we don't
23 cross, let's see, the 805 -- or we cross a little --
24 because City Heights is right above in that triangle
25 right there, right?

1 MS. TRATT: Okay, so instead of continuing east
2 towards Lemon Grove, once we reach the 805, go north?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

4 MS. TRATT: Okay.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Wait a minute. No. We would be --
6 hold on, Sivan.

7 Commissioner Sinay, you want to include in SECA the
8 area that is east of the 805 or west of the 805?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, right now, currently,
10 the -- it's -- it's the area that's east of the -- yeah,
11 just to finish up the -- going up to the 94, finishing up
12 the west side. And then -- and then I think that --
13 that -- then City Heights is right above it in that
14 triangle.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But I may be incorrect
17 because --

18 MS. TRATT: So -- yeah. So I think actually it's
19 the --

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Higher up.

21 MS. TRATT: -- bigger triangle, it's --

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay. Thank you.

23 MS. TRATT: -- this bigger area --

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Got you. Okay, sorry. I
25 was --

1 MS. TRATT: -- because these are the COIs that I
2 have for City Heights, and you can see this is kind of
3 the center where they overlap.

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Sorry, I was --

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's -- that's what I was
6 recalling.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I was get -- I was
8 getting there. I'm so --

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so -- so in fact, we would
10 exclude the currently selected area west of the 805. Is
11 that correct?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, that's the hard thing
13 is -- is that little triangle right there where her hand
14 is --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right?

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that is part of Logan
17 Heights, Sherman Heights. And then -- I get -- oh, I
18 see. So if we --

19 MS. TRATT: What if we -- yeah, we could -- we could
20 unselect this area as long as we just didn't cut it off.
21 It would still have to -- it wouldn't be as --

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Down --

23 MS. TRATT: -- packed, but that would be another
24 option.

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'm also -- if -- if,

1 you know, I'm also okay with southeast San Diego,
2 Paradise Hill, all those being part of the VRA area if we
3 can't get to City Heights. Those are all traditionally,
4 you know, lower income communities.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: You're going over population.

6 MS. TRATT: Thanks, yeah. Seeing that. Yeah, it's
7 very densely populated, so.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And -- but -- but, you know,
9 if -- if there are thoughts as to where we might reduce
10 population -- are -- are there any areas where we could
11 shed population from this? I mean --

12 MS. TRATT: I think that's a question for Mr.
13 Becker, probably.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, it -- yeah.

15 MS. TRATT: Or are you talking about this election
16 or the district as a whole?

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: District as a whole.

18 MS. TRATT: Oh, okay.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fornaciari's
20 raising his hand.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari?

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm just -- I'm just
23 wondering, if we don't go east of the 805 here, and go
24 between the 5 and the 15 up through that little triangle,
25 and then -- and then that way.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We just need to be careful,
2 because there's an LGBT COI right there that doesn't want
3 to be split, even though it's a VRA district and I -- and
4 I understand that.

5 The other option I was thinking, I don't know, this
6 is -- this would be where Mr. Becker could be helpful, is
7 is Bonita part of the VRA protected area or not?

8 MR. BECKER: Could you zoom out and show me where
9 Bonita is? Oh, I see it there. So my -- my maps aren't
10 that granular right now, I can try it, but honestly, can
11 you show the Latino CVAP heat map, please?

12 MS. TRATT: Oh, the heat map? Yes. One moment,
13 please.

14 MR. BECKER: Thank you. And then zoom in on Bonito
15 after you do, please.

16 MS. TRATT: Yes. Let me just turn these COIs off as
17 well.

18 MR. BECKER: So they're shading here, but am I right
19 that there's virtually -- doesn't appear like there's
20 much Latino population in Bonita?

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: There is, but it doesn't look,
22 you know, as high --

23 MR. BECKER: Unless --

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- as other areas.

25 MR. BECKER: Yeah, unless that shading is covering

1 it up.

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to
3 figure out.

4 MR. BECKER: Yeah, maybe you could --

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But Chula Vista looks like it
6 doesn't have a lot either, and it does.

7 MR. BECKER: Maybe you could remove the city shading
8 and we can take a look?

9 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

10 MR. BECKER: Thanks. And keep the boundaries on if
11 you can.

12 MS. TRATT: Yes. Sorry. Just trying to find where
13 (indiscernible).

14 MR. BECKER: No problem.

15 MS. TRATT: So this light yellow color would be
16 ranging from zero to thirty percent.

17 MR. BECKER: Okay.

18 MS. TRATT: The next darkest range would be thirty
19 to forty percent.

20 MR. BECKER: Right. Now can you zoom out just a
21 little bit more, please? Maybe two clicks?

22 MS. TRATT: Yes.

23 MR. BECKER: Maybe a little bit more. Let's go a
24 little farther out.

25 MS. TRATT: More? Further?

1 MR. BECKER: No, no, that's -- I don't need Mexico.

2 Now, back in a little bit, please. Thanks.

3 This -- this is going to be a close call. I think
4 it's likely an area we want to be careful about. To be
5 honest, this is -- this -- this entire area has -- is
6 there a way to change the gradation from zero to thirty
7 to maybe get a little more granularity there?

8 MS. TRATT: Yeah, actually. What would you like
9 the --

10 MR. BECKER: I'd love to see twenty to twenty -- the
11 higher-end of that differentiated, maybe twenty to
12 thirty.

13 MS. TRATT: Okay.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: While this is going on, Commissioner
15 Fornaciari, did you have anything further?

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, I just forgot my hand
17 up.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

19 Commissioner Akutagawa?

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My apologies if I'm -- if
21 I'm getting this confused. Are -- are we working on SECA
22 or are we done with SECA or are you -- I -- I thought you
23 were working on SECA, but now are we on to --

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: We are.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- the other one?

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're working on SECA.

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So -- so then my
3 question here is, I -- I see that we have to -- it looks
4 like we're under nine percent and some change deviation.
5 There are a number of similar COIs that we put into a --
6 you know, we grouped into a district here. Are -- are we
7 doing the right things by this significant portion of
8 COIs in this, you know, kind of central San Diego area,
9 by, in a sense, splitting them up?

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, we're -- we're trying not to
11 split them up. The other thing --

12 MR. BECKER: Sivan, that's --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that we're --

14 MR. BECKER: Sorry to interrupt.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yup.

16 MR. BECKER: I'm sorry. I just didn't want her
17 to --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The other -- the other thing
19 that we're trying to do is to remove these dissimilar
20 communities that we have currently unassigned, and that's
21 why SECA is underpopulated by that almost nine and a half
22 percent. That's -- that's population that was in there,
23 but very dissimilar communities, that have asked to be
24 grouped with other, quote unquote, East County or North
25 County communities. So we're trying to -- to move them

1 to where they are going to be happier. Move in City
2 Heights and perhaps part of southeast San Diego that is
3 more similar to the population in SECA, and -- and not
4 disturb any more communities of interest than we have to
5 in -- in the city itself.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, that's what I
7 understand. Or that's what I figure is going on. I
8 guess my -- I guess I'll just cite it as more of a
9 concern is that, you know, you have -- it -- will it --
10 will the -- will there be enough room for all of the
11 communities that are very similar immigrant? You know,
12 especially immigrant from different communities in -- in
13 this particular area, I remember that that's the
14 conversation we had -- and refugees and others. And so
15 are we going to leave out a small portion of that
16 grouping because of this grouping? And so -- I'm not
17 saying that we should -- one way or the other is -- is
18 that, but I think I'm just kind of raising -- floating it
19 as a -- as a concern.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: As a concern.

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, yeah, sure. And -- and we're
23 looking -- we're -- we're finding that -- I mean, it's
24 not a surprise -- that those areas are very heavily
25 populated. And so you know, these -- these moves are

1 very tricky when -- when we're looking at such densely
2 populated areas.

3 MR. BECKER: If I can interrupt, Sivan, can you do
4 me one more favor, can you -- can you highlight just
5 Bonita and show me the population in CVAPs, both
6 numbers --

7 MS. TRATT: Yeah.

8 MR. BECKER: -- and just --

9 MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

10 MR. BECKER: Thank you.

11 MS. TRATT: Yup. One moment, please.

12 MR. BECKER: And then Commissioner Sinay, I think
13 one of the other questions it's going to -- that's going
14 to be raised is whether the -- the part of -- the part
15 just north of Bonita is also included because that
16 might -- it might be impossible to go down and get there
17 because there -- it appears like there may be significant
18 Latino populations that could be covered there. So I'm
19 going to -- I'm going to go there next. I just wanted to
20 highlight that.

21 MS. TRATT: So there are 12,944 people, and let me
22 just -- let's see. It looks like the percent Latino CVAP
23 in Bonita is 19.85 percent.

24 MR. BECKER: So 12,944 people in Bonita?

25 MS. TRATT: Yes.

1 MR. BECKER: And about one in five of them are
2 Latino. Okay. Could you -- could you go a little bit
3 north of there, please? And can you --

4 MS. TRATT: Farther north?

5 MR. BECKER: Zoom out just a little bit, because
6 I -- I want to -- I think Commissioner Sinay, I don't
7 want to assume what you're -- what you are trying to do,
8 but there is a portion -- you had highlighted some
9 portion in the southern part of COR-CAJON, and you were
10 going to -- you were -- you were inquiring as to whether
11 you could connect down into Bonita to grab -- to -- to
12 chip some further population, is that right?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, you know, and I think the
14 question that Linda brought up -- sorry, Commissioner
15 Akutagawa brought up is -- is one that we've gone -- you
16 know, we -- and -- and I appreciate you, you know,
17 bringing it up -- and that's why I was trying to figure
18 out how exactly to -- City Heights is a very diverse
19 community. Their majority -- it is majority Latino
20 immigrants, and -- and so that's why, you know, I was --
21 my -- my thinking, but it is a collective thinking, is --
22 is -- is kind of when there is an opportunity in a VRA
23 district to connect similar communities.

24 MR. BECKER: I mean, you don't -- I -- you know, I
25 think, like I said, I think parking is not a huge concern

1 here. I -- I'd want to be careful --

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

3 MR. BECKER: -- because there are other criteria
4 here that need to be considered in terms -- including
5 compactness and continuity and COIs and other boundaries.
6 You -- yeah -- I -- I -- you want it -- I think you'd
7 want to be a little -- little bit careful of -- it if --
8 if you were taking the Bonita population and trying to
9 take some population north of the current district
10 boundary and place it in SECA, I'll just say, legally, I
11 don't think that raises Voting Rights Act concerns.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, it would be -- yeah.

13 MR. BECKER: If you were trying to go down into SECA
14 and take some population and --

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No.

16 MR. BECKER: -- add it into COR-CAJON -- okay,
17 that's not what you were doing?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: No.

19 MR. BECKER: So that -- that would have -- that
20 would have meant -- that's starting to get into the area
21 where I'd want to look at that very closely. I think
22 putting additional population, to some degree into SECA,
23 likely does not raise significant Voting Rights Acts
24 concerns.

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So -- so my thought is that if

1 we could at least put that -- that sliver of the 94 to
2 the 5 just to -- you know, just to make sure Sherman
3 Heights and Logan Heights, you know, they're -- all those
4 communities are together.

5 And then I -- you know, I -- I really do want to
6 hear from my colleagues on what is our thinking on -- on,
7 you know, really connecting another vulnerable community
8 to this at the risk of maybe breaking up some refugee and
9 Asian and other, you know, community COIs. We would
10 still have the Lemon Grove -- you know, those would not
11 be included, Lemon Grove, La Presa, Spring Valley, La
12 Mesa, and El Cajon.

13 But -- you know, the other piece is -- is asking, do
14 we have enough population to -- you know, if we -- we add
15 that little sliver, we still need some population because
16 we took some out. It -- can we get that from Riverside?
17 Because Imperial Valley is already all in. So then we
18 would have to get it from Riverside. So that's kind of
19 the way -- that's kind of how I was looking at it, is to
20 be able to do all the pieces that the -- that the
21 community was asking.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So are we -- are we
23 instructing Sivan to bring in that sliver below the 94
24 west of the -- is it the 5? Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Ideally, that -- I mean,

1 that is at the bare minimum what I would like to bring in
2 from San Diego, yes.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: To the -- to the right of that,
4 Sivan. Correct. Right?

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Um-hum.

6 MS. TRATT: This is -- okay, this is the 15. I
7 just --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: All right.

9 MS. TRATT: -- wanted to clarify --

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

11 MS. TRATT: -- because the 5 is here, so I --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct. Yes.

13 MS. TRATT: -- just want to make sure I got that --

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

15 MS. TRATT: -- right. Okay.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

17 MS. TRATT: No, it's okay. It's okay. So I'll
18 start to add that right now.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: And is -- Commissioner Sinay, is
20 there a reason to go east of that at all?

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: You know, going east so that
22 you start going into Paradise Hill and southeastern San
23 Diego, and those COIs, in the past, we've connected them
24 with City Heights up into Lemon Grove -- you know, La
25 Mesa to El Cajon. So the -- it can go either -- either

1 way, but I'm just concerned. That's why I was trying to
2 figure out how to connect them before without taking
3 them, and I -- I just think that what Linda was
4 bringing -- sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa was bringing up
5 was -- was -- is -- is something I would like to hear a
6 response from from all of you on, on our thinking up for
7 the Senate.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

9 Commissioner Fernandez?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Can you please --
11 Sivan, after you're done with that, can you please zoom
12 out? Because I'd like to see what this looks like and
13 then also -- now, I'm having a difficult time following
14 it, but it looks like we're -- might be pulling in rural
15 with urban, so I'm just trying to figure this out,
16 because in the past, we were trying to keep them
17 separate. So if -- if you can --

18 MS. TRATT: Is --

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- just zoom out, that
20 would be great. Thank you.

21 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Could I go ahead and accept this
22 change? This population --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

24 MS. TRATT: Okay.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

1 MS. TRATT: And then I will zoom out.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

3 Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything
4 further?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fernandez, to
8 answer your question, we do have rule with Urban because
9 we have to connect it with Imperial Valley, but what we
10 did was we tried to minimize the amount of rural we were
11 connecting with the -- with the VRA. Hopefully that
12 makes sense.

13 And unfortunately, there isn't a way to do a whole
14 San Diego VRA district.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner -- sorry, Commissioner
16 Sadhwani, you're next, and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I'm trying to wrap my
18 head around the changes here. This is a tough one,
19 right, because we do have more urban areas in and around
20 San Diego with Chula Vista, and this -- this is a
21 district that goes into the Coachella Valley and all the
22 way up to Needles. So it -- it's -- it's just combining
23 a lot of different folks. That being said, I'm -- I
24 could go either way, but I'm -- I'm kind of leaning
25 towards what we had. You know, filling out the rest of

1 this county, and then centering ourselves, like, for that
2 second district just north of there.

3 I think as Commissioner Akutagawa had mentioned, you
4 know, we had spent a lot of time during Assembly and
5 Congress looking at all of those COIs, thinking about --
6 I remember in Assembly, El Cajon was split. And in
7 Congress, I think it was whole, if I remember correctly.
8 You know, and I'm wondering if -- if this is an
9 opportunity, again, not directly nesting, but -- but
10 thinking about the COIs that we want to -- to keep
11 together and having a district that would allow us to do
12 that.

13 Because while they may not, you know, I could see
14 the rationale for bringing them into the VRA district.
15 If that's just not possible, I think having -- having a
16 district where a different variety of folks could feel
17 very well represented would -- would make sense to me,
18 especially given the, you know, vastness of this SECA
19 district. Thank you. I hope that's helpful.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

21 Commissioner Akutagawa?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. I --
23 that -- that's similar to what I was going to say. I
24 think we've had lots of conversations about rural versus
25 urban and my recollection from hearing and reading the

1 COI testimony, especially from the -- it looks like --
2 Sivan, if you move it, I guess it would be to my left,
3 which is I think maybe you're right -- I'm not sure --
4 but you know, more towards the San Bernardino, Riverside
5 borders with San Diego. Because the SECA district, I
6 think, includes -- yeah, it includes the Imperial Valley
7 in it, too, and I recall hearing from them that -- very
8 specifically that they consider themselves to be a much
9 more rural community and so --

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: That they -- who consider?

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Those in the Imperial
12 Valley here. They -- that's what I heard and that's what
13 I've read, is that they consider themselves to be more
14 rural. So I think -- I know these are going to be huge
15 districts, but I -- I would just echo what both
16 Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Fernandez have
17 asked. If this is what it's going to be, this is what
18 it's going to be. But I would like for us to see if we
19 could do a little bit better, perhaps.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: If I -- if I could, and then I'll
23 call on Commissioner Fornaciari -- what we had with SECA
24 included not only Chula Vista and San Ysidro down there
25 at the southern end of San Diego, which -- which are

1 pretty dense urban populations, but we had all of East
2 County San Diego. And the -- the feedback that we got
3 was that that area of East County really wanted to be
4 with, say, North County, Valley Center, Rainbow,
5 Fallbrook, those sorts of communities rather than part of
6 SECA. And so that's what we're trying to address.

7 And -- and I will say also that there is ample
8 historical precedent for -- for having a strip along the
9 south of San Diego County connected to Imperial County.
10 I mean, that's -- that's something that we've seen
11 over --

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- the years.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And unfortunately, the only way
15 to create a VRA district, the -- our VRA requirements are
16 that area in San Diego and then the Imperial Valley. And
17 so we try -- we -- yeah. It would be great if we could
18 create two separate VRA districts and maybe nestle the
19 Imperial Valley with another Riverside, but it -- the two
20 Assembly districts that we created, but it won't work.
21 And that's why, as strange as this district is -- and it
22 is how it's been in the past, because of a million people
23 and our VRA requirement in two different points, this is
24 kind of what comes out.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

1 Commissioner Fornaciari?

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry -- sausage.

3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, so I mean, I -- I
4 kind of support this sort of compromise where we're at,
5 where we -- we only added a little bit of additional San
6 Diego city to be equivalent to what we had in the
7 Assembly. We've moved out much of the East County. And
8 now we've got a bit of overage and we could take that
9 opportunity to move more of La Quinta out of the SECA.
10 And or -- and or see where that population -- you know,
11 if we need that population to balance out the moves we're
12 going to be making from the north.

13 MS. TRATT: I believe La Quinta is whole and is not
14 in the SECA district currently.

15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, okay. I thought --

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that little part that's
18 Santa Rosa was part of La Quinta; my mistake. Sorry.

19 MS. TRATT: No, all good. It's hard to tell with
20 the coloring off so I can turn that on if we're done with
21 the heat map. But let me know.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so if you can zoom back out?

23 MS. TRATT: It's the biggest.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, okay. So. We -- we could
25 do -- we could conceivably leave it here. Oh, let me --

1 let me stop here. We need instructions for the phone
2 lines. We will be breaking at 6:15 for fifteen minutes
3 and then starting public comment at 6:30.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

5 In order to maximize transparency and public
6 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
7 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
8 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
9 877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID
10 number provided on the livestream feed, it is 85932989398
11 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant
12 ID, simply press the pound key.

13 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
14 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
15 star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator.
16 When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message
17 that says the host would like you to talk and to press
18 star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name,
19 please state and spell it for the record. You are not
20 required to provide your name to get public comment.

21 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
22 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
23 call. And once you are waiting in the queue, be alert
24 for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please
25 turn down the livestream volume.

1 And back to you, Chair.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy.

3 So we will be back from break at 6:30 to take public
4 comment.

5 So on -- on this district, we've -- we've added a
6 very small portion of population in San Diego to this,
7 we've drawn this line horizontally from the Imperial
8 County line to -- that gives us a population currently
9 unassigned in Descanso, Alpine, Borrego Springs, et
10 cetera, that we now need to find a home for. And whether
11 that's north into MCV or west into SD-POW-ESC, that's
12 what we need to be working on for the next ten minutes.

13 MS. TRATT: And -- and thinking about what
14 population we want to add --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

16 MS. TRATT: -- into SECA. Yeah.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So could we -- could we zoom
18 in a bit on San Diego County and --

19 Commissioner Fernandez?

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I was thinking
21 opposite, where it looks like maybe Coachella Valley
22 would be, where we would try to get the additional
23 population.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: For SECA?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then I know that you've
5 discussed this before, Chair Kennedy, but if Sivan zooms
6 out a little bit, you have that -- what's that tail? Is
7 that tail in San Bernardino? Is that where it is? It
8 goes up?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Which? Up to Needles?

10 MS. TRATT: All right --

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

13 MS. TRATT: -- let me turn the heat map off.

14 Sorry, Commissioner Fernandez, where -- which --
15 this portion is Needles. Oh, yes.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And is that because Needles
17 has nowhere else, kind of, to go? Is that why -- is that
18 why we go all the way up there? I can't remember.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. The -- the idea of going up
20 there was that that has the Colorado River, which is an
21 incredibly important water source for all of Southern
22 California, in a single district.

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess my comment it -- it
24 does make it a -- a longer district, that's --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

3 MR. DRECHSLER: And just a reminder, this is the --
4 the going up to Needles is what we have in the
5 congressional and the Assembly as well. So just --
6 and -- we're just -- I just noticed we just need to match
7 up the three lines --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

9 MR. DRECHSLER: -- to point up to Needles between
10 the three, so that's something that we will -- will
11 correct as well.

12 MS. TRATT: Yeah. We're waiting for congressional
13 to be finalized, just because that's the most specific
14 deviation, and then we'll make sure that the census
15 blocks in this area are the same for all three plans.
16 But there's so little population in this area that it's
17 not going to impact the deviation of these districts. So
18 I would just ignore it, unless you are talking about
19 removing the area entirely.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

21 Commissioner Andersen?

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I just want to say a
23 little bit more about the -- the reason why we went up
24 there is the Colorado River basin, and though that -- and
25 then the Salton Sea clean up are the large water issues

1 in this -- in this whole area. And they're put in the
2 same district because they are essentially related. A
3 representative sort of needs to focus on some of both of
4 those. That's why we put them there.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

6 So if we can -- if we can go back to San Diego
7 County then and look at where we want to place the --

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: 91 --

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- 90,000 or so people that we
10 removed from SECA.

11 So Commissioner Sinay, did you have any thoughts on
12 where to do this, recognizing that this is going to have
13 some ripple effects?

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I -- I think I would put
15 it with the San Diego, Poway, Escondido. And yes, that
16 will have some ripple effects.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: So putting all of it with that
18 district?

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, because I think we'll pull
20 out some of the ones -- some of the communities that are
21 in that district.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

23 Okay. Any further discussion on this, any
24 objection?

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But I'm open to other ideas if

1 someone else -- because you -- did you have a thought on
2 going up to Rivers -- putting it in --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, at one point you had
4 mentioned that sometimes Anza and Borrego are grouped.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I thought about that
6 right after I said that. I did see that and go, hmm. I
7 do -- I do like keeping that whole desert together. And
8 so I would agree with you if -- if -- if we wanted to do
9 that.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: And -- and so what part of this
11 would go to --

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Anza?

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we would need to look
15 at what the Anza -- Anza, Borrego kind of what the desert
16 landscape is where the park --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need we need the
18 terrain layer and, Sivan, the MCV label is right on top
19 of Anza.

20 MS. TRATT: Was there a request to see how much
21 population was there, or should I go ahead and accept
22 this change?

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Wait one second.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Neither. We're looking to see what
25 portion of the current selection we might instead want to

1 group with Anza. Because Anza Borrego is, you know, an
2 area -- a community that is often grouped --

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's a state park, so this
4 is a good opportunity to put a state park together.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So can we unhighlight it?
7 My thought is to take just that kind of from the -- you
8 know, from the bottom. I don't know if I would take, you
9 know, all the light brown stuff.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And add it to the one right
12 above.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can you roughly highlight the
14 area in light brown around the Borrego Springs and the
15 Anza Borrego Desert State Park?

16 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please. Let's see if
17 it shows up on this layer. More or less this area?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: More or less.

19 MS. TRATT: I think this might be a small portion,
20 but we can -- there's not going to be people living here,
21 so we can just do this in the clean-ups to make sure that
22 the --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

24 MS. TRATT: -- actual state park is intact.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

1 Commissioner Andersen?

2 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I have two questions.
3 One would be, do we have a map of the state park so we
4 can just copy that in there? And then the second
5 question would be, the eight percent that we left at
6 the -- I believe it's minus eight percent over in the
7 SECA, was there a reason why we did not complete that
8 from the population that we added out of San Diego?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we just took it from San
10 Diego.

11 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. Not this area. The area
12 we left in SECA, it's a negative, negative eight --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

14 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- percent.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

16 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. So was there was
17 reason why we didn't get it within the proper deviation
18 by adding a little bit more of the population in San
19 Diego?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, the bulk of that came from
21 this area that we're working on right now. So you're
22 saying, should we reduce this area that we're working on
23 right now?

24 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: The discussion earlier, as

1 Commissioner Fernandez brought up, is we're going to be
2 needing to look in the Coachella Valley to replace that
3 population.

4 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Never mind.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Andersen, we
6 looked in San Diego, but it was breaking up too many
7 COIs, and so we thought we would look in Coachella
8 Valley. If that doesn't work, then we would go back to
9 San Diego, but there's a lot of COIs that we had put
10 together in San Diego before that would be split.

11 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

13 Commissioner Fernandez?

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I see were
15 Commissioner Andersen was going with that and that kind
16 of makes sense to move that extra, you know, three or
17 four percent to get it into the right percentage.
18 Because if you do this other move, then you're going to
19 have a population going into -- crossing over two
20 counties or something like that. Anyway, I usually
21 prefer to try to stay within the county and minimize
22 those county breaks, but everyone's different.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I mean, this the SECA
24 district has portions of four counties, so we're just
25 moving the lines in, you know, perhaps two of those four

1 counties. Because one of the counties is whole and will
2 always be whole in this district.

3 Commissioner Sadhwani?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. Two
5 things. So first, was just a clarifying question. Are
6 we putting Borrego Springs in to SECA; is that what's
7 happening?

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. The idea is to put Borrego
9 Springs in MCV.

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So I just wanted to
11 suggest that perhaps we pause, and I wanted to just have
12 a lesson learned from Congress. When we approached
13 Congress, we, you know, we came from San Diego up and
14 then we kind of felt like, ah, we've done all this great
15 work and we don't want to have to shift all these
16 populations around. But as we were trying to
17 contemplate, you know, our VRA districts, we ended up
18 feeling kind of stuck, right? And we kind of kept coming
19 back to Long Beach, and what can we do there? In many
20 ways, but it didn't leave open and flexible other places
21 where population can go.

22 And so I just want to be conscious of that before we
23 kind of get wedded to the idea of keeping the COI of
24 Borrego Springs with Anza, which I'm not opposed to by
25 any means. But we have a lot of VRA obligations that

1 aren't sorted out yet northern in the map, including in
2 Riverside, as well as population that needs to come down
3 from the map. And so I'm just -- I just want to be a
4 little cautious here that we don't trap ourselves in and
5 wind up in a similar problem.

6 I know that we've talked about, in general, that
7 we're going to try to localize those changes to the VRA
8 districts. But at the end of the day, I would prefer if
9 we can, you know, even if we do this change now, just
10 remember that we can always go back and change it as
11 opposed to getting locked in, because --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure.

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- I think that would be my
14 only concern. Because I feel like that happened to us in
15 Congress, and I wouldn't want it to happen again.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We could certainly undo it.
19 I'm looking at it also as if we get MCV closer to zero,
20 then that gives us more flexibility on the other side of
21 MCV, if we want to, you know, expand that deviation.

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Any further comment?

24 Okay. Sivan, go ahead and do this, please. And it
25 is we are into break time, so we will break and come back

1 at 6:30 to again taking public comment.

2 MS. TRATT: Chair, before we go to break --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

4 MS. TRATT: -- would you be able to just let me
5 know, should I leave this area for now or because I
6 already have a lot of requests in the Inland Empire as
7 well from what you worked on today with Jaime? I just
8 want to make sure we're leaving things in a place where
9 Commissioners feel comfortable for leaving.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: I would be comfortable leaving this
11 unassigned for now, understanding that if we need to pull
12 it up through MCV, we could. If we need to pull it up
13 through Orange County, we could. Other thoughts on that?

14 Commissioner Sinay?

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I mean, I think we can do that,
16 or we can assign it to SD, Poway, Escondido, and then we
17 have, you know, as we need to pull it up for other areas.
18 We don't want to be worried that we have an extra
19 district, you know, unassigned stuff.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm just -- I'm seeing that
21 currently it borders two different districts to the
22 north, and if we move it into SD-POW-ESC, it only borders
23 one district to the north. It does border the coastal
24 district as well, but I would be fine leaving it
25 unassigned for now.

1 Okay. Thank you, everyone. 6:30.

2 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:19 p.m.
3 until 6:29 p.m.)

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for bearing
5 with us through our mandatory break for our staff. We
6 want to welcome you to this evening's public comment
7 segment of today's meeting of the California Citizens
8 Redistricting Commission. And with that, I will turn it
9 over to Katy, our comment moderator. Thank you, Katy.

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.
11 This evening we will be doing a minute and thirty seconds
12 for public comment with verbal warnings at thirty seconds
13 and fifteen seconds remaining.

14 I will be identifying you by the last four digits of
15 your telephone number. Please be alert in the queue for
16 when you hear those last four digits of your telephone
17 number.

18 We will begin with caller 0983. And up next after
19 that will be caller 2931.

20 Caller 0983, please follow the prompts. And one
21 more time, caller with the last four digits 0983, if
22 you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
23 star six. I do apologize, caller 0983, for some type of
24 connectivity issue for you. I will come back to you
25 momentarily.

1 Right now we have caller 2931. And up next after
2 that will be caller 4521.

3 Caller 2931, please follow the prompts to unmute.
4 The floor is yours.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello. The floor is
7 yours.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you hear me?

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Hello, Commissioner.

11 Thank you for all your hard work you have done. I am
12 asking you to look at the Little Saigon Assembly district
13 again. We are almost there. During the pandemic, I lost
14 my job and I did not know what to do. And I was able to
15 contact my assembler who can speak Vietnamese and have
16 staff who have -- who can speak Vietnamese to help me.

17 This is why it is important for the Vietnamese
18 community to have a true representative who understand
19 our needs, our culture, and our history. Adding on not
20 Garfield in Huntington Beach stop at the (indiscernible)
21 Street is the right move to make sure Little Saigon has
22 two representatives with more (indiscernible), because we
23 don't have anything in common with them. We need
24 assembler who can help our community, especially our
25 unique culture. Thank you. Have a good night.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
2 right now we have caller 4521. And up next after that
3 will be caller 7716.

4 Caller 4521, please follow the prompts. The floor
5 is yours.

6 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. This is Deborah
7 (ph.) with the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and we would
8 like to strongly encourage you to please keep Rancho
9 Cucamonga whole, and do not split the city of Rancho
10 Cucamonga into multiple districts. Rancho Cucamonga has
11 a strong sense of identity and has historically been
12 mostly in all one Senate, Assembly, or Congressional
13 district.

14 The proposed maps unnecessarily split our community
15 into two Assembly districts, two Senate districts, and
16 even three congressional districts, which separate our
17 neighborhoods and diminishing our community power and
18 opportunity for strong representation. We do appreciate
19 the time you spent today working on this area, and we
20 look forward to some positive changes. Thank you so
21 much.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
23 right now we have caller 7716. And up next after that
24 will be caller 7860.

25 Caller 7716, please follow the prompts. The floor

1 is yours.

2 MR. BRYAN: Yeah. My name is Floyd Bryan, F-L-O-Y-D
3 B-R-Y-A-N. I'm the president of the International
4 Longshore and Warehouse Union, Southern California
5 District Council. And this is addressing San Pedro. We
6 feel it would be beneficial to match AD 65 line with SSB
7 (ph.) 35 and CD 44 line along the west boundary of
8 Western Avenue to make San Pedro whole. San Pedro is
9 part of Los Angeles and all of our services and schools
10 are with Los Angeles. Moving half of San Pedro into
11 Assembly district with Palos Verdes would be a disservice
12 to both.

13 San Pedro tends toward a blue-collar area. While
14 Palos Verdes tends towards the white-collar population.
15 And we in San Pedro have very different issues being part
16 of the LA Harbor. Thank you.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
18 right now we have caller 7860. And up next after that
19 will be caller 8224.

20 Caller 7860, please follow the prompts. Caller
21 7860, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
22 star six. I do apologize, caller 7860, you appear to
23 have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I
24 will come back to you.

25 And right now, we have caller 8224. Please follow

1 the prompts. The floor is yours.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Do you hear me?
3 Hello?

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we do.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Hello, Commissioner.
6 Hello. Okay. Hello, Commissioner. I called yesterday
7 and will continue to call to make sure that my comment is
8 heard, because it's very important to me and our
9 community. Yesterday, I heard that the Commission talk
10 about add Huntington Beach to Little Saigon for the
11 congressional map, which is a right suggestion. And a
12 lot of the comments yesterday saying the Commission for
13 considering.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
15 right now we have caller 9517. And up next after that
16 will be caller 2044.

17 Caller 9517, please follow the prompts to unmute.
18 The floor is yours.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Good evening,
20 Commissioner. A month I have heard my Vietnamese-
21 American communities in Little Saigon calling in and
22 making that populist command asking you to keep
23 Huntington Beach with Little Saigon. Today, I would like
24 to share with the Commission again why should be with
25 Little Saigon.

1 Here are the facts again. Vietnamese number one
2 language other than English spoken in Huntington Beaches
3 like Westminster and Fountain Valley. The largest
4 minority group in Huntington Beach are Asian Americans.
5 Our young programs, like the Boys and Girls Club or Young
6 Sports, are in Huntington Beach, Westminster, and
7 Fountain Valley. For the Assembly, PTW include the
8 Inland Pack of Huntington Beach, which is all north of
9 Garfield together with Little Saigon. The congressional
10 and Senate, please include all Huntington Beach.

11 By doing this, the Commission will allow the Little
12 Saigon to continue to grow and have a voice and more
13 importantly --

14 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- everyone -- but --
16 everyone that can understand us to represent us at
17 different government level. Thank you very much. Have a
18 nice day.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
20 right now we have caller 2044. And up next after that
21 will be caller 3700.

22 Caller 2044, please follow the prompts. The floor
23 is yours.

24 MS. MCKENZIE: Hello. This is Charlotte McKenzie.
25 I'm a board member with the Citizens University Committee

1 at the University of California Riverside. And I'm
2 calling to urge the Commission to please adjust the
3 California State Assembly district boundaries that
4 encompass the California Riverside UCR campus located at
5 900 University Avenue. In the current map, we're
6 associated with southwest Riverside, which splits the
7 campus from the Greater Riverside area and the City of
8 Riverside.

9 The city and UCR actively partner on various
10 initiatives, including significant innovation and
11 economic development, a UCR arts block, which is in
12 downtown Riverside in a different district. And we would
13 like to encourage you to consider readjusting that
14 boundary, so that the campus can remain contiguous with
15 the City of Riverside for continuity of representation --

16 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

17 MS. MCKENZIE: -- and also to maintain its
18 longstanding partnership with the City of Riverside on
19 housing, infrastructure, economic and workforce
20 development. It's imperative that UC Riverside be added
21 to the AD58 JRC map, so that we can continue to be --

22 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

23 MS. MCKENZIE: -- in the same district and get safe
24 representation. Thank you.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And

1 right now we have caller 3700. And up next after that
2 will be caller 5777.

3 Caller 3700, please follow the prompts. The floor
4 is yours.

5 MS. WILSON: Hi. My name is Betty Wilson (ph.).
6 I'm calling in for our coalition partners, Don't Ask San
7 Joaquin County. I am sure you have received the numerous
8 emails and letters regarding the most recent iterations
9 for the congressional district changes. Our county is
10 probably one of the most diverse in the state, and we
11 have worked hard over the years to build partnerships and
12 relationships with public, private, and nonprofit groups
13 to tackle our issues. Please allow us the chance to
14 continue this progress.

15 Please consider draft maps dated 11/10 or the
16 congressional map FY2 SSAC San Joaquin. Do not
17 surgically split our communities. I would respectfully
18 request review of submitted maps 1006 202 1112, 1006 202
19 1123, 1007 202 1124 also. Thank you for all your hard
20 work and dedication to this very important project.
21 Thank you so much.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
23 right now we have caller 5777. And up next after that
24 will be caller 7087.

25 Caller 5777, please follow the prompts. The floor

1 is yours.

2 MS. HUANG: Thank you. Hello, Commissioners. Thank
3 you for all the hard work that you are doing right now.
4 And this is Tina Huang (ph.), and I'm calling from
5 Huntington Beach. There were comments made yesterday
6 that somehow the calls coming in from Little Saigon are
7 new, which is not true. I have been calling almost
8 weekly, making comments online, so I'm not sure how you
9 can state that our comments are new. We have been asking
10 for the same things for months, which was to add north of
11 Huntington Beach to Little Saigon, which means at all of
12 north of Garfield and remove Stanton and east of Garden
13 Grove. This is what we -- what will reflect the true
14 grid reader, Little Saigon district. I hope you would
15 consider revisiting the Assembly and congressional maps
16 and move all of Huntington Beach or the inland of
17 Huntington Beach, which is all north of Garfield Street
18 to Little Saigon districts, whichever works for us since
19 we understand the population difference. Thank you for
20 your time, and have a great night.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
22 right now we have caller 7087. And up next after that
23 will be caller 3108.

24 Caller 7087, please follow the prompts. The floor
25 is yours.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
2 Tonight I wanted to come on here and tell you that as a
3 resident of the High Desert, I'm incredibly offended that
4 you keep ignoring our requests to not be grouped to Los
5 Angeles County. We've been respectfully asking this for
6 weeks now, but it continues to be ignored. Only one
7 small highway connects us in the Antelope Valley, the
8 community that you're currently trying to group us with.

9 And we also have nothing in common with Antelope
10 Valley as a community. And we're asking that you would
11 keep our community with San Bernardino County so that San
12 Bernardino County in the High Desert can be grouped
13 together. Thank you so much.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
15 right now we have caller 3108. And up next after that
16 will be caller 3995.

17 Caller 3108, please follow the prompts. The floor
18 is yours.

19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. This is Karina
20 (ph.) with Planned Parenthood Mar Monte. And I would
21 like to comment on the redistricting of Stanislaus and
22 Merced County, and share my concerns about how the
23 community will be impacted. I would like to comment on,
24 please keep Stanislaus and Merced part of the Central
25 Valley and reject your draft maps, which pull us out of

1 the Valley and into the sea areas.

2 We note that we have different social and economic
3 interests for everything from water to roads. We're just
4 not the same places. By combining in the same district,
5 you're doing harm to both. As you know, Stanislaus is
6 the fourteenth largest county in the state and half is
7 interested vetted in the draft Senate map.

8 The Valley fought hard for decades to get its first
9 UC campus. There's no excuse for UC Merced not to be in
10 hundred percent Valley district. You can draw your
11 Voting Rights Act districts to the South and we'll
12 respect counties in the north, but not at the expense
13 of --

14 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- drawing hundreds of
16 thousands of Valley residents into districts that make no
17 sense. Please do a better job of balancing the competing
18 concerns and stand up for the unique place that is the
19 Central Valley. Thank you so much.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
21 right now we have caller 3995. And up next after that
22 will be caller 7331.

23 Caller 3995, please follow the prompts. The floor
24 is yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

1 I'm calling from the High Desert to express my
2 disappointment with the decision to group the High Desert
3 with Los Angeles County. Yesterday, I was thanking you
4 for hearing our requests when it came to keeping the High
5 Desert together. So it's a little upsetting having to
6 make this call today.

7 We keep trying to tell you that when we get grouped
8 with Los Angeles County, High Desert residents are
9 disenfranchised. That's the current path we are headed
10 down, another decade of disenfranchisement. And
11 honestly, that's just inequitable. There's no
12 commonality between us and any part of Los Angeles
13 County, even the Antelope Valley.

14 I don't know how many more of our working class
15 residents have to call into these meetings, as they're
16 getting off work to make the point to the Commission, we
17 don't want to be grouped with Los Angeles County. Your
18 drafts were fine the way they were. Just consider going
19 back to those. Thank you.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
21 right now we have caller 7331. And up next after that
22 will be caller 9747.

23 Caller 7331, please follow the prompts. The floor
24 is yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.

1 My name is Aaron (ph.). I've called before, and I thank
2 you again for your hard work to keep communities
3 together. I would like to echo some of the other callers
4 and to draw the Commissioners' attention to the very last
5 big thing that the Commission did just before closing the
6 congressional maps and adjourning for dinner on Monday.
7 And that was the important act of including Sylmar in the
8 San Fernando Valley VRA district. This is good work.
9 Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for pushing for this.
10 Unfortunately, the Commission was tight for time at that
11 point, and the way that it happened ended up trading
12 Granada Hills and Porter Ranch out of the San Fernando
13 Valley without the Commission discussing it.

14 You do have any time to consider how Granada Hills
15 and Porter Ranch and Sylmar could all stay in the valley,
16 I hope that you will look at the suggestion made by
17 Stuart Waldman and VICA. In VICA's proposal, the
18 equestrian foothills community of Sunland and Tujunga is
19 taken out of the current district with West Hollywood,
20 which makes sense anyway, and it groups them together
21 with other semirural areas, like Acton and Littlerock in
22 the Antelope Valley, which are far closer anyway.

23 This allows Granada Hills and Porter Ranch to go
24 back to the Valley, which makes sense because they should
25 be with Chatsworth and West Hills and the other areas

1 affected by the Aliso Canyon gas leak. And it keeps
2 North Hollywood and Toluca Lake together.

3 If you can spare a minute over the next few days --

4 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- please try to go back
6 to the very last thing you did in Monday's rush to
7 finish. And thanks for your time.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now, we have caller 9747, and up next
10 after that is caller 7832.

11 Caller 9747, please follow the prompts.

12 The floor is yours.

13 MR. ROJO: Good evening. My name is Sylvester Rojo
14 (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut Park, and I
15 live here for over thirty-five years. We have a united
16 community between Walnut Park and Huntington Park and
17 Florence and Graham, as we would like to keep it as such
18 in order to continue our advocacy. That priorities
19 for -- for our communities, as we have state, political,
20 and social (indiscernible). We would like to map cleanup
21 and keeping Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington
22 Park, even if it's only part of Huntington Park, together
23 in the 110LA map.

24 I'd ask you to be very minimal to keep Walnut Park
25 and Florence-Graham together in our next Assembly map, as

1 this will be the only way to our residents of an
2 incorporated area of the Los Angeles County will have the
3 opportunity of having a voice in the Assembly.

4 Please move Walnut Park to the 110 map and make the
5 110 -- the 10 freeway the northern border of the map.
6 Thank you.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

8 And right now, we have caller 7832, and up next
9 after that will be caller 5944. Wait. Hold on. Where
10 did caller 7832 go?

11 All right. Well. Right now, we have caller 5944.
12 And up next after that will be caller 2648.

13 Caller 5944, please follow the prompts.

14 The floor is yours.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. I'm
16 asking that the Commission not move forward with its
17 congressional maps in Antelope Valley and Kern County,
18 which split tens of thousands of federal workers and
19 contractors into three different congressional districts.

20 Edwards Air Force Base and Plant 42 are part of the
21 same military base and collectively make up the second-
22 largest employer in Antelope Valley and East Kern.
23 Unlike many other communities of interest, Congress has
24 direct control over the funding and continued existence
25 of these military sites. And chopping them and their

1 huge workforce into three different federal districts
2 dramatically reduces their influence at the beginning of
3 a decade that will surely see another round of base
4 realignments and closures.

5 Combine California City, Mojave, Rosamond, Lancaster
6 and Palmdale into a single district, preferably with Kern
7 County, and keep these -- you know, keep this workforce
8 united. Refusing to make changes to the Antelope Valley
9 district is an artificial constraint that you are placing
10 on yourself at the --

11 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- expense of a very large
13 federal workforce. Please take a closer look at Plant 42
14 and Edwards Air Force Base and the large employment force
15 there. Thank you.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now, we have caller 2648. And up next
18 after that will be caller 6059.

19 Caller 2648, please follow the prompts.

20 And one more time, caller --

21 MS. MENDOZA: Hello.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: [Oop], there you are.

23 The floor is yours.

24 MS. MENDOZA: Good evening. My name is Alexandra
25 Mendoza (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut Park

1 and have lived here for over thirty-four years. We have
2 a united community between Walnut Park, Huntington Park,
3 and Florence-Graham. As we would like to keep it as such
4 in order to continue our advocacy and priorities for our
5 community. As we have some -- as some of the same
6 political and social challenges, we would like to request
7 cleaning -- cleanup by keeping up Florence-Graham, Walnut
8 Park, and Huntington Park, even if it's only part of
9 Huntington Park, together in the 110LA map.

10 I ask you to please, at the very minimum, keep
11 Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together in our next
12 Assembly map, as this will be the only way that Florence-
13 Graham residents of unincorporated areas in Los Angeles
14 County will have the opportunity of having a voice in the
15 Assembly. Please move Walnut Park to the 110LA map and
16 make the 10 freeway the northern border of the map.

17 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

18 MS. MENDOZA: Thank you.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 6059, and up next
21 after that is caller 0452.

22 Caller 6059, please follow the prompts.

23 And one more time, caller with the last four digits
24 6059, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
25 star 6. The floor is yours.



1 Caller 6059, please double check your telephone.

2 MR. LOMAS: Hello.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you are. The floor
4 is yours.

5 MR. LOMAS: Good evening. My name is Alfred Lomas
6 (ph.). I live in the community of Florence-Firestone,
7 and I'm calling in regards to the state Assembly 110LA
8 map. We have always been connected with Florence-Graham
9 community, otherwise known as Florence-Firestone.

10 And we both -- we are both unincorporated
11 communities next to each other, represented by the County
12 of Los Angeles. Our Walnut Park residents have worked
13 with Florence-Graham community on multiple social issues,
14 as we are side by side and both share similar challenges.

15 Separating the Walnut Park and Florence-Graham would
16 be a complete injustice. And does that benefit our
17 residents? We need to be with Florence-Firestone in
18 order to give us the opportunity to have a voice and a
19 fighting chance. Please move us into the 110LA map, and
20 make the one -- make the 10 freeway an northern border of
21 the map. Thank you for your time and consideration in
22 this minor change to the state Assembly 110LA map.

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you so much.
24 And right now, we have caller 0452. And up next after
25 that will be caller 4599.

1 Caller 0452, please follow the prompts.

2 The floor is yours.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, and thank you so
4 much for your hard work, Commissioners. You guys should
5 be really proud. My name is Craig (ph.), and I'm just
6 calling to agree with Stuart Waldman and VICA.

7 You know, Sunland and Tujunga don't really belong
8 together with West Hollywood in a congressional district.
9 Sunland and Tujunga is a great place for filming
10 Westerns, and they would be happy with other semirural,
11 horseback riding communities closer to them than being
12 kind of dragged down towards West Hollywood.

13 You know, the VICA proposal is to keep Sylmar in the
14 San Fernando Valley VRA district. Keep Granada Hills and
15 Porter Ranch in the San Fernando Valley. You know, it
16 also keeps Toluca Lake and North Hollywood together, and
17 connects Sunland-Tujunga with their neighbors in Antelope
18 Valley, rather than West Hollywood as it is now. You
19 know, thank you again for your hard work. You guys have
20 been doing great. Really appreciate it.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
22 right now, we have caller 4599. And up next after that
23 will be caller 4175. Caller 4599, please follow the
24 prompts to unmute.

25 The floor is yours.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name
2 is Jesse (ph.). I lived in Florence-Graham, and I live
3 here for forty-three years. I'm calling regarding the
4 state Assembly 110LA draft map. I am here to ask for
5 help in a minor cleanup.

6 We ask for you to also place the next-door neighbors
7 from incorporated Walnut Park into the same 110LA map and
8 use -- and make the 10 freeway a northern border of the
9 map. It is a courtous (sic) to have Walnut Park and
10 Florence-Graham together in the same map, as splitting
11 the incorporated islands will only diminish our voices
12 and efforts that we have fought so hard together for over
13 thirty years.

14 We have united communities between Walnut Park,
15 Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham that we would like
16 to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy and
17 priorities for our communities, as we have the same
18 political and social challenges.

19 I understand that Huntington Park cannot be the same
20 map due to the population. However --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- with a minor change
23 of moving Walnut Park into the 110LA map, it would help
24 our incorporated communities of Walnut Park and Florence-
25 Graham to have a fighting chance in having a voice in

1 Sacramento. Thank you.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 And right now we have caller 4175. And up next
4 after that will be caller 0504.

5 Caller 4175, please follow the prompts.

6 The floor is yours.

7 Caller 4175, if you will please double check your
8 telephone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are
9 unmuted in the meeting.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. Sorry about that.
13 I was muted.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It's okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. So thank you for
16 all your hard work, Commissioners. When the Commission
17 looks at Assembly maps again, I want to once again ask,
18 please draw two majority Latino districts in the San
19 Fernando Valley. Multiple organizations have submitted
20 maps showing this is possible, and even the Commission
21 itself proved it in one iteration. Please protect the
22 Latino vote in the San Fernando Valley, draw two majority
23 Latino Assembly seats, and a majority Latino Senate seat.

24 I've heard legal counsel say that you don't have a
25 legal obligation to do so, but you do have a moral

1 obligation to protect the rights of Latino voters. And I
2 ask you to draw these lines that give Latinos in the San
3 Fernando Valley the ability to choose the candidates of
4 our choice. Thank you so much for this opportunity to
5 speak tonight.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now, we have caller 0504. And up next
8 after that will be caller 6198.

9 Caller 0504, please follow the prompts.

10 The floor is yours.

11 MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: Well, good afternoon,
12 Commissioners. This is Lula Davis-Holmes. I'm the mayor
13 for the great City of Carson. And I'm just calling to
14 express my disappointment that you have split my
15 beautiful city and given us two -- into two districts, 65
16 and 69. That is unacceptable. We are one city, one
17 community, and with a common goal.

18 I'm asking that you reconsider the decision to split
19 my city in half, north versus the south. That's
20 unacceptable. The communities that we have like
21 commonalities in, we'd like to stay in that district.
22 There are many items that we fight for, and to split us
23 in half would be -- it just would tear our city apart.

24 So I'm asking you to reconsider splitting our city.
25 We need to have one voice from our Assemblymen, and we're

1 asking that we stay in Council District 65. Would you
2 please reconsider splitting us from -- into two Assembly
3 districts, 65 and 69. As the mayor of the City of
4 Carson, I speak for the 96,000 residents here, and we are
5 appalled at the fact --

6 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

7 MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: -- that you are talking about
8 splitting our city into two separate Assembly districts.
9 Please reconsider your thoughts and revisit the map --

10 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

11 MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: -- and put us in one district.
12 Thank you very much. Mayor Lula Davis-Holmes, from the
13 great City of Carson. Thank you.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

15 And right now, we have caller 6198. And up next
16 after that will be caller 8487.

17 Caller 6198, please follow the prompts.

18 And one more time, caller with the last four
19 digits -- [oop], there you are. The --

20 MS. TOMAYO: Hello.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- floor is yours.

22 MS. TOMAYO: Hi, good afternoon, my name is Sandra
23 Tomayo (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham. I have lived
24 here for forty years. I am calling regarding the state
25 Assembly 110LA draft map. Thank you for your

1 consideration in trying to keep our communities of Walnut
2 Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham together.

3 As it doesn't appear that this was possible, we are
4 here to ask for a minor change. Please move the
5 unincorporated Walnut Park area into the 110LA map to be
6 with Florence-Graham and make the 10 freeway the northern
7 border of the map.

8 Both our areas are unincorporated parts of Los
9 Angeles County, and we need to stay together. We are
10 asking for a small alteration to this map in order to
11 truly have an opportunity for our hardworking families to
12 elect a candidate of our choice. Thank you very much.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

14 And right now, we have caller 8487. And up next
15 after that is caller 6625.

16 Caller 8487, please follow the prompts to unmute.

17 The floor is yours.

18 MS. FUJII: Hi. My name is Mary Fujii (ph.), and
19 I'm the Irvine resident for thirty-one years and
20 counting. Since 1990, I have watched Irvine become the
21 fastest growing city in Orange County, and there are many
22 reasons why: schools, good city-wide services, and a
23 master plan that continues to guide our growth for the
24 entire city.

25 As our city celebrates its fiftieth anniversary, I

1 am distressed to see a final -- a recent draft of our
2 state Senate's district boundaries, which has split our
3 city at the 405 freeway into two districts. This goes
4 against logic and reasoning and doesn't ensure all of
5 Irvine, like me, are fairly represented by one
6 representative.

7 Irvine is a cohesive city in which the entire
8 community has shared common interests. We are all served
9 by Irvine Unified Schools, the Irvine Police Department
10 and the Irvine City Council. Also, several of Irvine's
11 schools are not neighborhood schools that are open to the
12 entire city, such as Vista Verde school, which enroll
13 students from all parts of the city. And in fact, my son
14 and daughter attended that school --

15 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

16 MS. FUJII: -- and we've made life-long connections
17 with others throughout the city. Also, as a Japanese-
18 American and a member of Irvine's cohesive and growing
19 Asian-American community, I have long shared common
20 interests and concerns with other Asian-Americans in
21 Irvine, as well as Tustin.

22 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

23 MS. FUJII: Splitting our state Senate district
24 would also splinter our cohesive Asian-American community
25 in Irvine and Tustin, and I hope that you will keep

1 Irvine and Tustin whole under one state Senate district.

2 Thank you so much.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 And right now, we have caller 6625. And up next
5 after that is caller 7175.

6 Caller 6625, please follow the prompts.

7 And one more time, caller with the last four digits
8 6625, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
9 star 6.

10 Caller 6625, I do apologize. You appear to have
11 some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I have
12 you marked for a retry, and I will come back around.

13 Right now, we have caller 7175. And up next after
14 that will be caller 9048.

15 Caller 7175, please follow the prompts.

16 The floor is yours.

17 MR. PAYNE: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioner.

18 This is Jeremy Payne on behalf of Equality California. I
19 am calling about the LGBTQ+ COI in the Coachella Valley.

20 Unfortunately, some of the shifts in the Inland Empire
21 today resulted in an overpopulated district that pairs

22 most of the high desert and mountain communities in San

23 Bernardino County with the Coachella Valley and Riverside

24 County, with another part of the Coachella Valley in the

25 SECA district.

1 As the Commission works with the (indiscernible)
2 about population between SBRC and MCV, we would ask that
3 you please unite as much of the Coachella Valley as
4 possible and Riverside County-based district separate
5 from the Victor Valley high desert and mountain
6 communities of San Bernardino County.

7 This would be consistent with the overwhelming COI
8 testimony that you received from Coachella Valley
9 residents who want to be kept together as much as
10 possible, and Victor Valley, Lake Arrowhead, and Yucaipa
11 residents who want to be kept together in a separate San
12 Bernardino district.

13 With the remainder of my time, I'd like to talk
14 about Los Angeles, specifically the West Hollywood and
15 Hollywood region.

16 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

17 MR. PAYNE: We heard Commissioner Sadhwani talk
18 about potentially moving West Hollywood and the NELA
19 district to the shoreline coastal district. That -- we
20 would be okay with that but would urge the Commission to
21 move the entire LGBTQ+ COI together, not just the City of
22 West Hollywood. So if you do need to make a move of West
23 Hollywood into shoreline, please also move Hollywood with
24 it.

25 Overall, the drafts and the plans kept much of the

1 LGBTQ+ COI from the state together, and as the Commission
2 makes adjustments this week, we'll just ask that you not
3 inadvertently separate LGBTQ+ COI.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 9612, and up next
6 after that is caller 5967.

7 Caller 9612, please follow the prompts.

8 The floor is yours.

9 MS. AVENDANO: Hi. Can you hear me?

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

11 MS. AVENDANO: Thank you. Hello, Commission
12 members. Thank you for all the work that you're doing.
13 My name is Paola Avendano. I am an alumni from UC
14 Riverside and a current staff member. I'm making a
15 public comment to urge you to address the Assembly
16 district boundaries that encompass the UC Riverside
17 campus located at 900 University Avenue.

18 In the current map iteration from December the 8th,
19 it does propose UCR to be part of AD 63, SWRIV, and it
20 splits the campus from the greater Riverside area. I
21 think it's important to keep the campus and the greater
22 Riverside area intact because of how much the area has
23 thrived over the years. I remember being a student and
24 visiting the downtown area frequently to work at the UCR
25 ARTSblock, and I enjoyed what it offered in terms of

1 nightlife and all the great --

2 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

3 MS. AVENDANO: -- places.

4 Even now as a staff member, I can rightfully say
5 that the UCR community is excited to see what will come
6 about from the recent (indiscernible) partnership and the
7 city's innovation district. So the city --

8 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

9 MS. AVENDANO: -- and the university constantly
10 advocate together at the state level for projects that
11 benefit the region. So keeping their representation in
12 tact is imperative. For this reason, I respectfully ask
13 that UC Riverside is added to the AD 58, JRC map.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

15 And right now, we have caller 5967, and up next
16 after that is caller 9736.

17 Caller 5967, please follow the prompts.

18 And one more time, caller with the last four digits
19 5967, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
20 star 6.

21 The floor is yours.

22 MR. VIENNESE: Hi. My name is Fabian Viennese
23 (ph.), and I'm calling on behalf of the city of Rancho
24 Cucamonga, and I am urging the Commission to reconsider
25 the latest iterations of the congressional, the State

1 Senate, and the Assembly maps.

2 For the congressional map, the City of Rancho
3 Cucamonga is currently split into three separate
4 districts. A city the size of Rancho Cucamonga should
5 not be in three separate districts. In one of the
6 districts, a good chunk of the city is in a district that
7 has over half a dozen LA County cities, going as far as
8 Pasadena and La Canada Flintridge, and these are
9 communities that we have no common interests with.

10 The State Senate map has a good chunk of Rancho
11 Cucamonga in with the high desert all the way up to the
12 Nevada state line. And these are rural communities that
13 have a very different character and interests as --

14 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

15 MR. VIENNESE: -- the City of Rancho Cucamonga. So
16 I urge the Commission to please reconsider the maps and
17 keep Rancho Cucamonga whole. Thank you very much.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

19 And right now, we have caller 9736. And up next
20 after that will be caller 5038.

21 Caller 9736, please follow the prompts.

22 The floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
24 I'm calling from San Bernardino County's High Desert, and
25 I asked you not to put us in a district of Los Angeles

1 County. When we are grouped as Los Angeles County, the
2 concerns of our residents are not heard.

3 Nothing about the Antelope and Victor Valley are
4 similar. They have different socioeconomic levels. They
5 do not have to deal with the issues of rural
6 transportation. And a district like this isn't even
7 functionally contiguous.

8 Please keep us out of the Antelope Valley, but most
9 importantly, keep us out of any part of Los Angeles
10 County. Thank you.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we have caller --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- 5038. And up next
15 after that will be caller 6675.

16 Caller 5038, please follow the prompts to unmute.

17 The floor is yours.

18 Caller 5038, if you will please double check your
19 phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted
20 in the meeting.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I want to thank the
22 Commission for their hard work and thoughtful
23 consideration of public input in Los Angeles and the San
24 Fernando Valley. However, I and others strongly feel you
25 are not giving San Fernando Valley Latinos a fair chance

1 to elect candidates of our choice.

2 There are more than enough Latinos in the San
3 Fernando Valley to draw two Latino voting rights
4 districts, and I think you are morally and legally
5 obligated to give our community that representation. I
6 know you have a tough task trying to create districts
7 that represent the diversity of our state. But please,
8 Commissioners, take the time to create a second Latino
9 Voting Rights Act Assembly seat in the San Fernando
10 Valley. We all urge you. Thank you so much, and have a
11 nice evening.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 6675, and up next
14 after that will be caller 4809.

15 Caller 6675, please follow the prompts.

16 MS. ABRAHAM: Can you hear me now?

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor
18 is yours.

19 MS. ABRAHAM: Oh, wonderful. Thank you. My name is
20 Theresa Abraham (ph.). I live in -- this -- in
21 Stanislaus County. And I was born and raised here in
22 Turlock. And Modesto is our county seat. And I see that
23 on -- on some of the maps where the redistricting is
24 being done is the west part of Turlock, and even the west
25 part of Modesto, are in an -- another part -- a different

1 district.

2 I would very much encourage you to keep this
3 district together in one district so that the cities of
4 Turlock and Modesto are not divided in this way. We have
5 a great deal in common together in our community, and I'd
6 like to see the community maintained together.

7 And I'm glad you'll be looking at the VRA
8 congressional --

9 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

10 MS. ABRAHAM: -- maps. And it seems like you could
11 get two really effective Latino seats in the Valley
12 instead of trying to do three and having them all not
13 perform. I'm not sure what is entailed by this idea of
14 an --

15 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

16 MS. ABRAHAM -- arm, but I'm curious to see how it
17 turns out. Either way, you need to make these seats
18 stronger. Please keep working and fix -- fix the
19 congressional VRA seat, please.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now, we have caller 4089. And up next
22 after that will be caller 5115.

23 Caller 4089, please follow the prompts.

24 It is. Sorry.

25 The floor is yours.

1 MS. THOMAS: Thanks. Good evening. Good evening,
2 Commissioners. Thank you for all of your hard work. My
3 name is Shauntay Thomas (ph.), and I'm calling regarding
4 the congressional maps. I live in Manteca, in San
5 Joaquin County.

6 I am worried that you are going to put us with Oak
7 Grove and possibly Sacramento. Those areas are
8 completely different from us here in San Joaquin County.
9 Putting the two together just isn't our area works, and
10 it would hurt everyone in both places. They would drown
11 out our ability to advocate for the transportation
12 infrastructure that we are in desperate need of, and I
13 just am requesting that you please do not pair us with
14 Sacramento. Thank you.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

16 And right now, we have caller 5115. And up next
17 after that is caller 0056.

18 Caller 5115, please follow the prompts.

19 The floor is yours.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I am
21 calling in regards to your recent proposal to split up
22 San Jose into four congressional districts. San Jose is
23 the tenth largest city in the entire United States, and
24 by drawing lines that prevent us from having a
25 representative that has the majority of San Jose

1 residents, you would effectively silence the priorities
2 and interests of our very large and very diverse
3 community of San Jose.

4 No other California city that makes that list is
5 split into four, and no other large Bay Area city is
6 split into four.

7 I implore you to reconsider splitting up San Jose
8 into four congressional districts and instead preserve
9 our current community of interests, which is our city of
10 San Jose. Thank you.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we have 0056. And up next after that
13 will be caller 8359.

14 Caller 0056, please follow the prompts.

15 The floor is yours.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. Good
17 evening. I'm calling from Yucaipa to thank you for the
18 map that you grouped us into. We're more than pleased to
19 be grouped with similar rural communities like Big Bear
20 and the High Desert. Yucaipa is still reeling from last
21 year's wildfires, especially my neighborhood. You could
22 see the flames from my home, and those same very real
23 wildfire concerns are also felt by Big Bear not too far
24 away.

25 So without similarity in mind, as well as others,

1 I'm sure, between our communities, we do appreciate you
2 hearing our case. So just thank you so much for the map
3 that you've added us to.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 8359. And up next
6 after that will be caller 5328.

7 Caller 8359, please follow the prompts.

8 The floor is yours.

9 MS. VILLALOBOS: Hello, good afternoon. My name is
10 Sofia Villalobos (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham and
11 have lived here for twenty-nine years. I am calling
12 regarding the state Assembly 110LA draft map. Thank you
13 for your consideration in trying to keep our communities
14 of Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham
15 together.

16 As it doesn't appear that this was possible, we are
17 here to ask for a minor change. Please move the
18 unincorporated Walnut Park area into the 110LA map to be
19 with Florence-Graham and make the 10 freeway the northern
20 border of the map. Both our areas are unincorporated
21 parts of Los Angeles County, and we need to stay
22 together.

23 We are asking for a small alteration to this map in
24 order to truly have an opportunity for our hardworking
25 families to elect a candidate for our choice. Thank you.

1 Have a great night.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 And right now, we have caller 5328, and up next
4 after that will be caller 2250.

5 Caller 5328, please follow the prompts.

6 The floor is yours.

7 MS. ROBERTS: Good evening. This is Gina Roberts.

8 I am secretary of the Valley Center Fire Protection
9 District, and I'm very interested in listening to all of
10 these other people complain about our comment about the
11 fact that the Commission has gone greatly out of their
12 way to break up communities and put rural areas --
13 combining them with -- with heavily urbanized areas,
14 which essentially disenfranchises places like Valley
15 Center.

16 For instance, in the Senate map that you now have
17 proposed, Valley Center is in the Senate district as
18 Mission Bay and Mira Mesa and all these areas which we
19 have absolutely nothing in common with, other than the
20 fact we're in San Diego County. And we're very rural,
21 they're very urbanized and very high density, and the
22 likelihood that a representative would be as interested
23 in representing --

24 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

25 MS. ROBERTS: -- a lower district or lower-density

1 areas is -- is unacceptable.

2 So basically, my point is, is listen to all these
3 people that are commenting about dividing up communities.
4 Valley Center should be in a --

5 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

6 MS. ROBERTS: -- in eastern San Diego County, North
7 County -- or -- community of interest. And right now
8 it's grouped in the San Diego city. I appreciate it.
9 You guys are working hard, and I understand that. Make
10 sure you're all looking excited to hear about --

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we have caller 2250. And up next
13 after that is caller 9399.

14 Caller 2250, please follow the prompts.

15 And one more time, caller with the last four digits
16 2250, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is
17 yours.

18 MS. SMITH-MCDONALD: Hi. Good evening,
19 Commissioners. Thank you for your hard work. I know
20 this is difficult work. My name is Michelle Smith-
21 McDonald (ph.). I am calling from Dublin, California, up
22 in the East Bay. I'm elected official on Zone 7 board in
23 addition to working for the Alameda County office of
24 education.

25 First, I want to say thank you very much for the

1 Senate map, which keeps our community of Dublin within
2 our Tri-Valley region with Pleasanton and Livermore. And
3 I really want to encourage you to leave that map as it
4 is. Senate map is a recognition that the Tri-Valley
5 regions, which shares critical resources such as water,
6 transportation, and workforces that serve, for example,
7 the Lawrence Livermore Lab, in addition to our school
8 systems that collaborate in a multitude of ways. We are
9 definitely a region that needs to be kept together, and
10 keeping consistent representation in this area is
11 critical.

12 It's disappointing, frankly, that the Assembly and
13 the congressional maps do not do that in that Dublin is
14 orphaned from its Tri-Valley neighbors and matched with
15 communities that are less contiguous and don't share
16 nearly as many common resources. But Dublin is one of
17 the fastest growing cities in the state, and --

18 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

19 MS. SMITH-MCDONALD: -- it must not be an
20 afterthought. So please leave the Senate map the way it
21 is. And thank you again for your hard work.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now, we have caller 9399. And up next
24 after that will be caller 1915.

25 Caller 9399, please follow the prompts.



1 The floor is yours.

2 Caller 9399, if you will please double check your
3 phone. Make sure you're not on mute. You are unmuted in
4 the meeting.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can you hear me now?

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Great. My name
8 is Fernando. I live up here in the High Desert, and I
9 want to applaud the Commission today for the direction
10 they've taken regarding this Mojave Desert area in trying
11 to keep it whole.

12 That great -- the original map that you have for
13 November 10th was more -- is more like what we were
14 looking for. I hope they're able stay with that.
15 (Indiscernible) and taking out the mountain region and
16 allowing the -- the High Desert to be near the
17 congressional district of CD 8 is what we're looking for,
18 and it would look more like -- like the Assembly
19 district.

20 Our Assembly district should be -- we can include
21 the communities like Victorville, Hesperia, Adelanto,
22 Apple Valley, (indiscernible), Phelan, Pinon Hills,
23 Barstow. That's the High Desert there. And I hope you
24 can take some polls --

25 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- that's what -- so
2 that's what we're looking for. Thank you very much for
3 the Latinos.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 1915. And up next
6 after that will be caller 9816.

7 Caller 1915, please follow the prompts.

8 The floor is yours.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I am a mother who has
10 lived and raised my kids in San Jose for thirty years. I
11 heard about this important issue from Solution Silicon
12 Valley (ph.). San Jose deserves to keep our voice in
13 Congress. We are the largest city in the Bay Area, and
14 we should keep at least one member of Congress who speaks
15 for us. No other major city in California is losing its
16 voice. Only San Jose. The is a loss that communities of
17 interest should be represented. And we are a community
18 of interest.

19 Please don't finalize a map that takes away the
20 voice of San Jose in Congress. Please don't split San
21 Jose into small parts of four different congressional
22 districts, which will make it much, much harder for us to
23 voice our concerns. We should maintain a district that
24 represents the majority of San Jose. We want San Jose to
25 keep its voice in Congress.

1 Please, I'm begging you as a mother, for the future
2 of our children, please keep San Jose as one community.
3 Thank you.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 9816. And up next
6 after that will be caller 6722.

7 Caller 9816, please follow the prompts.

8 The floor is yours.

9 MS. BABB: Hi, my name is Lauren Babb. I'm calling
10 on behalf of Planned Parenthood Mar Monte, and I'm a
11 resident of SD Placer ED. I can appreciate the hard work
12 needed to put these map together. Planned Parenthood Mar
13 Monte is concerned with the Placer County and El Dorado
14 County should not be drawn into deep Sacramento County.

15 I live and work in this area, and the health care
16 needs of an urban community is very different from a
17 rural community. Please respect the differences between
18 the Sacramento and the foothills. Planned Parenthood Mar
19 Monte represents marginalized communities that has
20 historically been left out of these conversations in
21 redistricting, which minimizes their voice and continues
22 to affect their communities.

23 Our concern is that the current Senate district map
24 takes away the voices of patients that support
25 reproductive health care, and to put them in a district

1 that lacks the urgency for prioritizing reproductive care
2 when it is needed the most. We hope you would consider
3 strongly the November 2nd map. Diversity in urban
4 communities, again, have very different health care needs
5 than the rural foothills communities.

6 Sacramento has very little in common with these
7 foothill communities and is severely at risk of --

8 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

9 MS. BABB: -- leaving representation. Thank you for
10 all your time, and hopefully you all have a great
11 evening. Please work hard, smart, and appreciate it.
12 Thank you.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
14 right now, we have caller 6722, and up next after that
15 will be caller 8724.

16 Caller 6722, please follow the prompts.

17 The floor is yours.

18 MS. JURALOPA: Hi, Commission. My name is Virginia
19 Juralopa (ph.). I am from the Central Valley, and I am
20 addressing the Senate draft for the Valley, specifically
21 SD_ECA for Merced and Modesto. As I'm following your
22 work since this summer, and I've called and written in
23 many times. On November 23rd, I submitted comment and a
24 topography 3D map for the Valley-Sierra region. It is
25 comment ID number 29074. Please look at my comment and

1 map. I also resubmitted today.

2 I grew up in Bakersfield, currently live in Fresno,
3 and attended UC Merced university, so I know and I love
4 the Valley. Merced and Modesto are Valley cities and
5 should not be in a big mountain district, like your
6 current Senate draft. Your draft also has UC Merced in
7 this big mountain district, and that is truly
8 disappointing.

9 The Central Valley fought so hard to get a UC
10 campus. UC Merced is a huge point of pride for us in the
11 Valley. UC Merced and Merced and Modesto must be in a
12 one hundred percent Valley --

13 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

14 MS. JURALOPA: -- district. These community share
15 culture, demographics, transportation, education, and
16 economy. I echo so many other public comments you have
17 heard about Merced and Modesto. Keep our Valley cities
18 and Valley districts. Do not put us in the Sierras.

19 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

20 MS. JURALOPA: Again, please look at my November
21 23rd comment and map. Comment ID number 29074. Thank
22 you so much. Have a great evening.

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

24 And right now, we will have caller 8724. And up
25 next after that will be caller 1457.

1 Caller 8724, please follow the prompts.

2 The floor is yours.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

4 I'm calling from Rancho Cucamonga to ask you not to group
5 us into the 210 district. The area we are grouped with
6 is mostly cities in Los Angeles County, and I'm unsure
7 why we are grouped with them. Our concerns are best
8 represented by being grouped in a San -- San Bernardino
9 County district.

10 The district you want our city in is so much more
11 homogeneous than our community. To make matters worse,
12 the communities we are currently grouped with are way
13 richer than us out here. I urge the Commission to not
14 group any part of Rancho Cucamonga into a Los Angeles
15 County district. Thank you.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now, we have caller 1457, and up next
18 after that will be caller 1983.

19 Caller 1457, please follow the prompts.

20 The floor is yours.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. Hi,
22 Commissioners. I'm calling from the San Fernando Valley,
23 and I want you to know that you've got the three San
24 Fernando Valley congressional districts almost right.
25 There is really no need for major changes.

1 But since you're still tweaking things, I wanted to
2 flag for your attention the impact of the last minute
3 swap that moved Sylmar into the East San Fernando Valley
4 district. You did this by removing Porter Ranch and
5 Granada Hills from the West Valley -- San Fernando Valley
6 district, and instead connected them with Palmdale.

7 There was and still is a better way to do this.
8 Please keep Porter Ranch and Granada Hills with the West
9 San Fernando Valley. These neighborhoods are a mountain
10 range away from where you have placed them. All the
11 public services are provided by the City of Los Angeles
12 and (indiscernible) --

13 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- is the academic and job
15 hub for the region.

16 Instead, Sunland-Tujunga is the community that can
17 go with the Antelope Valley. Sunland-Tujunga is rural,
18 but it's presently in --

19 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- a district with West
21 Hollywood, which is urban. Moving Sunland-Tujunga is a
22 win-win. Porter Ranch and Granada Hills has been with
23 the San Fernando Valley and congressional district map
24 you've presented for months.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 1983. And up next
2 after that will be caller 1043.

3 Caller 1983, if you will please follow the prompts.
4 The floor is yours.

5 MR. WALDMAN: Yeah, hi. Stuart Waldman from VICA.
6 Excited to be moving on to the Senate maps, although as
7 you've heard from many callers, there's still some touch
8 ups that need to be done on the congressional maps. VICA
9 did submit a shapefile, and we resubmitted it this
10 morning. So we hope you'll take a look and make those
11 fixes.

12 When it comes to the Senate maps, though, we're okay
13 with where they started, although you're starting to move
14 things around. So we just want to make sure that we have
15 three seats that go from Glendale to Woodland Hills and
16 Calabasas that encompass the San Fernando Valley. We
17 think that you can keep the San Fernando Valley mostly
18 whole in -- in two of the seats, and you know, we look
19 forward to that process.

20 We hope that we don't have to go south of Mulholland
21 again. You know how we feel about --

22 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

23 MR. WALDMAN: -- those folks down there. And you
24 know, we are -- you know, if you nest it, that'd be
25 great. If you don't nest, that'd be great, as well. But

1 if things move around, we hope that you don't just grab
2 pieces of the San --

3 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

4 MR. WALDMAN: -- Fernando Valley for population for
5 other districts.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now, we have caller 1043. And up next
8 after that will be caller 5104.

9 Caller 1043, please follow the prompts.

10 The floor is yours.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. I have
12 been calling in every day and willing to waiting for hour
13 to speak because this is important to me and the Little
14 Saigon community, which this which we will effect for the
15 next ten years. Thank you for Commissioner Kennedy, for
16 suggesting to add North Huntington Beach to Little Saigon
17 for the AD_GGW map. Please add all of North Garfield
18 Street to Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach. Please
19 remove Stanton and east of Garden Grove because the
20 majority of these residents, they all speak Spanish.
21 They would probably want to leave with their community of
22 interest. I don't think so.

23 For the congressional map, please add the CD of the
24 Seal Beach and all of the Huntington Beach in which
25 Little Saigon. This will complete Little Saigon district

1 and will give us a two presentation. Thank you, and
2 please do consider this change so that we can protect our
3 Little Saigon community of interest.

4 God bless Little Saigon. Have a good evening. Good
5 night.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now, we have 5104. And up next after that
8 is caller 9966.

9 Caller 5104, please follow the prompts.

10 The floor is yours.

11 MS. ZEPEDA: Good afternoon. My name is Jessica
12 Zepeda (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham and have lived
13 here for about twenty years. I am calling regarding the
14 state Assembly 110 LA draft map. I merely asked for you
15 to help with a minor cleanup modifications. We ask for
16 you to also place our next door neighbors from
17 unincorporated Walnut Park into the same 110LA map. Add
18 us and make the 10 freeway the northern border of the
19 map.

20 It is imperative to have Walnut Park and Florence-
21 Graham together in the same map. Isolating this
22 unincorporated island will only diminish our voices and
23 effort that we have fought so hard together for over
24 thirty years. We have united community between Walnut
25 Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham. As we will

1 like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy
2 and priorities for our community, as we have the same
3 political and social challenges.

4 I understand that Huntington Park cannot be in the
5 same map due to population, however with a minor change
6 of moving Walnut Park into the 110LA map, it would help
7 our unincorporated communities of Walnut Park and
8 Florence-Graham to have a fighting --

9 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

10 MS. ZEPEDA: -- in having a voice in Sacramento.

11 Thank you. Have a good night.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 9966, and up next
14 after that is caller 6235.

15 Caller 9966, please follow the prompts.

16 The floor is yours.

17 MR. LARA: Hi, good evening. My name is Ricardo
18 Lara. I am the current mayor of the City of Maywood.
19 I'm calling today because the current maps under
20 consideration are unfair and placed -- and misplaced
21 Maywood at a great disadvantage. Maywood had -- has
22 always been part of the southeast Los Angeles area. And
23 the current maps, both Assembly and Senate, place Maywood
24 in Northeast Los Angeles, communities have never been
25 apart -- we have never been part of and have little in

1 common with.

2 I call upon and urge the Commission to keep Maywood
3 with similar cities and communities of interest in the
4 southeast of Los Angeles. Maywood belongs with the
5 cities of Bell, Cudahy, Huntington Park, Lynwood, and
6 South Gate. Not only do we share common boundaries with
7 these cities, but we share common needs and goals.

8 By placing us in the northeast, we are dealing
9 with -- we will have our voices taken away --

10 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

11 MR. LARA: -- and all the years of hard work that
12 we've have actually have done to improve the City of
13 Maywood will go to -- go away. We urge you to please
14 keep in mind and leave the City of Maywood in the
15 southeast of Los Angeles area. Thank you very much for
16 all your time, Commissioners, and I do appreciate all
17 your efforts and listening to our comments.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

19 And right now, we will have caller 6235, and then up
20 next after that will be caller 1524.

21 Caller 6235, please follow the prompts.

22 The floor is yours.

23 Caller 6235, if you will please double check your
24 phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted
25 in the meeting.

1 MS. FRECOCUS: Okay. Can you hear me now?

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

3 MS. FRECOCUS: Wonderful. Hi. My name is Pam
4 Frecocus (ph.), and I am part of the northern Central
5 Valley in Stanislaus County. And I am asking you to --
6 well, first of all, I want to thank you for all your hard
7 work. I know that you guys are listening to a lot of
8 people, and I appreciate all the time and effort that you
9 have spent. And so I would like to thank you for that
10 first.

11 There's no question that I heard some of you saying
12 yesterday that the VRA districts for Congress need to be
13 reworked. And in the Central Valley, it's about time our
14 communities could be finally heard. And so I really want
15 to just say you're doing the right thing by not rushing
16 through the process and getting them right.

17 I heard you talking about drawing an arm. I'm not
18 sure what that means exactly, but I sure hope that you
19 could make it better because that sounds better to me if
20 we can make things stronger instead --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 MS. FRECOCUS: -- of weaker. Thank you so much for
23 your time and your effort. I appreciate all your hard
24 work.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 1524, and then up next
2 after that will be caller 8174.

3 Caller 1524, please follow the prompts.

4 The floor is yours.

5 MS. GRISNABOR: My name is Teresa Grisnabor (ph.).

6 I, too, am calling from Stanislaus County. I live in
7 Modesto and have done so for thirty years. I speak to
8 you from my experience as a reference librarian who
9 worked downtown at the Modesto library for sixteen years.

10 I'm calling to argue that you redo our congressional
11 district. I have several reasons for saying that.

12 The -- the map that you proposed on November 27th would
13 split our county in a very disadvantaged way, and it's
14 not functional.

15 First of all, when you split our county, it creates
16 confusion among the citizens. We've already experienced
17 this. Between 2003 and 2011 after the 2000 census, the
18 county was split right down the middle. I work at the
19 reference desk at the public library. Citizens and
20 businesses would called in needing help. We would refer
21 them to their congressional district, and they would say,
22 yeah, we need -- we know we need our congressman. Who is
23 it? We often couldn't tell them. It was hard to tell
24 because the district lines were so confusingly drawn and
25 hard to determine.

1 There was a lack of coordination. The western part
2 of our county was headed up by a Democrat. The eastern
3 part by a Republican. The Democrat was concerned with
4 the western issues of the county, principally the --

5 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

6 MS. GRISNABOR: -- farmers. The -- the eastern one
7 was concern with the foothills. By the way, the
8 foothills, the --

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we have caller 8174, and then up next
11 after that will be caller 6739.

12 Caller 8174, please follow the prompts.

13 The floor is yours.

14 MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Sandra Rodriguez.

15 I'm calling from CHIRLA. We appreciate that the
16 Commission has drawn most of the Antelope Valley together
17 in AVSCH (sic). We ask that you include Lake LA as part
18 of the district. Currently, it's part of the
19 (indiscernible) map and connected to the High Desert.
20 This modification will be more respectful of the AV
21 community residents locally. Lake LA is part of the AV.
22 Residents rely on assets for higher education like
23 Antelope Valley College and health care with Antelope
24 Valley Hospital, which are major economic engines for the
25 community.

1 Thank you for putting Sylmar back in the San
2 Fernando Valley district. As a long-time resident of
3 Sylmar, we can't be separated from the rest of the East
4 San Fernando Valley. As an undocumented student, LA
5 Mission College was the closest and most accessible
6 college my family and I could afford.

7 By keeping Sylmar in the SFV district, you are
8 ensuring students continue to have access to colleges in
9 their home cities. Valley Village and south North
10 Hollywood is home to higher income communities and have
11 no shared -- no share interests in cities like Van Nuys
12 or Panorama City. Therefore, we ask that the Valley
13 Village and it's -- anything south of Burbank Boulevard
14 and North Hollywood not being included --

15 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

16 MS. RODRIGUEZ: -- in this district.

17 We appreciate today's Senate discussion on the
18 Senate maps, which led to a new configuration of SBRC.
19 The cities of San Bernardino, we also are different
20 communities of interest from Morena Valley and Paris.

21 Lastly, I want to uplift the need for a BRB -- VRA
22 district --

23 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

24 MS. RODRIGUEZ: -- from the Senate that draws the
25 Santa Ana community of interest together in the outline

1 of South Fullerton and West Anaheim communities of
2 interest. This can be achieved by looking at the
3 (indiscernible) map configuration. Thank you.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 6739, and then up next
6 after that will be caller 5457.

7 Caller 6739, please follow the prompts.

8 The floor is yours.

9 MS. TORRES: Hello. My name is Jessica Torres, and
10 I'm currently the councilwoman from the City of Maywood.
11 I'm calling today because the current maps under
12 consideration are unfair, and they place Maywood at a
13 great disadvantage. Maywood has always been part of
14 southeast of Los Angeles, and the current maps, both for
15 Assembly and Senate, place Maywood in Northeast Los
16 Angeles communities, a disadvantage.

17 Maywood belongs with the cities of Bell, Cudahy,
18 Huntington Park, Lynwood, South Gate, et cetera. Not
19 only do we share common boundaries with the cities, but
20 we share common needs and goals. I respectfully ask that
21 you keep Maywood in the Southeast Assembly district.
22 Thank you so much for everything. Good night.

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

24 And right now, we have caller 5457, and up next
25 after that is caller 3358.

1 Caller 5457, please follow the prompts.

2 The floor is yours.

3 Caller 5457, if you will please double check your
4 phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted
5 in the meeting.

6 MS. SANCHEZ: All right. Thank you so much. My
7 name is Claudia Sanchez (ph.), and I am a current student
8 at UCR, making a public comment to urge you to make an
9 adjustment to Assembly district boundaries that encompass
10 the university UCR located at 900 University Avenue,
11 Riverside, California, 92521.

12 The current map iteration last proposes UCR to be
13 part of AD 63, SWRIV, which splits the campus from
14 greater Riverside area. But keeping the campus and the
15 greater Riverside area together is very important, given
16 how much they complement each other.

17 So as a student, I commute from -- from downtown
18 area to UCR frequently, and I would hate to see how both
19 entities lose from future benefits and its representation
20 does not stay intact. So because of this, I respectfully
21 ask that UCR -- UC Riverside to be added to the A --

22 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

23 MS. SANCHEZ: -- AD 58, JRC map. Thank you so much
24 for the consideration.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 3358. And up next up
2 that will be caller 7894.

3 Caller 3358, please follow the prompts.

4 The floor is yours.

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening,
6 everyone. My name is Diana, and I live in the Florence-
7 Graham area. I'm calling regarding the state Assembly LA
8 110 map -- draft map. Thank you for your consideration
9 in trying to keep our communities of Walnut Park,
10 Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham together. As it
11 doesn't appear that this was possible, we are here to ask
12 for a minor change.

13 Please make the unincorporated Walnut Park area in
14 the -- into the LA -- into the 110LA map to be with
15 Florence-Graham and make the 110 freeway -- then make the
16 10 freeway -- I'm sorry -- the northern border of the
17 map. Both our areas are unincorporated parts of Los
18 Angeles County, and we need to stay together.

19 We are asking for a small alteration of this map in
20 order to truly have an opportunity to have our
21 hardworking families to elect candidates of our choice.
22 Thank you very much for your hard work, and have a
23 blessed, good evening.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

25 And right now, we have caller 7894, and then up next



1 after that, we will retry caller 0983.

2 Caller 7894, please follow the prompts.

3 The floor is yours.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Good evening.

5 As an employee of the University of California Riverside,
6 I encourage the Commission to add the university located
7 at 900 University Avenue to AD 58, JRC map for continuity
8 of representation and to maintain its long standing
9 partnership with the City of Riverside on housing and
10 infrastructure, economic and workforce development.

11 It's imperative that UC Riverside be added to the AD
12 58, JRC map. Thank you so much for your service to the
13 residents of the State of California. Have a good
14 evening.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

16 And right now, we will retry caller 0983, and then
17 up next after that, we will go to caller 1456.

18 Caller 0983, if you will please follow the prompts
19 to unmute.

20 The floor is yours.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, the floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me? Okay --

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- hello, Commissioner.

3 Hello, Commissioner. I have been calling every day to
4 make my comment because I am a resident of Huntington
5 Beach. And for a long time, the Vietnamese community has
6 been growing and living there.

7 Yesterday, I heard that the Commission talk about
8 adding Huntington Beach, Little Saigon, for the
9 congressional. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, for a
10 suggestion to add north of Huntington Beach to Little
11 Saigon. I applaud you for your effort. And please
12 continue to make sure Little Saigon have a true
13 presentation.

14 Little Saigon asking you to please listen to our
15 voice and do the right thing. Make sure we have a
16 congressional, Senator, Assembly that can help our
17 community, especially our elders. Thank you. Have a
18 good night.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 1456. And then up
21 next after that will be caller 4340.

22 Caller 1456, please follow the prompts.

23 The floor is yours.

24 MS. YU: Hi. My name is Patty Yu (ph.). I have
25 been living in the Irvine area since college at UCI since

1 1996. I'm calling today to voice my concern about the
2 proposed border, the new district splitting up Irvine and
3 putting Tustin in a new district with the top half of
4 Irvine.

5 It seems like it would be better to keep the -- the
6 cities together, as it has been, and to keep a large,
7 unique area like Irvine as one. We -- you know, we have
8 a -- a state university, UCI. We have the great park.
9 We have a very robust business center, with many Fortune
10 500 companies. We have one -- one school district, and
11 we share state resources.

12 So to have half represented by one state senator and
13 the other half represented by another doesn't seem to be
14 a very effective way to --

15 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

16 MS. YU: -- service that community.

17 As I mentioned, we share city resources, events, and
18 have many common interests to be represented. And to
19 split it up just would really set us back. And it's the
20 very growing and flourishing area that would be best
21 served by a continuous representation. Every effort
22 should be made to keep cities whole as possible. I mean,
23 we're not even talking about a small portion. We're
24 talking about a huge city.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 4340, and then up next
2 after that, we will retry caller 6625.

3 Caller 4340, if you'll please follow the prompts to
4 unmute.

5 The floor is yours.

6 MS. LADDISH: Good evening. My name is Kate
7 Laddish, that's K-A-T-E, L-A-D-D-I-S-H. I live in the
8 Yolo County city of Winters, just two blocks from Solano
9 County and near Napa County. Thank you for your ongoing
10 work. Your task is colossal, and I appreciate your
11 thoughtful discussions. And I'm very grateful that our
12 state tasks a Commission rather than the legislature with
13 redistricting. Your meetings, including public comment,
14 are democracy in action.

15 I'm calling about the Senate district for Yolo
16 County. I support you using your draft district for our
17 area, SD_NAPABYRON draft, rather than trying to nest
18 Assembly district.

19 SD_NAPABYRON draft groups Yolo and Solano, which
20 matches community of interest testimony and would keep
21 the greater Winters area whole. It keeps Yolo, Solano,
22 and Napa counties whole and groups the delta portions of
23 Yolo, Solano, Sacramento, and Contra Costa County. It
24 includes areas with shared interest and transportation,
25 wildfire preparation and recovery, agriculture, including

1 specialty crops such as wine grapes and --

2 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

3 MS. LADDISH: -- oil in the delta. I'm concerned
4 that if the Commission moves towards nesting rather than
5 using the draft Senate district that we might lose some
6 of the community of interest connections and groupings
7 that are in the draft Senate district SD --

8 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

9 MS. LADDISH: -- NAPABYRON draft. Thank you again
10 for your ongoing work.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And all right. Now, we will retry caller 6625, and
13 then up next after that will be caller 2696.

14 Caller 6625, please follow the prompts.

15 The floor is yours.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, the High
17 Desert in San Bernardino County has been absolutely
18 shredded, sliced, and ripped apart. At a similar level,
19 you put Pinon Hills and Phelan, rural communities with
20 dirt roads, into a district with one of the wealthiest
21 and urban areas in LA, Pasadena. Now, today, you ripped
22 apart our desert without looking at other options or
23 pointing to any significant COI testimony. Only
24 Commissioner Vazquez showed any concern for our
25 community.

1 You are essentially disenfranchising part of our
2 value by dumping them into a majority-LA County district
3 in the Assembly and the Senate and also dividing our
4 desert and preventing us from being able to speak with
5 one voice.

6 Last week, Commissioners said they wanted to uplift
7 poorer communities, but your actions show otherwise. We
8 were kind of happy with those draft maps. I -- I ask
9 that you go back and look at the draft maps when making
10 your future decisions. Thank you.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we're going to caller 2696, and then
13 up next after that will be caller 9387.

14 Caller 2696, if you will please follow the prompts
15 to unmute.

16 And one more time, caller 2696, if you will please
17 follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

18 Caller 2696, it appears you may be having some
19 type --

20 MR. MEYERS: Hello.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, nope. There you are.
22 The floor is yours.

23 MR. MEYERS: Yes, thank you. My name is Tom Meyers
24 (ph.), and I live in Modesto, and I'm in favor of keeping
25 Stanislaus County as whole as possible, as presented in

1 map 2. Modesto should not be split into two Assembly
2 districts, especially one going to Tahoe and Death Valley
3 that have very little in common with the Central Valley
4 cities of Modesto, Manteca, Tracy, and Patterson. One in
5 three people in the tenth congressional District in -- is
6 a Modesto resident, and if you divide Modesto, we would
7 lose congressional representation.

8 Agriculture is a major industry in the Central
9 Valley, certainly not Tahoe and Death Valley. Water is
10 our most important natural resource, and we want -- need
11 people in power to fight for it. And it's important not
12 to disrupt the economic progress among Modesto, Manteca,
13 Tracy, and Patterson.

14 In 2019, the mayors of these cities established an
15 economic development plan covering infrastructure and
16 transportation. These communities --

17 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

18 MR. MEYERS: -- are -- consist of -- consist of many
19 commuters from the Bay Area and Santa Clara, and traffic
20 congestion will continue to be a challenge. The ACE
21 train is scheduled to start up in the Valley in 2022, so
22 that's another thing these cities have in common.

23 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

24 MR. MEYERS: A realistic Central Valley should
25 consist -- include all of Modesto, Tracy, Manteca,

1 Patterson, and Turlock. So I urge you to adopt map 2. I
2 appreciate your attention in this matter. Thank you.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 And right now, we will have caller 9387, and then up
5 next after that will be caller 9846.

6 Caller 9387, if you will please follow the prompts
7 to unmute.

8 The floor is yours.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, for
10 all your hard work during the redistricting process. I
11 wanted to refer to the plan ST iteration. As a Modesto
12 resident, this district map keeps communities of interest
13 together, as we all share similar agricultural and water
14 concerns. Please approve of this visualization. Thank
15 you, once again.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now, we will have caller 9846.

18 Caller 9846, if you'll please follow the prompts to
19 unmute.

20 The floor is yours.

21 MS. SEYMOUR: I'm from the great City of Carson,
22 California, and I'm Verges Seymour (ph.). Carson is the
23 home of Cal State University, Dominguez Hills, and I'm
24 calling to respectfully request that this Commission
25 reconsider splitting our city into two Assembly

1 districts. I'm afraid splitting our city into two
2 districts will adversely affect our students at Cal State
3 University, Dominguez Hills, and we need to remain whole
4 in District 65. Thank you for your consideration and for
5 your hard work.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And Chair, at that time -- at this time, that's all
8 of our callers.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy. Thank you,
10 Christian. Thank you, interpreters. Thank you,
11 captioners. Thank you, staff.

12 It is time for a break for all of us. So I don't
13 want to belabor anything. I would just ask if colleagues
14 could take some time this evening or tomorrow morning,
15 reflect on how much work we yet have to do, how little
16 time we have to do it, and if there are ways that you
17 would see as available to us that we could make faster
18 progress on this.

19 So thank you, everyone, for a good day. And we will
20 see you tomorrow morning at 11 a.m. We are adjourned.

21 (Whereupon, the CRC Live Line Drawing Meeting
22 meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.)

23

24


25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 4th day of January, 2022.



JACQUELINE DENLINGER,
Court Reporter

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.



TRACI FINE, CDLT-169

January 4, 2022